

Consistencies in Personality Characteristics & Behavior  
Patterns of Homicide Offenders:  
A Synthesis of a Police Technique and Psychological  
Theory

by  
Lawrence A. Ellerby

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirments for the  
Degree of Masters of Arts

Department of Psychology  
University of Manitoba  
Winnipeg, Manitoba

© 1986



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

*Your file* *Votre référence*

*Our file* *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-86129-0

**Canada**

CONSISTENCIES IN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIOR  
PATTERNS OF HOMICIDE OFFENDERS:

A SYNTHESIS OF A POLICE TECHNIQUE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORY

BY

LAWRENCE A. ELLERBY

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1987

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis.

I authorize the University of Manitoba to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Lawrence A. Ellerby

I further authorize the University of Manitoba to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Lawrence A. Ellerby

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When one decides to leave the safety of the inner sanctum and conduct research outside of an academic institution problems ultimately arise whereby one must rely on the assistance of the people around him. When one decides to conduct research in a federal correctional institution those "people around you" become that much more significant.

First off I would like to thank Dr. Lawrence Breen, not only for his participation in this thesis, but for introducing me to an application of psychology that immediately caught my interest as an undergraduate. Dr. Breen has both nurtured and encouraged that interest up to this present day. I am indebted to his teaching, advice, and freindship.

I would also like to thank my committee members Dr. Ross Hartsough, and Dr. Rick Linden for allowing me to maintain a great deal of independence while conducting my research, yet who were there when advice and input was needed. Their interest in this project was greatly appreciated.

I also owe a debt of graditude to the psychology department at the Stony Mountain Institution. Dr. Richard Howes went out of his way to see that this research project succeeded. His efforts saw to it that this project was passed by all the necessary individuals and committees both within the institution, and regionally. Once the project was accepted he saw to it that I had access to everything I needed and kept an eye out to make sure things ran smoothly. His interest and enthusiasm served as a catalyst and will not be forgotten. I must also thank Mr. Om Chaudhry who was kind enough to always leave his door open to me. He was always there willing to share his years of experience and the lessons he taught me can not be found in any book. His concern and interest in people and his dedication to his proffession serve as an inspiration. I would also like to thank Trudy Colburn for all her assistance.

I must also thank all the staff at Stony Mountain for their assistance and cooperation throughout the study.

I also owe a big thank you to all the inmates that participated in this research, they gratuitously permitted me to probe into very personal, and often painful memories. I must especially thank the members of the "Omega Lifers Club". They allowed me to come into their world and included me in both their club meetings and club activities.

Finally I would like to thank my family and friends for their support and guidance, and for putting up with me during the course of this research.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments .....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
Abstract .....	iv
Introduction .....	1
Method .....	26
subjects .....	26
questionnaires & self report scales .....	28
procedure .....	33
Results .....	37
Demographic Data .....	37
age .....	37
race .....	37
family history .....	38
education .....	42
employment .....	43
substance abuse .....	44
past criminal history .....	45
differences in violent & nonviolent offenders .....	47
Psychological Testing .....	50
Jackson Personality Research Form .....	50
Personal Belief Scale .....	52
Psychopathy Checklist .....	53
Offender/Victim/ Crime Interactions .....	54
victim's age .....	54
victim's race .....	55
offender's race .....	55
victim's sex .....	56
relationship between offender & victim .....	57
substance abuse .....	58
planning .....	59
weapons .....	59
approach .....	61
force prior to homicide .....	61
method .....	63
point of impact .....	63
overkill .....	63
postmortem activity .....	64
altering the scene of the crime .....	65
location .....	66
remaining at the scene of the crime .....	67
statements .....	69
repeat .....	70
Discussion .....	70
Demographic Information .....	72
age .....	72
race .....	73
family history .....	74

education .....	87
employment .....	92
substance abuse .....	87
past criminal history .....	98
differences in violent & nonviolent offenders .....	99
Psychological Testing .....	102
Jackson Personality Research Form .....	102
Personal Belief Scale .....	115
Psychopathy Checklist .....	118
Offender/Victim/Crime Interactions .....	129
age .....	129
race .....	130
relationship .....	132
substance abuse .....	140
planning .....	144
remaining at the scene of the crime .....	147
postmortem activity .....	150
Summary .....	154
References.....	159
Appendix A	
Demographic Questionnaire .....	177
Appendix B	
Victim Questionnaire .....	198
Appendix C	
Crime Questionnaire .....	203
Appendix D	
Jackson Personality Research Form .....	218
Appendix E	
Personal Belief Scale .....	225
Appendix F	
The Psychopathy Checklist .....	229

## ABSTRACT

Psychological profiling is an investigative technique used by police agencies to determine what type of individual might commit a particular type of crime. Facts for profiling are derived by extrapolating information from past crimes of a similar nature. While no formal explanation for the principle of psychological profiling has been forwarded, it was suggested that the foundations of this technique rest in the trait model of personality and psychopathology. Both these psychological constructs suggest consistencies in both personality and behavior. Based on this premise of consistency it was hypothesized that homicide offenders would demonstrate consistencies in 1) demographic variables, 2) personality characteristics, 3) and in interactions with their victim, and environment during the commission of the offence. Consistencies were observed in the demographic backgrounds of homicide offenders, however these backgrounds did not appear to be significantly different than those of the nonviolent comparison group. While consistencies were demonstrated on the psychological tests, these consistencies were not as pervasive as expected. The most notable findings which

produced marked consistences, were observed on the Jackson Personality Research Forms measure of harmavoidance, on Rotter's Personal Belief Scale, and on the Psychopathy Checklist. A number of associations were observed which suggested consistencies within the offenders interactions with the victim, and the crime scene. This information serves to demonstrate that using past crimes and criminal behavior as a guide for solving present cases is in fact a scientifically viable investigative technique. Theoretically it is suggested that an interactionist perspective may be better suited in accounting for these consistencies rather than the strict person oriented model originally suggested.

## Consistencies in Personality Characteristics & Behavior Among Violent Offenders

In 1978 the Behavioral Science Unit of the Federal Bureau of investigation began looking for patterns among violent criminal offenders. Members of the Behavioral Science Unit believed that if common characteristics of specific offender populations could be identified, these offender profiles could be generalized to predict the characteristics of individuals who had perpetrated similar types of offences. The technique of making predictions about present/future criminal offenders based on a knowledge of past offenders and their behavior is known as psychological profiling. Geberth (1983) defines psychological profiling as "an educated attempt to provide investigative agencies with specific information as to the type of individual who would have committed a certain crime (page 400)." Psychological profiling serves to focus investigations properly, help locate possible suspects, identify suspects, and assist in the prosecution of suspects (Pinizzotto, 1984). The knowledge that is necessary to develop psychological profiles has relevance in a number of academic and practical areas. The understanding of deviant individuals, and criminal behavior is important to many areas of psychology. This information can be directly

applied to the areas of personality, psychopathology, clinical and forensic psychology. Such facts are also applicable to the fields of sociology, criminology, corrections, law enforcement, and all areas of the criminal justice system. Despite the far reaching applications of psychological profiling, its major objective is to provide investigators with a personality composite that will aid in the apprehension of the offender.

The composite drawn up by the FBI usually includes information regarding the age, race, sex, marital status, general employment history, and past criminal history of the offender for a given crime (Ault & Reese, 1980). A profile may also include information pertaining to the relationship between the offender and victim, the location of the offender's residency in relation to the crime scene, and the offender's emotional and psychological state at the time of the offence. The profiler is able to make such predictions by relating what is known about the victim, and crime scene of a specific crime to what is known of similar past offences (Porter, 1983).

It is important to note that psychological profiling is only one of many investigative techniques used by police agencies throughout the course of a criminal investigation. It is by no means designed to

be the sole technique on which an investigation, and the subsequent selection of a suspect is based. The actual origins of psychological profiling are obscure. However, the technique is not an entirely new concept. For centuries there have been attempts to describe physical and/or psychological attributes that would clearly indicate potential and actual criminal types (Pinizzotto, 1984). McPoyle (1981) points out that even literary works such as Shakespeare's "Julius Ceaser" and Edgar Allen Poe's "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" exhibit examples of attempts to profile certain behaviors by means of physical attributes.

During World War II, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) employed a psychiatrist, William Langer, to profile Adolf Hitler. The OSS hoped that Langer would be able to predict Hitler's future behavior based on a psychological description of his personality (Ault & Reese, 1980).

Dr. James A. Brussel, a New York City psychiatrist was responsible for both creating an interest in psychological profiling as well as temporarily discrediting profiling as a valid and reliable investigative technique. During the 1950s the New York City Police were engaged in a manhunt for an individual who was known as the "Mad Bomber" of New York. Over the course of 8 years the same individual had inter-

mittently detonated 32 incendiary devices. During this time period police were unable to come up with any substantial leads using conventional investigative techniques. Dr. Brussel was asked to construct a personality profile of the "type of person" who would be capable of performing these "mad bombings." After analyzing the facts Dr. Brussel stated that the "Mad Bomber" would be 40-50 years of age, of Eastern European descent, and would live in Connecticut with either his sister or a maiden aunt. He diagnosed the bomber as a paranoid personality, and went on to speculate that as a child he had a poor relationship with his father, but loved his mother. Finally Dr. Brussel stated that the bomber would pay great attention to detail. He suggested that when the bomber was apprehended he would be wearing a double breasted suit with all the buttons done up. Within the same year that Dr. Brussel had completed his profile the New York city police arrested and charged George Metesky for the bombings. George Metesky was in his early 50s, Slavic by birth, and lived in Connecticut with his two unmarried sisters. At the time of his arrest he was wearing a double breasted suit with virtually all the buttons buttoned. While this raised great interest in profiling, it also created skepticism. Questions arose concerning the ability of this technique to be

repeated. Many felt that Dr. Brussel's prediction was a coincidence, something that would only happen once. The next test for profiling came when police asked Dr. Brussel to aid in the search for the "Boston Strangler." When the strangler was apprehended there were no similarities to be found between the profile and the individual whom police had arrested and charged with the murders. This enormous failure in profiling created a loss of interest in the technique. Many felt profiling could not be regarded as a reliable investigative technique as it was not systematic, or scientific. After this time very little work was done in the area of profiling until the Behavioral Science Unit reintroduced the technique in 1978. The goal of the FBI was to gather data with the intent of demonstrating that profiling could in fact be a systematic, and scientific technique.

In order to develop a profile one must have access to three main sources of information. The profiler must have a complete description of the victim, a detailed account of the crime scene, as well as an extensive background knowledge of offender profiles.

Just as the forensic pathologist uses the body by examining bruises, marks, and chemical analysis to determine the cause of death, the forensic psychologist uses information about the victim and the crime scene

to determine what type of individual may have committed a particular crime (Pinizzotto, 1984). The behavior of the perpetrator as evidenced in the crime scene, including the victim, will identify certain characteristics about the offender. According to FBI agents Ressler and Douglas an offender's personality may be reflected in the crime scene in the same manner in which furnishings in a home reflect the characteristics of the homeowner (Geberth, 1983). The job of the profiler is to look for "psychological fingerprints" at the scene of the crime that correspond with certain types of personality characteristics and behaviors.

The starting point of profiling lies in having detailed information about offenders. By studying offenders of specific crimes one is able to look for patterns. These patterns may exist in the personality characteristics of specific offenders, and/or the interactions with their environment. Before one is able to draw conclusions about what the psychological evidence at the scene of the crime means they must first know how the behavior exhibited at the scene of the crime can be related to the behavior and personality characteristics of past offenders. Geberth (1983) states that a psychological profile focuses attention on individuals with personality traits that

parallel traits of others who have committed very similar offences. Pinizzotto (1984) also states that given many incidents of a similar nature, investigators have discovered that individuals who commit a particular type of offence display certain specific characteristics or traits. A profiler is able to use what he knows about the victim and the crime scene to infer what type of offender committed a specific crime based on his knowledge of how past offenders have interacted in similar situations. This knowledge of past offenders is derived from studying offender profiles. Offender profiles are simply attempts to determine the "typical" type of offender for any given offence. While no two offenders are alike, and there are likely to be individual differences found among offenders who commit similar offences, there are also likely to be common traits that are shared by these offenders. It is both these important differences and important similarities that serve to differentiate and identify specific types of offenders within the same offence category (Burgess, Ressler, & Douglas, 1980). The technique of psychological profiling has never been formally described in terms of psychological constructs. It appears however, that the concepts of "traits" and consistency of behavior seem to be the cornerstone of this technique. The trait theory of

personality has been a dominant force in personality research and theory over the years (Mischel, 1968). The leading proponents of trait psychology have been Gordon Allport and Raymond Cattel, both influential personality theorists (Hall & Lindzey, 1978). The trait model proposes that behavior comes primarily from within the organism. Each individual can be described in terms of a constellation of traits such as aggression, impulsivity, dominance, affiliation, anxiety, and nurturance. These traits are presumed to be relatively stable characteristics which determine a person's manifest observable behavior. Their stability suggests that the behavior will be constant across a variety of situations. The trait model assumes that there are individual differences for each of the many trait dimensions and that this serves as the basis for comparing and contrasting individuals and groups (Hjelle & Ziegler, 1981). The trait model recognizes the impact of situational factors but places a greater emphasis on the person variable. Offender profiles in essence are attempting to describe the characteristics, or traits of specific groups of offenders.

The two other major models of personality are situationalism, and interactionalism. The situationalist theory of personality defines situational factors as constituting the main

determinants of behavior. Sociologists and social psychologists such as Cooley (1902) and Mead (1934) were among the first to suggest that situational factors are more important than individual differences as sources of behavior variance. The assumptions of the various theorists supporting this model vary greatly with only the importance of the situation serving as the common denominator at times. Classical behavior theorists Dollard & Miller (1950) emphasize learning and situational factors. However they also include organismic variables such as drives, motives, conflicts, and response-produced cues. Skinner (1953, 1971) refuses to infer internal constructs. His focus is based on the empirical analysis of stimulus (reinforcement) conditions, as well as the reinforcement contingencies that shape behavior. Social learning theorists Bandura (1969), Bandura & Walters (1963), Mischel (1968, 1976) and Rotter (1975) all focus on what the organism does rather than on underlying attributed traits, motives, or other dispositions. It should be noted that most of these theorists do not ignore person variables. While Bandura downplays person variables he does not follow Skinner in completely discounting them (Bandura, 1978). Mischel (1971) has addressed the issue of cognitive factors, and Rotter (1966) has talked about expectancies.

The interactionalist position is essentially a combination of the trait and situational models. Interactional psychology is concerned with scientific investigation of the complex interplay of persons and situations in determining behavior (Endler, 1976). Endler and Magnusson (1976) state that actual behavior is a function of a continuous process or multidirectional interaction (feedback) between the individual and the situation that is encountered. According to the interactionist position, the question of which is more important, person or situation is a meaningless one. Endler and Hunt (1966) call this a pseudo issue. They state that asking whether behavioral variance is due to either situations or persons, or how much variation is contributed by persons and how much by situations (an additive approach) is analogous to asking whether air or blood is more essential to life. So called modern interactionism was derived from observing statistical interactions in which it was noted that in a number of instances the interaction of individuals and situations accounted for more variance when combined than when either was taken alone (Bowers, 1973 Endler & Hunt, 1968). The interactionist position is not a new idea. As early as 1936 Kurt Lewin was writing about the separation of the person from the psychological environment and how when added together

they formed an individual's life space. He illustrated his theory in the following formula  $B = f(P, E)$  which reads, personality is a function of the person and the environment (Geiwitz, 1969). Murray (1938) in his studies of personality also endorsed an interactionist view point.

Of these models the trait theory of personality best exemplifies the technique of psychological profiling. This is because of the relationship between the trait model and psychopathology. Psychological profiling is most effective in crimes where the unknown suspect has demonstrated some form of psychopathology in their crime. Geberth (1981) gives examples of such crimes as sadistic torture in sexual assaults, evisceration, post-mortem slashing and cutting, motiveless firesetting, lust and mutilation murders, ritualistic crimes, and rapes. This research will attempt to demonstrate consistencies in less bizarre forms of homicide. In discussing profiling and psychopathology Geberth (1981) states that in virtually any crime where available evidence indicates a mental, emotional, or personality aberration, a psychological profile can be instrumental in providing information about the offender. The entire notion of psychological profiling is based on the belief that there is consistency in the personality characteristics, and

behavior of offenders. Profiling is most suited to crimes demonstrating psychopathology because abnormality often suggests stability of personality characteristics, and behavior. Davison and Neale, (1982) state that one of the hallmarks of a mental disorder has been said to be rigidity and inflexibility, which is another way of saying behaviour is consistent in a variety of situations. Assuming that violent offenders demonstrate some form of psychopathology one may conclude that these individuals demonstrate more consistent patterns of behavior, and more stable personality traits than non-pathological populations. Alker (1972) suggests that the behavior of abnormal or disorganized personalities can be explained by intrapsychic consistency, while he states that situational factors may be an important source of variance for normal people, or organized personalities. This would suggest that the person variable becomes more important when dealing with abnormal/deviant individuals. Closer examination of how the person variable increases in importance with pathological noncriminal populations may shed some light on why it is felt that this concept can be generalized to criminal populations whose crimes indicate the existence of some form of pathology.

Although few studies have investigated the stability of personality characteristics or traits in relation to the psychological health of the individual, the existing data indicates that the person variable accounts for a larger percentage of the variance in abnormal populations.

Moos (1968) investigated how psychiatric patients and the staff at a hospital described their reactions to a variety of situations within the ward. A number of different settings were chosen in an attempt to systematically sample the different types of situations in which patients and staff participated. The settings were each rated on 33 adjective pairs ie. friendly-hostile, relaxed-tense. Moos found that the descriptions given by the abnormal group most often were reflected as a function of the individual rather than the situation they were in. The person variable accounted for 29.96% of the variance whereas the situational variable and the person times situational variable accounted for only 1.70% and 16.95% respectively. In a similar study, Moos (1969) observed 16 psychiatric patients across 6 different settings in which the patients were free to engage in any type of activity they chose. The patient's behavior was observed in each of the settings. After participating in each setting the patients filled out a questionnaire

regarding how they felt in, and about, the environment they had just been in. This procedure was repeated after three months. The self report data indicated a higher percentage of the variance was due to person variables over situational variables on both occasions. The observational data revealed that the person variable accounted for a greater percentage of the variance during the first recording only. It must also be conceded that in this study the person times situation variable accounted for the largest percentage of the variance. Another similar study by Moos (1972) found the person variable to be more important than the situational variable, but not as important as the person times situation variable.

Endler (1973) administered the S-R Inventory of General or Trait Anxiousness (Inventory of Attitudes Toward General Situations) to samples of high school, university, and evening college students, as well as to neurotic and psychotic psychiatric patients. This test presents four general situations. The first three situations are based on three situational anxiety factors (interpersonal factors, physical danger, and ambiguity). The fourth is designed to measure anxiety in routine or generally innocuous situations. Endler argued that individual differences are not a major source of behavioral variance in disorganized

personalities. He states that the person variable is not as predictive as either the situational, or interactional variables. Data from Endler's research however indicate a different trend. The results suggest that the person, or trait variables play a more important predictive role in disturbed personalities. The data also suggests the more disturbed the personality is, the more important the person variable becomes. The person variable for high school, university, and evening college students accounted for .93, 3.65, and 4.20 percent of the variance respectively, while the situational variable accounted for 17.88, 28.71, and 24.20 percent of the variance. The person by situation interaction accounted for 16.86, 17.47, and 20.04 percent of the variance. The data from this study suggests that situational variables play a more important role than either the person, or the person by situational variables in the behavior of normals. On the other hand the neurotic and psychotic subjects showed a different trend. For the neurotic group the person variable accounted for 12.13 percent of the variance while the situational variable only accounted for 5.78 percent. The person by situation variable accounted for 22.09 percent of the variance. In the more disturbed psychotic group the person variable accounted for 18.75 percent of the

variance. In this group of subjects the person by situation accounted for 8.28 percent of the variance while the situational variable accounted for only 5.25 percent of the variance. This study demonstrates how the person variable increases in importance with more disturbed populations. A similar study by Endler and Okada (1975) yielded equivalent results. The S-R Inventory of General Trait Anxiousness was administered to samples of normal children, and adults as well as to neurotic and psychotic individuals. For the normal adult sample the person variable accounted for the smallest amount of the variance (3.77%), while the situational variable and the person times situational variable accounted for 17.96, and 19.22 percent of the variance respectively. Normal youths demonstrated comparable results. In the neurotic subjects the person variable accounted for 10.66 percent of the variance. The situation accounted for 9.38 percent, while the person times situation accounted for 19.66 percent. The person variable accounted for the highest percentage of the variance (16.5%) in the psychotic subjects. The situation only accounted for 7.01 percent of the variance, while the person times situation accounted for 10.8 percent. Again one can see that the person variable increases with importance as one looks at populations exhibiting psychopathology. In this study

normal and neurotic subjects demonstrate the importance of the interactionalist perspective, however in the more disturbed psychotic group the person variable remains the major source of variance. In an early study Endler & Hunt (1969) found that the person variable accounted for the largest percentage of the variance in a sample of male psychotics. In what seems to be an attempt to support their interactionalist perspective, the authors' speculated that these particular findings may be unreliable.

Psychological health may not be the only factor contributing to the increased importance of the person variable. It may also be the case that some personality characteristics or traits are by their own nature stable within an individual. Aggression may be just such a trait. In a two part study Endler and Hunt (1969) presented a sample of normal university students with a number of situational statements. In each of these statements the students were confronted with situations in which they were either personally or impersonally frustrated (ie. your instructor unfairly accuses you of cheating on an examination, you are trying to study and there is incessant noise). The subjects were then asked to rate themselves on a continuum (from not at all, to very much) on 10 modes of responses included items such as heart rate

increases, lose patience, want to strike something or someone, and curse. The students were then administered the S-R Inventory of Hostility. This inventory regards anger, aggression, and hostility to be synonymous. It contains items such as: you are carrying a cup of coffee to the table and someone bumps into you; and someone pushes ahead of you in a theater ticket line. Subjects were again asked to rate their responses. In both males and females the person variable accounted for a larger percentage of the variance (male 19.12%, female 16.20%) than either the situation (male 5.23%, female 7.18%), or the person times situation interaction (male 13.02%, female 11.16%). This suggests that with some personality characteristics, such as aggression, the stability of the trait may override any effect that the situation may have. Berkowitz (1977) states that with traits such as aggression, the situation may play an important role in determining the intensity with which the behavioral trait is demonstrated.

While the debate between trait, situational, and interactional theorists will no doubt rage on, it appears that for abnormal populations, and possibly for specific traits such as aggression, that the person variable increases in importance. This important link between stability of personality characteristics,

behavior, and psychopathology is the key to psychological profiling.

It is expected that consistencies will exist in the age, race, family history, education, employment, past criminal histories, and substance use/abuse of homicide offenders.

It is believed that the majority of homicide offenders will be young individuals under the age of 26 (Glaser, 1978), and that the majority of killers in this sample will be natives (Nettler, 1982).

It is suggested that the majority of homicide offenders have been raised in disrupted family environments. This includes an environment where they receive little attention, or negative attention (abuse) by a parent or parents (Duncan et al., 1958; Riley & Cohen, 1977). More specifically it is believed that these individuals will have had especially poor relationships with their fathers (Guttmacher, 1960; Lamberti, 1958; Revitch & Schlesinger, 1981; Wolfgang, 1966).

It is believed that homicide offenders will have achieved low levels of education (Lamberti, 1958) and demonstrate unstable work histories (Riley & Cohen, 1977).

Finally it is postulated that homicide offenders will demonstrate a history of alcohol abuse (Holcomb, &

Anderson, 1983) and that they will have a past history of criminality (Wolfgang, 1958).

These points serve to define the first major hypothesis of this research which is that there will be similarities in the demographic information pertaining to homicide offenders.

It is postulated that homicide offenders will demonstrate similarities in how they score on a variety of personality measures. More specifically it is suggested that this group of offenders will score high on traits of aggression (Newman, 1974), impulsiveness (Campion et al., 1985; Getsinger, 1976), exhibitionism (Cleckly, 1976) and dominance. It is also believed that these individuals will score low on measures of nurturance (Revitch & Schlesinger, 1978), harmavoidance (Hare, 1965; Quay, 1965), achievement, endurance (Newman, 1974; Revitch & Schlesinger, 1981), affiliation (Blackmand et al. 1974; Satten et al., 1960), and social recognition.

It is also postulated that homicide offenders will demonstrate an external locus of control (Rotter, 1972). Messer (1976) suggested that individuals who delay gratification in order to evaluate may do so because they feel that they and not others around them are responsible for their successes and failures. Such a statement would lead to the assumption that

reflectives (non impulsive individuals) will demonstrate an internal locus of control while impulsives would display an external locus of control. It is suggested that since murder is most often an impulsive crime (Satten et al., 1960) the offenders will be externals.

Finally it is suggested that homicide offenders will meet the diagnostic criteria for the antisocial personality disorder. A number of authors have reported a relationship between homicide offenders and psychopathy (Bluglass, 1979; Guttmacher, 1960; Nettler, 1982; Pothast, 1956; Revitch & Schlesinger, 1981; Rosenhan & Seligman, 1984; Weiss et al., 1960). The above mentioned traits will be measured in order to test the second major hypothesis, which is that individuals incarcerated for homicide will demonstrate specific stable personality characteristics or traits.

The concluding assumption of this research is that there will be consistent patterns in the offenders' behavior during the commission of the offence. These consistencies will be predicated on the relationship and interaction between the offender, the victim, and the environment in which the crime took place. Each murder when taken at a macro level is different. This is mainly because each occurs under different circumstances with different motivations. However, if

taken at a micro level, looking at each part of the crime in isolation, one may begin to find similarities in the offender, victim, and crime scene interactions. It is believed that if one breaks a crime into its most basic elements there will be consistencies in how offenders react to specific situations during the commission of their crimes.

There are a number of important offender-victim interactions that must be looked at when profiling crimes. The first is the relationship between the ages of the offender and the victim. It is suggested that in the majority of cases the victim will be of approximately the same age, or slightly older than the offender (Langevin et al., 1982a; Swigert & Farrel, 1976).

The relationship between the race of the offender and the race of the victim is another important factor. It is expected that homicides will be intraracial (Garfinkel, 1949; Centerwall, 1984).

It is also assumed that there will be an interaction between the race of the offender and the sex of the victim. It is suggested that Caucasian killers will most often kill females, while native offenders will kill males and females equally (Nettler, 1982).

Virtually all research investigating the interpersonal relationship between the offender and the victim suggests that they are most often familiar with one another. Family relations, lovers, close friends, and acquaintances account for the majority of homicide victims (Daly & Wilson, 1982; Nettler, 1982; Revitch & Schlesinger, 1981; Swigert & Farrell, 1976; Wolfgang, 1958). Very few offenders kill strangers. It is thus expected that homicide offenders will, in the majority of cases, know their victims.

It is also suspected that the pattern of attack during the actual murder itself will vary as a function of the relationship between the offender and his victim. Mowat (1966) has suggested that the closer the relationship between the offender and the victim the more direct, close contact, and violent the killing appears to be. It is suspected that in close relationships deadly force will often be concentrated to the head and neck regions (Mowat, 1966; Geberth, 1983), delivered from close contact (ie. the offender must be in physical contact with the victim in order to deliver deadly force), and that there will be an element of overkill (Ressler, Burgess, & Douglas, 1983). Overkill is the use of force over and above what is necessary to take the life of a human being. Overkill will be recorded when the offender has shot

his victim more than twice, stabbed his victim more than three times, used multiple methods in order to commit murder, or when any other type of exaggerated force has been used by the offender.

It is believed that in most cases there will have been some form of substance abuse by the offender, prior to the commission of the homicide (Holcomb, & Anderson, 1983).

It is believed that the majority of homicides will be unplanned (Satten et al., 1960). When a murder is impulsive it is expected that the murder weapon will have been obtained at the scene of the crime, and evidence will have been left behind (ie. the weapon, fingerprints). Porter (1983) notes that in planned killings the weapon is usually brought to the scene of the crime.

It is also believed that if the offender has spent an extended period of time at the crime scene (either while committing the crime, or after the commission of the crime) he either feels comfortable at that location, and/or is familiar with the area (Ressler, Burgess, Douglas, 1983).

It is believed that the emotional state of the offender and his feelings towards the victim may be determined by the placement and the condition in which the body is left (Geberth, 1983).

These are but a few of the many interactions that may occur during the commission of murder. These points serve to illustrate the third and final major hypothesis of this research which is that there will be consistencies in the offender, victim, and crime scene interactions.

The central hypothesis of this research revolved around consistencies within a group of homicide offenders. The three major hypothesis of this research were that these individuals would demonstrate consistencies in 1) demographic backgrounds, 2) personality characteristics, and 3) patterns of interactions occurring between the offender, victim and crime scene as evidenced in the offenders behavior during the commission of the crime.

Through joint interviewing, and testing of homicide offenders, and the use of a nonviolent comparison group, it is hoped that the procedures utilized in this study will overcome some of the prior deficiencies of research in this area. Ultimately the goal of this research is to contribute to understanding the crime of homicide and the offenders who perpetrate that crime.

## Method

### Subjects

The subject population consisted of male inmates incarcerated at the Stony Mountain Institution, an S5 medium security institution. The subjects of interest have been involved in violent offences relating to culpable homicide. Subjects are presently serving sentences for murder (first and second degree), and manslaughter. Murder is the most serious type of culpable (unlawful) homicide. The charge of murder requires that there be specific intent to cause a person's death. Murder is classified as either first degree, or second degree. Murder is first degree when it is planned and deliberate. Second degree murder may not be planned but has the element of specific intent. Manslaughter is a general intent crime. For example, if individual A beats individual B severely and B dies from the beating A would be charged with manslaughter and not murder if it is clear that A did not specifically intend to cause B's death but only had the general intention to do the act of beating (Clarke, Barnhorst & Barnhorst, 1977).

It is important to note that these labels are simply legal definitions. At times an individual's charge may reflect processes within the legal system,

such as plea bargaining, rather than the actual offence. For this reason no differentiation was made between the different charges of murder.

In order to qualify as subjects homicide offenders had to meet two requirements: 1) they must have admitted to committing murder; and 2) the offender must have been directly involved in the killing.

Of the 73 individuals incarcerated for homicide at the time of data collection 65 volunteered to participate in the interview portion of the research. Out of these 65 volunteers, 57 met the criteria for inclusion. Four individuals denied guilt, while another four played only a secondary role in the crime and did not actually commit murder. Psychological testing was completed by 45 homicide offenders. Of the 12 offenders who did not complete testing 6 refused, 3 transferred to other institutions, 2 were released, and 1 spoke limited english.

A sample of 26 nonviolent property offenders was included as a comparison group. All nonviolent offenders in the institution completed the interview and psychological testing.

## Questionnaires and Self-Report Scales

Interview Form. The interview form was compiled by the author, and served as a guideline for questioning during semi-structured interviews. The interview form is divided into three sections. The first section of the form deals with offender demographics (see Appendix A). Questions in this section relate to the offender's age, race, religion and religious beliefs, upbringing, family, education, occupation, relationships, substance abuse, and past criminal history. The second part of the interview form deals with information pertaining to the victim of the crime (see Appendix B). Questions in this section deal with the age, race, sex, criminal history, and substance abuse of the victim. Questions pertaining to the relationship between the offender and the victim, as well as questions inquiring about the offender's thoughts, feelings, and emotions toward the victim are also contained in this section. The final section relates to the mechanics of the offence (see Appendix C). Questions such as the location of the crime, use of weapon, method of murder, the use of force and resistance, duration of struggle as well as the motivation for, and feelings during the homicide are contained in this section.

The interview form has been organized in a manner that attempts to allow the inmate to feel comfortable with the interviewer and the interview. There is time allowed in the actual questionnaire to build up rapport and a non-threatening comfortable interview atmosphere. The initial demographic questionnaire allows for relatively nonstressing self-disclosure on the part of the inmate. When the interview has progressed to the more direct questions about the mechanics of the assault the inmate has already shared information about many aspects of his life with the interviewer. Hopefully, and from this author's past experience with inmates, it is believed that this progression in questioning will allow for more candid responses on the part of the inmates.

Personality Research Form (PRF). This questionnaire was developed by Jackson (1967). It was designed as a tool to measure a broad range of personality traits, and to aid in personality research. The questionnaire contains 300 items which are scored true or false. The PRF Form A measures fourteen variables of personality and has one validity scale. The traits that are measured by this questionnaire are: achievement; affiliation; aggression; autonomy; dominance; endurance; exhibition;

harmavoidance; impulsivity; nurturance; order; play; social recognition; understanding; and infrequency (validity). The mean reliability for the fourteen content scales of the PRF (Form A) is .93. Reliability scores for each of the scales range from .89 to .94. The median test-retest reliability for the fourteen scales is .90, and ranges from .75 to .90. The median validity coefficients of the fourteen scales contained in the questionnaire have been reported as ranging from .51 to .61.

There are a number of reasons why the PRF was chosen to identify personality traits. The main objective of this research is to establish profiles of homicide offenders. This includes identifying personality traits as they occur in everyday situations. The PRF was designed to yield scores for personality traits broadly relevant to the functioning of individuals in a wide variety of situations (Jackson, 1967).

Most psychological inventories administered to offender populations are designed to identify psychopathology. It was felt that it would be interesting to see how inmates scored on 'normal' psychological measures. The PRF is primarily focused on areas of normal functioning rather than psychopathology.

Another positive aspect of the PRF is that each dimension of personality was designed to be bipolar. Some personality inventories are keyed in one direction. If an individual scores high on the specified trait he is said to possess that trait. If a low score is obtained it is not clear whether it should signify the absence of the trait or the presence of its opposite. The PRF is bipolar both theoretically and in terms of measurement. Therefore, when measuring dominance the scale is also measuring submissiveness. The final reason for selecting the PRF was because of its relatively low correlation with social desirability.

Personal Belief Scale (Rotter's I-E Scale). This scale developed by Rotter (1966) is concerned with the subjects' expectations about how reinforcement is controlled. Consequently, the test is considered to be a measure of a generalized expectancy. This questionnaire is a 29-item, forced-choice test which includes 6 filler items intended to make the purpose of the test somewhat more ambiguous. Subjects are simply required to select the one, of two statements presented, which they believe to be closer to the truth. Internal consistency of the I-E scale used with

a male population has been reported in a number of studies. The internal consistency ranges from .65 to .70. Test-retest reliability reports have ranged from .49 to .83. Jessor (1964) reported test-retest reliability at .78 for a population of male prisoners.

The Psychopathy Check List. This 20-item checklist was developed by Hare (1985) for use with a criminal population. It is a revision of an earlier 22-item research scale (Hare, 1980; Hare & Frazelle, 1980) that was designed to replace the global clinical ratings previously used in the authors' research on psychopathy. Subjects are given a score based on how well they fit the description of 20 points characteristic of psychopathy. If an item applies to an individual, a score of 2 is assigned; if an item applies to a certain extent but not fully, a score of 1 is assigned; a score of 0 is assigned if the item does not apply to the individual. The checklist lists as its 20 salient characteristics of psychopathy superficial charm, inflated sense of self worth, need for stimulation, pathological lying, manipulative behavior, lack of remorse, shallow affect, lack of empathy, parasitic life style, poor behavioral controls, promiscuous sexual behavior, early behavioral problems,

lack of realistic long term goals, impulsivity, irresponsibility, failure to accept responsibility for own actions, many short term relationships, juvenile delinquency, reconviction of conditional release, and criminal versatility.

Information used to complete the Psychopathy Checklist is obtained from a semi-structured interview and from institutional files (Hare, 1985). Generalizability coefficients for the checklist have ranged from .85 to .90 (Schroeder, Schroeder, & Hare, 1983). These same authors report a generalizability coefficient for test-retest reliability as .89. Classical indices of reliability (alpha coefficients, inter and intrarater reliability) are also reported by these authors as ranging from .82 to .93.

#### Procedure

A list of all individuals serving time for murder was compiled, and inmates appearing on that list were called to appear for an interview. All interviews were conducted in the psychology wing of the institution. Upon arrival the interviewer would introduce himself to the inmate and explain to him why he had been given a pass to the Psychology Department and what the research involved. Each inmate was told that the major objective

of the research project was to look for consistencies in the personality characteristics and behaviour patterns of homicide offenders. They were told that there were two parts to the study, the first being an interview and the second filling out questionnaires (psychological testing). Inmates were informed that all information would remain strictly confidential and that participation was on a voluntary basis. Prisoners were also told that they would not receive any direct personal benefits for their cooperation, and that a decision not to participate would not be used against them in any way.

The key to this type of research lies in creating an atmosphere where the subjects feel comfortable with the interviewer and the research itself. Before data collection began the author became active in the "Omega Club" which is a group composed solely of inmates serving life sentences for murder. This made the author highly visible to the prospective subject population. Before being asked to participate in the research most inmates had some knowledge of the author and the purpose of this project.

Prior to the commencement of each interview a period of time, variable dependent on the offender, was used to build rapport. Due to the semi-structured nature of the interview, the interviewer often diverged

from the questioning and took time to discuss topics that the inmate found interesting or wished to discuss. This was done in order to build a relationship in which the inmate felt more comfortable and more trusting. In the long run it is suspected that this benefited the researcher both in terms of inmate participation and the quality of that participation. In past experiences dealing with prison inmates the author has found that they are apt to be less reticent to participate and more willing to speak freely (often answering questions which they might normally refuse to comment on) when they feel comfortable with the interviewer.

The actual interview consisted of the topics and questions covered in the demographic questionnaire.

Once an interview had been completed inmates were thanked for their cooperation, and any questions they had were answered. At this time they were asked to sign a statement prepared by the author which indicated that they were aware that participation was voluntary and confidential. The average duration of the interviews was between 2.5 - 3 hours. All interviews were conducted by the author.

Once the inmate left, the Psychopathy Checklist was completed using information obtained from the interview and the inmates' institutional files.

Information from each of the inmates' files was also used to supplement interview data.

At a later date inmates were called back to fill out the psychological tests. Groups of approximately 10 - 15 inmates were tested in each session. The psychological testing took place in a classroom, also in the psychology wing of the institution. All inmates received the Jackson PRF, and the Personal Belief Scale. On average, testing was completed within two hours.

During data analysis responses to the Jackson Personality Research Form were divided into those falling in the upper and lower third (scores less than or equal to 33.5%, and scores greater than or equal to 66.5%). This was done in order to investigate extreme scores.

It is difficult to state the typical I-E Scale score that should be used to differentiate internals from externals because such scores tend to vary from study to study, from population to population, and from one point and time to another (Phares, 1976). A score of 10 was selected as the point for separating internals from externals on the Personal Belief Scale based on suggestions by Phares (1976), and past research (Phares, 1965; Rotter, 1966; Schneider, 1971).

## RESULTS

The reported results will reflect data obtained for homicide offenders. The results of the nonviolent comparison group will be reported when they have been found to be significantly different from those of the violent offenders.

### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR HOMICIDE OFFENDERS

Hypothesis 1 was tested using general frequencies and means for all violent and nonviolent demographic information.

#### Age

As a group homicide offenders spanned the age range from 14-41 years of age at the time of the offence. Despite the large range in age, 88% of the sample committed murder between the ages of 14-30. The mean age at the time of the offence was 23.6. Younger offenders accounted for the highest percentage of murderers with 63% of the sample 23 years of age or younger.

#### RACE

The majority of homicide offenders in this sample (67%) were native. Caucasian killers accounted for 30%

of the sample, while the remaining 3% consisted of 1 Negro and 1 Vietnamese.

#### Family History

Homicide offenders were generally found to come from detached family units. Only 31% reported their parents as either being married or living together. Thirty percent of the offenders reported that their parents were separated or divorced, while 39% reported growing up having lost one or both parents through death.

When asked who was responsible for raising them 30% of the offenders stated their mothers, 7% said their fathers, and 28% said both parents. Other relatives, such as grandparents, aunts and uncles, were said to have brought up 12% of the offenders. Foster homes and/or homes for boys were identified as the environment of socialization for 19% of the offenders. A final 4% stated that they were responsible for raising themselves.

The mothers of homicide offenders generally had low levels of education. While most of the respondents (44%) did not know what level of education their mother had obtained, 32% of those that did reported it as being grade 9 or less. Only 9% had mothers whom had achieved some post secondary education. The majority of

mothers (44%) were unemployed or functioned in the home as housewives. Those mothers who were employed most often held down unskilled or semi-skilled positions (39%). Only 5% of the respondents had mothers who had been involved in skilled or professional employment. When asked how they felt about their mothers 38% responded negatively, 25% made a neutral response, and 37% responded positively. Homicide offenders' mean attitude toward their mothers on a five point scale was a neutral response of 3. In most cases (65%) the mothers of these subjects were physically present in some form during the offender's youth. Thirty-five percent of the violent offenders reported having very limited or no contact at all with their mothers while growing up. Slightly over half (53%) of the offenders reported their mothers as being "psychologically present" in a concerned, caring, emotional capacity. A number of offenders (47%) reported not having such a relationship with their mother. These mothers were considered "psychologically absent".

Like mothers, the fathers of murderers in this sample were poorly educated. While 49% of the offenders did not know what level of education their fathers had obtained, 35% of those that did reported fathers with a grade 9 education or less. Only one inmate (1.75%) reported a father having achieved some form of post

secondary education. The majority of these men (60%) were employed in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations. Sixteen percent held skilled or professional employment.

When respondents were asked how they felt about their fathers 67% responded negatively, 23% rated their feelings as neutral, while only 10% responded positively. The mean emotion towards fathers was a negative response of 2. When asked if fathers were physically present during their youth 42% responded positively, while 58% reported that their fathers were physically absent. When offenders were asked if their fathers were psychologically present while they were growing up 30% responded affirmatively. Seventy percent stated that their fathers were psychologically absent during their youth.

In terms of siblings, while the mean number of brothers was 2 and the mean number of sisters was 3. The mean attitude towards siblings was 3 for brothers, and 2.9 for sisters, both neutral responses. Only 16% of the respondents stated that they were the only child.

A little over half (55%) of the offenders reported having parents with alcohol problems. Offenders reported mothers with alcohol problems (11%), fathers

with alcohol problems (14%), and both parents having a drinking problem (30%).

A little under half (47%) of the respondents report being victims of physical abuse. Mothers were responsible for abuse in 7% of the cases, fathers in 21%, and both parents in 12% of the cases. Other care givers were responsible for abusing 7% of the offenders. Some homicide offenders also report being subjected to watching their siblings being abused (21%), and their mothers beaten by their fathers (28%). When asked if they ever acted in an aggressive manner toward their parents 32% reported acting verbally aggressive, while 19% reported acting both verbally and physically aggressive.

In describing their childhood a large percentage of the homicide offenders (53%) stated they had a difficult/unhappy childhood. Seventeen percent said they would describe their childhood as being neutral, and 30% described their childhood as positive.

Most of the respondents left home at an early age. Ninety one percent of the offenders left home at age 18 or younger. Fifty four percent left home at age 15 or younger.

In terms of criminal activity within the offender's family, 21% of the offender's fathers, 10% of the offender's mothers, 53% of the offender's

siblings, and 37% of other family members had been convicted of a criminal offence. These family members had been convicted for violent offences (37%), property offences (42%), and alcohol related offences (33%).

#### Education

Homicide offenders have low levels of formal education. Only 7% of the offenders in this sample completed high school. A grade 9 education or less was held by 68% of the respondents.

The reasons given for leaving school were going to jail (7%), kicked out (21%), left to work (28%), and quit (44%).

Offender's attitude toward school was negative with 42% stating they disliked school, and 35% reporting a neutral attitude toward academics. Only 23% stated that they enjoyed going to school.

The respondents performance in school was often poor with 42% having failed at some point, and another 35% receiving poor grades. Average marks were reported by 19%, while only 4% achieved grades considered above average.

The majority of homicide offenders (88%) felt that they did not live up to their potential in school and could have achieved if they put in the effort.

In school 73% of the violent offenders reported being physically aggressive and getting into a number of fights. Another 54% stated that their peer group was considered the "bad crowd" and they were always getting into trouble.

#### Employment History

Unstable employment patterns were also evident in the work histories of homicide offenders. A high turnover in full time jobs (over 4) was observed in the employment records of 33% of the respondents. Eighteen percent reported never having a full time job. More often than not employment was sustained for short periods of time. Only 37% of the respondents held a full time job for over a year. Thirty four percent reported that on average they would remain working at a full time job for under 6 months. The type of jobs most often held were labour (72%) and semiskilled (26%).

At the time of the offence 40% of the offenders were employed. Of those individuals most (80%) had been working at that particular job for under 6 months. The majority of offenders (60%) were unemployed at the time of the offence. Of those unemployed 4% were fired from their last job, 14% were laid off, and 39% quit. When working 42% of the offenders stated that they had difficulty following orders. A number of offenders

(58%) reported that they were "loners" on the job and made few if any friends when working.

#### Substance Abuse

In describing their drinking habits 11% of the respondents stated that they drank very little, 21% reported moderate and weekend drinking, while 68% labelled themselves as heavy drinkers. Alcohol use often began at an early age with 47% of the respondents stating they began drinking at age 15 or younger. Ninety-one percent of the respondents began drinking at age 18 or younger. The mean age at which homicide offenders began drinking was 14.6. A large number of homicide offenders (61%) admitted to having a problem with alcohol. The mean age at which offenders stated their drinking problems began was 18.2.

Drug use was reported as being frequent or regular by 26% of the respondents. Occasional use was reported by 25%, while another 17% stated that they had experimented with drugs but did not continue using them. Thirty-two percent reported that they had never used drugs. Drug use began at age 18 or less for 84% of the respondents reporting drug use. Sixty percent of the drug users began taking drugs at age 15 or less. The mean age at which drug use began was 16.5. Only 9%

of the respondents admitted to having a drug addiction problem. Of those the mean age of addiction was 17.

#### Past Criminal History

Very few of the violent offenders in this sample came in contact with the criminal justice system as juveniles for violent offences. Juvenile convictions for assault were held by 19% of the respondents, while 14% had been convicted of weapons charges. Four percent of the sample had been involved in attempted murders as juveniles. More frequently (54%) these individuals had been involved in nonviolent property offences as juveniles. Alcohol or substance abuse convictions as juveniles were reported by 19% of the respondents. Thirty two percent of the individuals in the sample reported no juvenile convictions.

As adults, homicide offenders demonstrated more frequent convictions for violent crimes. Adult convictions for assault were held held by 49% of the offenders. Weapons charges were held by 32% of the respondents. Adult convictions for property related offences were held by 42% of the offenders, while substance abuse charges were held by 25% of the respondents. Only 33% of the offenders reported having no prior adult convictions.

Over half (58%) of the homicide offenders in the sample had served time in a provincial correctional institution. Sixteen percent of the respondents had served one prior provincial sentence, while 42% reported serving two or more provincial 'bits'.

The majority of homicide offenders (75%) had never served a federal sentence prior to their present incarceration. Of those with prior time served in a federal institution 9% had served one previous sentence, while 16% had served two or more.

Not all crime is recorded by prison sentences, convictions, charges, or arrests. All of the respondents were asked to very generally describe the types of criminal activity they have engaged in without being caught. Homicide offenders report perpetrating a number of violent offences such as assaults (61%), use of weapons (32%), attempted murder (14%), and murder (5%). Nonviolent offences committed without detection include both potential substance offences (35%), and property related offences (46%). Only 25% of the respondents report that they have never committed a crime and gotten away with it.

## DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES: VIOLENT &amp; NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS

Differences in demographics between violent and nonviolent offenders were investigated through the use of 2 way chi-squares. Violent and nonviolent offenders were not significantly different on the majority of demographic variables, however some statistical differences did exist.

While 44% of the individuals incarcerated for homicide had seen a mental health professional prior to the offence, 69% of the nonviolent offenders had prior contact with the mental health profession. Nonviolent offenders had more prior contact with mental health professionals than violent offenders  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=4.603$   $p<.05$ .

The violent and nonviolent offenders in this sample differ in terms of race. The majority of violent offenders were native, while most nonviolent offenders were Caucasian  $\chi^2(2, N=83)=20.289$   $p=.0001$ .

Inconsistent treatment as a child was experienced by both violent (49%), and nonviolent (85%) offenders. Inconsistent discipline and methods of punishment were also experienced by violent (39%), and nonviolent offenders (73%). Nonviolent offenders experienced higher inconsistencies growing up both in general

treatment  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=9.391$   $p<.01$ , and discipline  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=8.493$ ,  $p<.01$ , than did homicide offenders.

Homicide offenders were more likely to describe themselves as heavy drinkers  $\chi^2(2, N=83)=16.268$   $p<.001$ , and more often admitted to having a problem with alcohol  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=15.180$   $p=.0001$ , than nonviolent offenders.

Violent offenders were more likely to have been drinking prior to the commission of their offence than nonviolent offenders  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=33.995$ ,  $p=.0001$ . When drinking prior to an offence, homicide offenders were more severely intoxicated than nonviolent offenders  $\chi^2(2, N=83)=18.529$ ,  $p=.0001$ .

After having consumed alcohol violent offenders were more likely to report feeling less inhibited  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=6.627$   $p=.01$ , and more aggressive  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=4.693$   $p<.05$  than nonviolent offenders.

Violent offenders were more likely to exhibit past aggressive tendencies than nonviolent offenders. While in school violent offenders displayed more aggression and were involved in more fights and bullying than nonviolent offenders  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=5.953$   $p<.05$ . As adults violent offenders had more prior convictions for violent offences such as assaults and weapon charges  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=5.312$   $p<.05$ ,  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=7.780$   $p<.01$ . Violent offenders were also more likely to commit violent

offences without detection then were nonviolent offenders. Such offences include assaults  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=17.886$   $p=.0001$ , and weapon use  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=5.570$   $p<.05$ ).

Nonviolent offenders were more likely to have a history of nonviolent offences than were violent offenders. Nonviolent offenders engaged in more nonviolent offences both as juveniles  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=5.312$   $p<.05$ , and as adults  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=13.060$   $p<.01$ , compared to violent offenders. Nonviolent offenders were also more likely than violent offenders to be involved in criminal activity for financial gain during the time period preceding their latest conviction and subsequent incarceration  $\chi^2(2, N=83)=10.818$   $p<.01$ . Nonviolent offenders were also more likely than violent offenders to have committed nonviolent offences without being detected  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=16.254$   $p=.0001$ .

Homicide offenders are less likely to have a past adult criminal record than are nonviolent offenders  $\chi^2(1, N=83)=4.354$   $p<.05$ . Nonviolent offenders are more likely to have been more frequently incarcerated in provincial institutions than violent offenders  $\chi^2(2, N=83)=8.990$   $p<.05$ .

## PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING

Hypothesis 2 was analyzed using general frequencies and means. Test score differences between violent and nonviolent offenders were analyzed using 2 way chi squares,  $F$  tests, and a comparison of means. The interrelationship of test scores was investigated using point biserial correlations.

### Jackson Personality Research Form

Violent and nonviolent offenders did not significantly differ in their responses to the personality measures on the Jackson, with the exception of the harmavoidance scale. The mean percentage scores for violent and nonviolent offenders will be reported, while the actual numbers and percentages of offenders scoring in the top and bottom third (extreme scores) can be found in table 1.

Violent offenders scored comparatively low on the achievement scale in comparison to nonviolent offenders. The mean percentage for violent offenders on achievement was 47%, while the mean percentage score for nonviolent offenders was 60%. The differences between violent and nonviolent offenders on the measure of achievement approach, but do not reach significance  $F(1,68) = 3.26$   $p = .076$ .

Both offender groups scored low on the measure of affiliation. The mean percentage score for violent offenders was 37% while the mean percentage score for nonviolent offenders was 33%.

Violent offenders scored only slightly higher than nonviolent offenders on the scale for aggression. The mean score as a percent for violent offenders was 51%, and the mean score as a percentage for nonviolent offenders was 45.6%.

Both offender groups scored in the high range on the scale for autonomy. The mean percent on this scale for violent offenders was 62.2% and for nonviolent offenders was 72.4%.

Both offender groups scored low on the measure for dominance. The mean percentage on the dominance scale was 36% for violent offenders, and 36.3% for nonviolent offenders.

On the endurance scale the mean percentage for violent offenders was 60%, and the mean percent for nonviolent offenders was 67.8%.

Both offender groups scored low on the measure for exhibitionism. The mean percentage on this measure for violent offenders was 33%, and 38% for nonviolent offenders.

On the measure of impulsivity the mean percentage was 45% for violent offenders, and 50% for nonviolent offenders.

On the scale for nurturance the mean percentage for violent and nonviolent offenders was 59.3% and 48.3% respectively.

Violent and nonviolent offenders both scored low on the scale measuring social recognition. The mean percentages for this scale was 34% for violent offenders and 29% for nonviolent offenders.

A significant difference was found between the two offender groups on the scale measuring harmavoidance. The mean percentage on the harmavoidance scale was 62% for the violent offenders and 47% for the nonviolent offenders  $F(1, 67)=5.27, p<.05$ .

The amount of time which the respondents had been institutionalized (on the present charge) did not significantly effect the scores obtained on the Jackson personality measures. The mean time served was .88 years for nonviolent offenders and 4.6 years for violent offenders.

#### Personal Belief Scale

An internal score for the purposes of this research has been defined as a score of 10 or less, while external scores are those which exceed 10. The

majority of homicide offenders score as internals (63%), while only 37% score as externals. Nonviolent offenders obtain internal scores 58% of the time, and external scores 42% of the time. The mean scores on the personal belief scale were 9.3 for violent offenders, and 10 for nonviolent offenders. These two groups do not significantly differ in terms of their scoring on this scale.

Once again time spent in the institution did not contribute to the score obtained on the personal belief scale.

#### The Psychopathy Checklist

Hare (1985) suggests that raw scores on the psychopathy checklist can be used to describe the degree to which the respondent possesses symptomatology characteristic of an antisocial personality. Those scoring 30 or over on the checklist are considered to be psychopaths. Violent offenders scored within the psychopathic range in 58% of the cases, while 23% of the nonviolent offenders scored in this range. Violent offenders scored significantly higher on measures of psychopathy than did nonviolent offenders  $F(1, 82)=8.42$   $p<.01$ .

When length of time institutionalized (for present offence) was controlled, time in was not found to account for scores on the checklist.

Those individuals scoring as psychopaths, with high scores on the checklist tended to score high on the Jackson personality measure for aggression  $r=-.288$ ,  $p=.055$ , and low on the measure of harmavoidance  $r=-.389$ ,  $p<.01$ .

#### OFFENDER/ VICTIM/ CRIME INTERACTIONS

Hypothesis 3 was analyzed by the use of general frequencies and 2 way chi-squares. Point biserial correlations were utilized to provide measures of the relation between dichotomous variables.

#### Victims Age

When the murder victim was young (22 years of age or less) it was often the case that the victim and the killer had been involved in an intimate, or close relationship  $r=-.339$ ,  $p=.01$ . The killer of a young victim is often undergoing stress brought on by problems in a relationship prior to committing the act of homicide  $r=.348$ ,  $p<.01$ . Older victims may suggest that the perpetrator of the crime did not know the victim, or if they knew each other it was in a more distant capacity such as a friend or acquaintance.

Young murder victims were more likely to be females  $r = -.315$ ,  $p < .05$ . Murderers also rated young victims as more attractive than older victims  $r = .341$ ,  $p < .01$ .

Offenders who murder a young victim were more likely to report feeling depressed after the murder  $r = .287$ ,  $p < .05$ .

#### Victim's Race

In the majority of killings the murderer was the same race as the victim  $r = .675$ ,  $p = .0001$ .

White victims were more likely than natives to be involved in killings where murder was not the initial motive, and the homicide occurred in conjunction with another crime  $r = .369$ ,  $p < .01$ .

Native victims were more likely to have precipitated violence by initiating verbal  $r = -.331$ ,  $p < .05$ , or physical force  $r = -.330$ ,  $p < .05$ .

#### Offender's Race

White offenders were often 'loners' who had few if any close friends  $r = .306$ ,  $p < .05$ .

White offenders were more likely than non-white offenders to be experiencing stress from a relationship prior to the commission of the offence  $r = .301$ ,  $p < .05$ .

White offenders found their victims to be more attractive than non-white offenders  $r = .503$ ,  $p = .0001$ .

Native offenders were likely to be involved in crime on a regular basis prior to the offence  $r=-.377$ ,  $p<.05$ . Native offenders were also likely to have brothers, sisters  $r=-.274$ ,  $p<.05$ , cousins, uncles, and aunts  $r=-.290$ ,  $p<.05$  with criminal records.

When developing a profile the characteristics of the offender become the dependent variables. You are trying to predict an offenders characteristics based on what you know about the victim, the crime scene and past offenders. The best predictors of the offender's race was the victims race  $\chi^2(1, 57)=17.25$ ,  $p<.0001$ , and the sex of the victim  $\chi^2(1, 57)=7.93$ ,  $p<.01$ .

#### Victim's Sex

Females were most often killed by white offenders, while native offenders most often killed males  $r=-.519$ ,  $p=.0001$ .

Female victims were most often younger than male victims  $r=-.315$ ,  $p<.05$ .

Female victims were typically known to the offender, often within the context of an intimate relationship  $r=-.409$ ,  $p<.01$ .

Offenders often reported having positive feelings for female victims (like, or love), while negative emotions were reported for male victims (dislike, or hate)  $r=-.407$ ,  $p<.01$ .

Offenders often reported that they did not regret committing murder if the victim was a male but did regret their crime when the victim was a female  $r = -.283, p < .05$ .

When the victim was a male, offenders reported feeling 'in control' after the commission of the crime  $r = .283, p < .05$ .

Offenders reported feeling 'out of control' after committing murder when the victim was a female  $r = -.334, p = .01$ .

#### Relationship Between Offender and Victim

When the offender and the victim had been involved in a close relationship, the offenders reported having experienced relationship stress  $r = -.410, p < .01$ , personal stress  $r = -.389, p < .01$ , or depression  $r = -.268, p < .05$  prior to committing the offence.

If the offender held positive feelings for the victim it was likely that the murder was spontaneous and not planned  $r = .305, p < .05$ . The respondent was also likely to experience anxiety at the time of the offence when he liked, or loved the victim  $r = .304, p < .05$ . Offenders were also more likely to regret the offence when they maintained positive feelings toward the victim  $r = .566, p = .0001$

If the victim was a casual acquaintance or a stranger, offenders were likely to feel "in control" after the murder  $r=.277$ ,  $p<.05$ . If offenders had been involved in a close relationship with the victim they most often felt "a loss of control" following the murder  $r=-.457$ ,  $p<.001$ .

In developing a profile the offender-victim relationship becomes a dependent variable. The best predictors of whether or not the offender and victim knew each other were the victims age  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=6.70$ ,  $p<.01$ , whether or not the offender knew the location at which the murder took place  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=4.19$ ,  $P<.05$ , if the weapon was obtained at the scene of the crime  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=11.02$ ,  $p<.001$ , and whether or not the homicide occurred in conjunction with any other type of crime  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=6.39$ ,  $p<.05$ .

#### Substance Abuse

The majority of homicide offenders (88%) reported drinking prior to the offence. In terms of how impaired offenders believed they were at the time of the offence 38% stated that they were not at all or only slightly impaired, 25% reported being moderately impaired, while 37% stated they were highly intoxicated.

Alcohol and drugs were used in combination prior to the offence by 33% of the offenders. Only 1.75% had used drugs alone prior to the offence.

Offenders who drank prior to the offence state that the emotion they experienced at the time of the offence was anger  $r=.262$ ,  $p<.05$

After the offence, 54% of the offenders reported drinking.

#### Planned vs Unplanned Murder

Natives were often murdered in totally spontaneous, unplanned killings  $r=-.288$ ,  $p<.05$ .

If the murder was planned in some form or manner the offender usually carried a weapon on him at the time of the offence  $r=-.338$ ,  $p=.01$ .

The best predictor of whether or not a homicide was planned was whether or not the offender was carrying a weapon at the time of the murder  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=8.31$ ,  $p<.01$ .

#### Weapons

When the weapon used to commit murder was brought to the scene by the offender, it was most often either a gun or a knife  $r=.334$ ,  $p<.05$ .

Offenders who armed themselves prior to the offence expressed feeling nervous both before the

murder was committed  $r=.337$ ,  $p=.01$ , and during the actual commission of the crime  $r=.338$ ,  $p=.01$ .

If the homicide was not planned, weapons were more likely to be obtained at the scene of the crime  $r=.238$ ,  $p=.07$ .

If the murder was committed with a weapon obtained at the scene of the crime it was likely that the killer knew the victim, most likely in a close or intimate relationship  $r=-.328$ ,  $p<.05$ .

Household objects and hardware such as kitchen knives, hammers, and various other blunt, or pointed objects were most often used to commit murder when the weapon was obtained at the scene of the crime  $r=-.430$ ,  $p<.001$ .

When the victim's body had been moved or altered in some manner the weapon used to commit the offence was most often obtained at the scene of the crime  $r=.441$ ,  $p<.001$ .

The type of weapon most often used by this sample of homicide offenders was a knife (44%), followed by household objects/hardware (29%), guns (14%), and bare hands-physical beatings/strangulations (13%).

The majority of weapons were removed from the scene of the crime after their use. Most often weapons were thrown away (42%). Offenders also report

destroying the weapon (12%), taking the weapon home (11%), or hiding the weapon (3%). Weapons were left at the scene of the crime by 32% of the respondents. Weapons left at the scene of the crime were most often those obtained at the crime scene  $r=.374, p<.01$ .

#### Approach

No significant interactions were observed between the offender's method of approach and other crime scene variables. Most often (82%) the offender's approach pattern was a fast pace 'blitz' approach. Other approach methods include a slow approach (2%), a 'con' (7%), and 'surprise' attack (9%).

#### Force Prior to Homicide

A struggle between the offender and victim was observed in 71% of the homicides. There was most often a struggle preceding the homicide when murder occurred during the commission of another offence  $r=.263, p<.05$ . One of the best predictors of a murder committed in conjunction with another crime is evidence of a struggle  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=4.45, p<.05$ . Other unplanned homicides also involved force prior to the killing  $r=.289, p<.05$ .

The struggle prior to homicide is most often (53%) short in duration (15 minutes or less), and involves

moderate to excessive force  $r=.798$ ,  $p=.0001$ . Minimal force (little or no physical force, mild slapping, intimidation) was observed in 12% of the murders, moderate force (repeated slapping or hitting in a painful manner) in 19%, excessive force (beating to all parts of body) in 26%, and brutal force (sadistic torture, intentional infliction of physical and emotional pain) in 14%.

There was more often a physical struggle preceding murder when the victims were male  $r=.252$ ,  $p<.059$ . The motive for physical force prior to murder varied depending on the sex of the victim. When the victim was male, force was used to control the victim, or to hurt the victim. When the victim was a female force was used out of anger or because the offender became caught up in the situation  $r=.284$ ,  $p<.05$ . If there was an intimate or close relationship between the victim and the offender, force was also motivated by anger or due to the fact that the offender became caught up in the emotions of the moment. If the victim was a stranger or distant relation force was used to subdue and control  $r=.370$ ,  $p<.01$ .

Offenders explain that force prior to murder most often occurs as an attempt to subdue or control the victim. In most cases offenders report that victims respond with little or no resistance  $r=.759$ ,  $p=.0001$ .

When resistance was reported it was most often the response of a victim that was known to the offender  $r=.296, p<.05$ .

#### Method

The most frequent method of murder was death resulting from stabbings (40%). Other methods include physical beating (14%), shooting (13%), bludgeoning (11%), and strangulation (4%). Multiple methods used to inflict death were used by 18% of the offenders.

#### Point of Impact

During the commission of murder the physical location of the point of impact on the victim was most often the body area (81%), and the facial area (56%).

When the method of killing was highly intense and close contact (ie. multiple methods, bludgeon, strangle, physical beating) the major point of impact was the facial area  $r=.592, p=.0001$ . Wounds to the face were also associated with offenders having had frequent thoughts of killing the victim prior to the actual homicide  $r=.274, p<.05$ .

#### Overkill

Overkill (the use of excessive force to take the life of the victim) was evident in 60% of the homicides. Overkill was most often observed when the

offender  $r=.313$ ,  $p<.05$ , and victim  $r=.319$ ,  $p<.05$  were white. The offenders race was the best predictor of overkill  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=4.93$ ,  $p<.05$ .

#### Post-mortem Activity

Post-mortem activity in terms of committing further physical damage to the body after death was observed in only 12% of the homicides. This type of post-mortem activity was most likely to take place when the victim was killed in an intense, close contact method (multiple methods, bludgeon, strangle)  $r=-.289$ ,  $p<.05$ , with a weapon requiring close contact (bare hands, striking victim with some type of weapon)  $r=-.317$ ,  $p<.05$ .

Offenders who carried out post-mortem activity were likely to remove some of the victims personal possessions from the crime scene  $r=.390$ ,  $p<.01$ . This does not include theft of property. Monetary gain was not the purpose of taking the possessions although some personal objects removed may have some monetary value (eg. a locket).

The best predictors of this type of post-mortem activity were the offenders race  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=4.29$ ,  $p<.05$ , the type of weapon used  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=5.63$ ,  $p<.05$ , and the removal of victim's possessions  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=7.06$ ,  $p<.01$ .

Post-mortem activity which consisted of altering the body (ie. re-position, re-arrange clothing etc.) was observed in 25% of the homicides. Offenders who altered the body often reported experiencing fear at the time of the murder  $r=.277$ ,  $p<.05$ . They also reported being nervous after the murder was committed  $r=.404$ ,  $p<.01$ .

Those individuals who committed post-mortem physical damage also altered the body in some other way  $r=.407$ ,  $p<.01$ .

If the body had been altered it was also likely that the offender altered the crime scene as well  $r=.481$ ,  $p<.001$ . Often evidence  $r=.339$ ,  $p<.01$ , and property  $r=.356$ ,  $p<.01$ , had been removed.

#### Altering the Scene of the Crime

When murder was committed in conjunction with another offence the scene of the crime was often altered  $r=.278$ ,  $p<.05$ . This most often consisted of the removal of property  $r=.262$ ,  $p<.05$ , and evidence  $r=.383$ ,  $p<.05$ . Nothing found missing from the scene of the crime is one of the best predictors that no other crime was involved in connection with the murder.  $\chi^2 (1, N=57) = 8.77$ ,  $p<.01$ .

Property was most often removed from the crime scene when the victim was a male  $r=.263$ ,  $p<.05$ , or a stranger  $r=.320$ ,  $p<.05$ .

For all types of homicides the thing most often removed from the scene of the crime was evidence  $r=.535$ ,  $p=.0001$ .

Evidence was most often removed if the offender carried a weapon with him at the time of the offence  $r=.266$ ,  $p<.05$ .

Individuals who removed evidence from the scene of the crime reported being nervous after the commission of the crime  $r=.367$ ,  $p<.01$ .

If property or the victim's possessions were removed from the scene of the crime, it was likely that the offender was not familiar with location at which the murder took place  $r=-.314$ ,  $p<.05$ ,  $r=-.359$ ,  $p<.01$ .

#### Location

Murders were committed at the offender's residence in 11% of the cases, at the victims residence in 23% of the cases, and at a residence jointly shared by the victim and offender in 19% of the cases. Other locations include the home of a friend or relative (9%), the street (23%), a car (3%), inside a commercial place (5%), and outside a commercial place (7%).

Murders committed in homes most often took place in the living room (30%), the bedroom (18%), the kitchen (7%), and the entrance (7%).

Offenders who were familiar with the location at which the murder took place generally knew the victim  $r = -.374$ ,  $p < .01$ . They reported feeling more comfortable at the scene of the crime  $r = .433$ ,  $p < .001$ . They also remained at the scene of the crime for a period of time after the murder  $r = -.307$ ,  $p < .05$ . Those individuals who knew the crime scene were also likely to have obtained the weapon used to commit the murder from that location  $r = .266$ ,  $p < .05$ .

If the offender felt comfortable at the location of the offence, it was likely that nothing was removed from the crime scene  $r = -.363$ ,  $p < .01$ . Offenders that reported knowing the location of the crime were more likely to reported feeling depressed after the murder  $r = .306$ ,  $p < .05$ .

#### Remaining at the Scene of the Crime

The majority of offenders do not remain at the scene of the crime for extended periods of time after the murder. Twenty-one percent report leaving prior to the victim's death while another 26% report leaving immediately after the death of a victim. A number of offenders (21%) report leaving the scene of the crime

within 1 hour after the murder. A smaller number (18%) report remaining at the crime scene from 1-10 hours after the victim's death. A final 14% stated that they remained at the scene of the crime until police arrived.

A number of variables function in accounting for how long the offender stays at the scene of the crime. Offenders remained at the scene longer if they knew the victim  $r=.318$ ,  $p<.05$ , and the location  $r=-.307$ ,  $p<.05$ . If offenders reported feeling comfortable at the crime scene they were more likely to stay longer  $r=-.322$ ,  $p<.05$ .

Offenders tended to remain at the scene of the crime longer when the victim was a female  $r=.289$ ,  $p=.052$ , and when the victim was young  $r=.256$ ,  $p=.055$ .

If the murder occurred in conjunction with another crime it was likely that the offender did not spend a long time at the crime scene after the death of the victim  $r=.283$ ,  $p<.05$ .

Offenders who carried the weapon did not remain at the scene long  $r=.269$ ,  $p=.05$ , while those that obtain the weapon at the scene of the crime were more likely to remain  $r=-.332$ ,  $p<.05$ .

If evidence had been removed from the crime scene it was likely that the offender did not remain long  $r=.291$ ,  $p<.05$ . It appears that offenders remained at

the scene longer if there was an indication that the victim's body had been altered and/or nothing had been removed from the scene of the crime  $r=-.259$ ,  $p=.052$ ,  $r=-.284$ ,  $p<.05$ .

In terms of the offender's emotional stability, remaining at the scene of the crime suggested that the offender had felt depressed before the murder  $r=.268$ ,  $p<.05$ . It was also indicative of the offender feeling humiliation at the time of the offence  $r=-.283$ ,  $p<.05$ . Offenders who remained at the crime scene for extended periods also reported feeling depressed after the murder  $r=-.302$ ,  $p<.05$ .

The best predictors of how long the offender remained at the scene of the crime were the relationship between the offender and the victim  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=9.23$ ,  $p<.01$ , alteration of the body  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=6.05$ ,  $p<.05$ , and removal of evidence  $\chi^2(1, N=57)=8.08$ ,  $p<.01$ .

#### Statements

Offenders were most likely to volunteer a statement of guilt to the police if they had been experiencing stress from a relationship prior to the homicide  $r=.282$ ,  $p<.05$ .

Offenders were also more likely to make a statement if they had not been drinking prior to the

offence  $r = -.286$ ,  $p < .05$ . The only exception to this was offenders who had been drinking prior to the offence and had stated that alcohol has the effect of making them feel more confident  $r = .278$   $p < .05$ .

#### Repeat

A number of homicide offenders felt that there was a possibility of them becoming involved in future violence. While only 9% felt that they would most likely become re involved, 46% felt that there was some possibility of further perpetration of violence.

Offenders who reported that they might recommit a violent offence generally had a family history of violence  $r = .334$ ,  $p < .05$ .

Offenders were also more likely to state that they might repeat a violent offence if there was some element of planning involved in their present homicide charge  $r = -.269$ ,  $p < .05$ , and if they felt that their victim deserved to die  $r = .289$ ,  $p < .05$ .

### DISCUSSION

Homicide is an important social problem, however it has received little systematic research from psychiatrists and psychologists (Revitch & Schlesinger, 1981). Tanay (1969) remarks that studies in this area are conspicuous by their absence. While much is written

about murder, the vast majority of material is not research orientated. Langevin et al. (1982) state, that the vast majority of studies and review articles that do exist almost never include interviewing and/or administering standardized psychological tests to offenders. These authors also report that generally studies in this area do not use control groups of any sort for comparison with homicide offenders. Unlike much past research the interaction of the offenders emotions and psychological make up have been stressed. Demographic information, which serves as the focus of most research in this area, was used in an effort to determine the origin of these attitudes and characteristics. The mechanics of the offence were investigated in detail in order to see how the offender's personality was reflected in the actual commission of the crime. The relationship between an offender's personality traits and emotions, and the manner in which he commits his crime, covers ground relatively untouched by both past and present criminologists and psychologists. It is hoped that the combination of demographic data, psychological test data, and information relating to how the offences were committed and why will add to the existing research on homicide offenders.

## DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

### Age

As expected the majority of homicide offenders were young individuals. This finding has been documented a number of times by various authors throughout the years. Wolfgang (1958) reported that the majority of homicide offenders in his sample ranged between 20-24 years of age, while the next largest age group of offenders ranged from 25-29 years of age. Tanay (1969) found a large percentage (49%) of murderers to be under 30 years of age. Swigert & Farrell (1976) also found the age of killers to reflect a youthful offender population. They report that 45% of their sample was under the age of 29. Langevin et. al. (1982a) reported 51.9% of the homicide offenders to be under age 29. Glaser (1978) noted that the age of individuals convicted for murder seems to be decreasing. He suggests that adolescents and young adults have the highest probability of being charged with murder. It is difficult to account for the high involvement of young offenders in murder. Wilson & Herrnstein (1985) state that a variable such as age resists explanation because it is so robust. Many variables may be intervening without reflecting themselves directly in the age variable. Wolfgang

(1978) states that a popular explanation for the youthfulness of homicide offenders lies in the age composition of the population. Block (1977) reports that as the number of young people increases the age of homicide offenders drops.

#### Race

Natives were found to make up the majority of offenders convicted for murder. Nettler (1982) reports that, nationwide, Indians constitute slightly more than one percent of Canada's population. However, between the time periods of 1946-1967 they were convicted of 6.1% of all capital murders and contributed to approximately 16% of all homicides.

The over-representation of native homicide offenders may be explained in terms of subcultural differences. Wolfgang & Ferracuti (1967) state that groups with the highest homicide rates should demonstrate a subculture of violence. In such a subculture the use of violence is not viewed as illicit conduct. Individuals are taught that violence is the appropriate response to situations of conflict. Violence thus becomes an acceptable, and at times desirable response. When discussing life on the reserve a number of natives described an atmosphere where violence was a way of life. They saw violence in the

home, violence at school, and violence on the streets. In the home, respondents reported violence within the family, and often between families. In school, fighting was constant, especially on the sports field. Gangs were also reported to exist in the native communities. Many of the reserves have some form of organized gang whose enemy was a rival gang either from within the reserve or from another reserve. Fighting seems to function as a main social activity on the reserve. After an evening of drinking and partying one can often expect an outbreak of violence which will be forgotten by the next morning.

The use of alcohol may also account for high native participation in murder. Schmeiser et al.(1974) reported that a high percentage of native crimes are fueled with alcohol and are therefore violent.

#### Family History

It was suggested that the majority of homicide offenders have been raised in disrupted family environments. This was indeed the case. Most offenders were not raised within the context of an intact family unit. Many were raised by one parent, some were raised by people other than their biological parents, while others were raised in institutions, or fended for themselves. Revitch & Schlesinger (1981) report broken

homes and disturbed families as typical for homicide offenders. Wolfgang (1966) also reports finding a number of offenders who came from broken homes.

Disrupted family environments have been identified as a factor in disturbing the attachment process. Attachment may be defined as the sense of an early affectional bond between an infant and a parent. The emergence of an affectional bond between the child and parent is not inevitable and there is strong evidence, at least among young children, that the absence of this bond has important psychological and behavioral consequences (Wilson, & Herrnestein, 1985).

Absent or broken bonds often result in low self esteem. The ability to function in interpersonal relationships is also impaired by disturbances in the attachment process.

Rutter (1972) reports that the effects of parental deprivation may vary depending on the time of deprivation. Rutter distinguishes between children who never form an emotional bond, and those who form bonds which become disrupted through parental discord or separation. Individuals whose bonds are disrupted are not likely to face major long term distresses to the same degree as those who never form bonds.

Parent deprivation results not only from the separation of the parent figure(s), but as a result of

suffering from inadequate care at home. Parental rejection may be demonstrated in a variety of ways such as physical neglect, denial of love and affection, lack of interest in the child's activities and achievements, harsh or inconsistent punishment, failure to spend time with the child, and lack of respect for the child's rights and feelings (Coleman, Butcher, & Carson, 1984). Parental rejection may be partial or complete, passive or active, and subtly or overtly cruel (Coleman, Butcher, & Carson, 1984). Riley & Cohen (1977) found homicide offenders to have had poor parenting. The homicide offenders in this sample were often exposed to this type of inadequate care at home. Those offenders who reported being raised by one or both of their parents often stated that while their parents lived at home they showed little interest or concern towards them. Such parents were physically present but were psychologically absent.

Offenders rated mothers more positively, and less neglectful than fathers. Mothers were often present during childhood. A little over half of the offenders stated that their mothers were psychologically present, while just under half of the respondents reported uncaring mothers. It is interesting to note that often both mothers seen in a positive and negative light were described as dominant within the family. Mothers seen

as positive may have appeared to be controlled by domineering husbands, however they were described as the ones keeping the family together. A number of offenders felt that their mothers did everything they could given the circumstances of the family situation. Mothers who were described negatively were also described as the dominant parent. These mothers were described as much more cruel and psychologically sadistic than abusive fathers. Lamberti (1958) reported that the mother is usually the dominant parent in the homicide offender's family.

Offenders relationships with their fathers were most often very poor. The majority of offenders stated that they disliked or hated their fathers. Typical replies to inquiries about how offenders felt about their fathers included "he never supported me", "he was weak", "he always let me down", "I was afraid of him", "he was violent", "he was a drunk", "he was an asshole", "he would never talk to me", "I never respected him", "the only thing he ever taught me was how not to be a father". One offender reported that he used to stay up nights thinking of ways to kill his father. Another stated that he was envious of the relationship a friend had with his dad. His friend's father used to beat him all the time but they would also do things together. The respondent stated "I often

wondered what it would be like to do things with my dad. I would have put up with the beatings if my father paid attention to me". A number of the respondents stated that they had no use for their fathers and that they never wanted anything to do with them. Wolfgang (1966) reported that homicide offenders often had inadequate fathers. Riley & Cohen (1977) state that the father of these offenders are ineffectual and hostile. Guttmacher (1960) reports that fathers of these offenders are often cruel and rejecting. Lamberti (1958) stressed that fathers of murderers are consistently negative figures. He states that they are either absent indifferent, or rejecting. He also describes many of these fathers as hostile and overstrict.

Fathers play an important role in the development of a child. A number of developmental problems arise when the father is either absent, or ineffectual. Boys from fatherless homes have been found to be less well adjusted and less skilled in peer relations than boys whose fathers were regularly at home (Kimble, Garmezzy, & Zigler, 1984). Some boys from fatherless homes do not learn how to be appropriately aggressive. They often believe that masculinity is displayed through consistent aggression toward others (Kimble, Garmezzy, & Zigler, 1984). Peterson et al. (1959) found that

fathers of children with adjustment problems were themselves less adjusted, less friendly, and less democratic than the fathers of well adjusted children. Children with weak ineffectual fathers tended to demonstrate unacceptable patterns of aggression, while children of dictatorial, unconcerned fathers tended to be shy and have marked feelings of inferiority. The physical or psychological absence of a father is thus likely to have important developmental consequences. Since so few homicide offenders report positive interactions with their fathers it is likely that these individuals are predisposed to the types of developmental pathology resulting from the absence of a father figure.

Regardless of its specific nature or intensity parental rejection has been associated with a more or less specific pattern of development. Homicide offenders often experience the symptomatology of that developmental pattern. Rejected children tend to be overly aggressive and prone to impulsive behavior (Lefkowitz et al., 1973; Pemberton & Benady, 1973). Homicide offenders demonstrate marked aggressive, and impulsive behavior both as children and as adults. While these tendencies were not recorded on the psychological tests, they were in fact reported during the demographic interviews. Children exposed to

parental rejection often experience serious difficulty in giving and receiving affection (Pringle, 1965). Homicide offenders most often demonstrate an impairment in dealing with interpersonal relationships. As a group these offenders scored low on a measure of affiliation. They also reported having few friends. The majority of homicide offenders reported that their relationships with women were generally short term and casual. They often reported having had a number of such relationships. It is suggested that this pattern of dating served to set up a situation whereby the offender never had to form a trusting and emotional bond with another individual. Other behaviors associated with rejecting parents include diminished intellectual functioning (Hurley, 1965), excessive fears (Poznansky, 1973) and running away from home (Stierlin, 1973). High scores on the measure of harmavoidance suggest that homicide offenders have excessive fears. Many of the offenders engage in self protective behaviors. It is suggested that the actual offence of homicide may be an exaggerated form of self protective behavior. This point will be developed fully at a later time. A number of offenders reported running away from home. To them this was often the best, and easiest way to remove themselves from their pathological environment. Most of the offenders would

return home however the brief absence allowed them to get some short term relief from their family situation.

Faulty patterns of discipline are also commonly practiced by the parents of homicide offenders. Punishment is often inconsistent or overly severe. Coleman, Butcher, & Carson (1984) report that there is a high correlation between inconsistent punishment and later delinquent and criminal behavior. A child who is punished one time, and ignored, or rewarded at a later time for the same behavior will be unable to decipher whether or not that behavior is appropriate. Deur & Parke (1970) found that children with a history of inconsistent reward and punishment for aggressive behavior were more resistant to punishment and to the extinction of their aggressive behavior than were children who experienced more consistent discipline. Severe discipline most often takes the form of physical punishment in the households of homicide offenders. The result of such discipline tends to be increased aggressive behavior on the part of the child (Faretra, 1981). This type of physical punishment apparently provides a model of aggressive behavior that the child tends to emulate. Wilson & Herrnstein (1985) state that non-contingent punishment, which is from the child's view random, leads the child to believe that violence

is a normal and acceptable method of expressing one's feelings.

Severe punishment and parental rejection may also take the form of cruel and abusive treatment both in terms of physical and psychological abuse. Tanay (1969) reported that 67% of his sample of murderers had a history of severe corporal punishment in their developmental years. Satten et al. (1960) also noted that homicide offenders were exposed to extreme parental violence during their childhoods. Duncan et al. (1958) report that homicide offenders were often the target of high physical abuse by one parent. They state that the other parent is most often aware that the child is being abused but does nothing to stop the beatings and/or protect the child.

A little less than half of the violent offenders reported being victims of physical or psychological abuse. The most frequent forms of abuse reported were physical beatings by fathers which included being pushed, thrown, punched and kicked repeatedly to all parts of the body in a frantic attack. Beatings with a variety of objects such as sticks, vines, belts, leather straps, and rubber hoses were also common forms of abuse and punishment. One respondent commented "when the old man got wound up, watch out, if it wasn't nailed down you were gonna get hit with it". Offenders

also reported with some degree of frequency that their movements were restricted prior to a beating. Offenders report being tied up to a chair and beaten, being tied to a table beaten and sodomized, being tied to a bed and beaten, and being forced to lay on the floor while they were beaten with a bamboo stick. One respondent reported that his father used to tie him up, splash water on him, and then proceed to poke at him with an electric cattle prod. Another offender reported being restricted as his hands were burned on the electric element of the stove. Psychological punishment through invoking humiliation or terror often accompanied physical abuse. One respondent reported "he often made sure the beatings were in public so he could humiliate me in front of everyone". Another stated "he was always trying to intimidate me. He would yell and scream out putdowns and call me names as he hit me. Thinking back on it now it is almost comical that he could have done all that at one time". One respondent reported that he and his brothers were regularly beaten with a stick. Sometimes they would be made to cut the sticks with which they were to be beaten. Other respondents reported being locked up, often for days. One respondent stated that sometimes he found ways to escape so he could eat but would always return to the room so no one would find him missing. Another reported

that he was tied up and thrown in the dirt cellar with all the rats. One respondent related how his mother had him go through exercises such as sit ups and running on the spot for hours on end. This individual also stated "sometimes she would make me kneel on dry noodles, I know it sounds silly but you try kneeling on hard noodles digging into you for hours at a time. It hurts like hell". It is difficult to imagine how any child experiencing such serious abuse could escape without suffering some ill effects. Most often such treatment tends to impede or even prevent the formation of a strong confident attachment between the child and parent. Maltreated children also tend to display more aggression both on psychological tests and in play situations (George & Main, 1979).

A little over half of the offenders reported parental alcohol abuse while a few offenders reported having family members with criminal records. Such realities further demonstrate the point that a number of homicide offenders are raised by undesirable parent models. Coleman, Butcher, & Carson (1984) report that since children tend to observe and imitate the behavior of their parents, parental behavior can have a highly beneficial or detrimental effect on the way a child learns to perceive, think, feel, and act. These authors go on to say that parents may be considered undesirable

models if they have faulty assumptions about reality, possibility, and values, if they depend excessively on defence mechanisms in coping, or if there is a marked discrepancy between their proclaimed values and the values reflected in their actual behavior. This is often the case in the families of homicide offenders.

Homicide offenders were asked how they responded to their parents in such a dysfunctional family environment. The majority of offenders stated that they were too afraid, usually of their father, to strike back or defend themselves. Most never dared to act in a verbal or physically aggressive manner towards their parents. When they did so it was most often to protect another family member, usually their mother. One respondent stated "whenever dad would beat on mom I would go after him, I knew I would get shit kicked, but there was nothing else I could do". Other offenders stated "When I got a little bigger I threatened to kill him if he didn't leave mom alone", "I pulled a gun on him and told him that I would blow his fucking head off if he ever touched her again", "I was really into archery and one day I pointed my bow and arrow at my stepfather. I aimed it right at his head and held it there. I wanted him to stop beating us (his mother, and himself). I still don't know why I didn't kill the bastard". Some offenders fought back after they had

been pushed to the end of their limits. One respondent commented "I never did anything until he threatened to kill me. That's when I threatened to fight back". A few of the offenders were afraid of challenging their fathers' authority however once they decided to strike out they knew that they had to go all the way. The majority of respondents avoided any type of confrontation with their parents. Most got away from the situation by removing themselves from the family environment at an early age.

A number of the offenders (both violent and nonviolent) were raised in highly pathological environments. Often attachment processes were disrupted, if they even existed at all. The parent figures were often inadequate and most often served as models for antisocial behavior. It is not difficult to see why individuals experiencing this type of family environment are predisposed to a variety of forms of developmental pathology. While this type of troubled family history does not excuse or justify criminal activity, it certainly gives some insight as to how and why offenders reach the point of adult development at which they became capable of breaking both the norms and the laws of society.

### Education

A large majority of the homicide offenders had low levels of education. Most had only achieved an elementary school education. Very few attended, let alone completed, high school. Lamberti (1958) and Wolfgang (1966) noted low levels of education among homicide offenders. Swigert & Farrel (1976) found that 75.4% of the killers in their sample did not finish high school. Most of the respondents simply stated that they did not finish school because they decided to quit. The reasons for quitting most often included "it was boring", "school is a waste of time", "you don't learn anything worthwhile", and "what good is it?". Other reasons given for leaving school early consist of going to work, coming in contact with the criminal justice system, and being expelled from school.

The fact that these individuals did poorly in school, or did not achieve high levels of education, should not be taken as an indication of their intelligence. Interviews revealed many of these individuals to be well-spoken, intelligent, and very street-wise. Many demonstrated themselves to be fast and creative thinkers.

The majority of the respondents felt that they did not live up to their potential while they were in school. While for some this was simply a

rationalization, for others it appeared to be quite true. Two replies were typical of the situations experienced by many of the offenders; "I was capable of doing good but why bother, the old man would not be satisfied anyhow", and "I didn't have the confidence in myself to try. The thought of attempting something and failing was devastating".

A number of reasons may account for poor performance and the early drop out rate of offenders. How the respondents did in school may have played a role in their early departure from the educational system. The vast majority of homicide offenders reported failing or doing poorly in school. It is likely that their poor performance did not stimulate them to go further with their education. The fact that they did poorly in school may also be one of the reasons that so many of the respondents maintained a negative attitude towards their school history as well towards the educational system in general.

Children who are temperamentally impulsive, extroverted, and aggressive are likely to find school, which demands sitting still and being attentive, to be boring, confining, and unrewarding (Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985). One offender stated that he felt he did not live up to his potential because "I didn't like

to be confined to a class room, I couldn't concentrate".

Low levels of education may also demonstrate a subcultural attitude towards school. On the reserves many natives feel that education is a luxury. Very often native children are removed from school by their parents in order to work. Therefore the children not only have their schooling interrupted, but they also learn that education serves a secondary role. Most often if a native on a reserve wants to continue his education he will have to leave the reserve and go to school elsewhere. Many natives do not want to do this, and those that do often find the experience traumatic. The type of educational facilities that are available to natives may also play a role in their low levels of education.

Wilson & Herrnstein (1985) suggest that children who have been conditioned by their parents to ignore or discount the connections between actions and consequences (due to inconsistent treatment, for example) are likely to find little connection between school rules and personal conduct. They are also likely to find no connection between school work and personal gratification. These authors also state that a child who has not formed a strong emotional bond or attachment with one or both parents is likely to

distrust and dislike any source of adult authority (eg. teachers). A number of offenders come from backgrounds where they are exposed to inconsistencies, and form negative attitudes to adult authority. These children are not likely to pay attention to the teacher, out of disrespect, or to the school work, because their behavior will not bring about the desired response.

The majority of homicide offenders (73%) reported being aggressive in school, where as only 45% of the nonviolent offenders reported aggressive behavior at school. Gold & Moles (1978) reported high rates of school violence by delinquent boys. School was a place to vent hostilities and to demonstrate some form of rebellion. As one offender commented "I put up with shit at home, not at school", Another commented "fighting at school was a release from the tensions at home, I felt better afterwards". Still another stated "I always fought at school. I had a fuck you attitude". Much of the aggression at school was directed towards teachers. It was a way of rebelling against authority without having to challenge the parent figure. Offenders reported the following incidents: "I used to act both verbally and physically aggressive towards the teachers all the time for no special reasons"; "a teacher grabbed me once and I beat him"; "a teacher poked me with one of those wooden pointers and I broke

it over his head"; "I attacked a teacher because he told on me for skipping"; "I attacked a teacher and threatened to kill him if he gave me an F"; "one teacher was always on my case so I stabbed him"; "ya, I beat up a teacher. One time I threatened to beat up the principal. I had to go to the office for the strap and I told him, you touch me and i'll club your fuckin head in".

The bulk of aggression at school was directed at other school children. Very often it vented itself on the sports fields. In most cases aggression was expressed through physical fights, however there were some other extreme forms: "I beat the shit out of white girls. I didn't like the way they treated me"; "in grade three I stabbed a girl with a screw driver. I don't know why"; "I held a kid by the feet off the third floor of the school then dropped him"; "I didn't like fighting but I would never back down. I got beat up and embarrassed at school so I ran over the guy with his own car"; "I got blamed for everything in school, and got strapped for something I didn't do. The teachers found out I didn't do it and didn't say they were sorry. They told me it counted for something I probably did and got away with in the past. I broke into the school at night and poured ink all over the floors, and in the fish bowl. I went to the teachers

lounge ate and drank all the food, then pissed in the coffee pot and on the floor". These extreme forms of aggression were most often motivated by 'getting even'. These forms of aggression were often perceived by the offenders to be retaliations for the poor treatment they received from other students or the teachers.

In the majority of cases aggression in school served as an outlet for the offenders. Emotionally they were so restricted in their daily home lives that they seemed to vent their hostilities when ever they were given the chance.

Often offenders put up with so much abuse at home, where they had to, that they would react, often violently, to any form of abuse outside the home which they felt they did not have to take. Violence in school may also have been a way for the offender to assert himself, and rebel in an environment which he was able to accomplish this. It may also be the case that offenders were simply acting out the responses for dealing with conflict which they had learned at home.

#### Employment History

Some of the offenders in this sample reported never having held a full time job. Few offenders reported holding jobs for long periods of time (over 1 year). Most stated that they would hold a job for only

short periods of time (under 6 months). At the time of the offence the majority of offenders were unemployed. Most of these individuals reported that they were unemployed because they had quit their last job. Reasons for quitting included poor pay, poor working conditions, boring or unsatisfactory work, and strained relations with supervisors. The majority of offenders who reported being employed at the time of the offence stated that they had only been working at that job for a short period of time. Homicide offenders were most often employed in labour and unskilled jobs. Unstable work histories are common among homicide offenders (Lamberti, 1958; Riley & Cohen, 1977). Revitch & Schlesinger (1981) noted that offenders reported having a difficult time adjusting to work environments. Swigert & Farrel (1976) observed that 31.6% of the offenders in their sample were unemployed and received their income from public assistance. Of those employed 46.3% were unskilled and semi-skilled labourers.

The poor work histories of homicide offenders may reflect their youthful age. Young offenders are less likely to have settled into a steady job. They may not have started working, or they may be just working to get some quick money. Young offenders are not likely to be working at a job because of a desire to be involved in a specific area of employment. An individual

involved in the work force at a young age is likely to work short time periods, and have a higher turn over in jobs.

The educational backgrounds of these offenders may also explain employment histories. Individuals who have marginal educations are limited in their employment opportunities. Most often they are forced to work in labour or unskilled jobs because they lack the academic qualifications and/or the skills that go with them.

The fact that offenders most often hold labour-type jobs may also partially account for unstable work histories. The type of jobs most often held by these offenders are 'dead-end' jobs. Such employment produces low returns, and offers few prospects for advancement. They therefore have a high turnover.

As was the case with school, those individuals who are unable to draw a connection between what is required by their job and how they should act are likely to have trouble holding a job. Those individuals who have trouble with authority are also likely to find it difficult to hold a job for any length of time without becoming involved in some kind of dispute with their superiors.

Individuals with unstable employment histories have been found to be highly aggressive (Bachman, O'Malley, & Johnston, 1978; West & Farrington, 1977).

#### Substance Abuse

A large number of homicide offenders were found to have a history of alcohol abuse. Most described themselves as heavy drinkers and admitted to having a problem with alcohol prior to the commission of the offence. Homicide offenders were more likely to describe themselves as heavy drinkers and admit to having a problem with alcohol than were nonviolent offenders. The vast majority of offenders began using and abusing alcohol at an early age (18 years of age or less). Most research in this area investigates alcohol use at the time of the offence but fails to trace the offender's past history of substance abuse. Holcomb & Anderson, (1983) looked at alcohol use by homicide offenders both at the time of the offence and prior to the offence. These authors suggest that a large number of homicide offenders have a history of alcohol abuse, which is consistent with the fact that many had been drinking at the time of the crime. Only a small number of offenders reported regular drug use. Only a few of these individuals reported having a drug addiction problem. Those that used and/or abused drugs began

doing so at an early age. Holcomb & Anderson (1983) also reported a small number of offenders with a history of drug abuse.

The number of homicide offenders with histories of alcohol abuse may in part be accounted for by the racial mix of the subject population. The majority of homicide offenders in this sample were native. Nettler (1982) states that Indians have a long and sad history of alcohol abuse. Biological factors may in part account for native alcoholism. Goodwin (1979) states persons of different races may differ in their tolerance for alcohol. Natives may have a lower tolerance for alcohol. It may also be the case that persons of different races may differ in the speed with which alcohol enters the blood and the length of time it remains there. Fenna et al. (1971) report that blood alcohol levels dropped faster in whites than in American Indians. Schuckert (1980) states that persons of different races may differ in personality. Alcohol may interact with these aspects of personality in ways that lead either to more aggressive behavior, to a greater dependency on alcohol, or both.

Subcultural norms may also influence attitudes towards alcohol and alcohol use (Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985). On many reserves drinking is a way of life. It is a major social activity and therefore is readily

accepted. Young members of the community are involved in alcohol use without any thought of its negative influence. Parents often think nothing of or encourage the use of alcohol by their children. Drinking is the norm on many reserves, so to abstain is a deviation.

A little over half of the respondents reported that one or both of their parents had a problem with alcohol. Individuals whose parents have an alcohol problem are likely to drink themselves (Cotton, 1979). Bohman (1978) found that adopted individuals whose biological fathers had been alcoholics were three times more likely to have a drinking problem than adopted males without alcoholic biological parents. Goodwin et al.(1974) states however that "sons of alcoholics were more likely to become alcoholic if they were reared by their alcoholic parent than if they were separated from their alcoholic parent soon after birth and reared by nonrelatives" (page 168).

### Past Criminal History

Finally it was postulated that homicide offenders will have a past history of criminality. Few of the homicide offenders had juvenile records for violent offences and alcohol related offences. A number of homicide offenders did, however, have juvenile records for property related crimes. Adult convictions revealed that nearly half of the offenders had prior convictions for violent crimes. Over half of the respondents reported committing acts of violence which were never brought to the attention of the police or courts. Very few homicide offenders had served a federal sentence prior to their present incarceration. Provincial time, however, had been served by over half of the respondents. Of note was the finding that homicide offenders were more likely to have a history of involvement in violent offences, while nonviolent offenders had histories for nonviolent offences.

Wolfgang (1958) found that 64% of the offenders in his sample had a criminal record. Swigert & Farrell (1976) report that 61.7% of the the murderers in their sample had a prior arrest record. They noted that offenders' prior criminal histories included arrests for public order offences (42.4%), property crimes (34.1%), and violent crimes (32.9%).

This past criminality is most likely a reflection of inadequate and antisocial families, subcultural norms, poor education and job skills, and involvement with alcohol.

#### Violent Versus Nonviolent Offenders

Homicide offenders demonstrated consistent patterns in age, race, family history, education, employment, substance abuse and past criminal history. However, there were few differences that distinguished violent from nonviolent offenders on these demographic variables.

The data suggest that the two offender groups can be differentiated on the basis of race, substance abuse, aggressive tendencies and past criminal records. It has already been suggested that the differences in race and substance abuse may be subculturally determined. Homicide offenders demonstrated more aggressive tendencies than nonviolent offenders. Violent offenders reported engaging in more aggressive behavior at school. They were also more likely to have prior adult convictions for violence, and to have committed violent offences without detection. Future research should investigate the differential exposure to violence in the lives of violent and nonviolent offenders. The degree of exposure as well as the

intensity of the violence to which offenders have been exposed may account for the differences between the two offender groups in terms of aggression. Finally nonviolent offenders are more likely to have a past criminal record than are violent offenders. This most likely reflects the fact that nonviolent offenders may commit a number of offences prior to being incarcerated. As well nonviolent offenders are likely to serve 'short time' for their offences. This allows them to be back on the street and become reinvolved. Homicide offenders however will be automatically incarcerated for their offence. The length of the sentence they receive also generally decreases their chance of reinvolvement.

Since there were so few demographic variables that differentiated the two offender groups one might be tempted to conclude that such differences do not exist. However, alternatively one might speculate that there are differences between these offender groups that have not as of yet been identified. The most important finding differentiating violent and nonviolent offenders was in terms of aggressive tendencies. On the whole violent offenders tend to have a history of aggressive behavior whereas nonviolent offenders do not. This finding brings up the most elementary question of why do individuals who seem to have

relatively similar demographic characteristics differ in the extent that they exhibit aggression.

It is believed that demographic differences between the two groups of offenders do exist. This research looked at a number of different variables but often did not look close enough. For example, physical abuse was recorded for both offender groups, however the age of onset, the severity, the duration of, and the impact of the abuse were not investigated in detail. While both offender groups may have been exposed to physical abuse, the specific circumstances involving that abuse may be important for differentiating violent and nonviolent offenders. It is suggested that future research investigating demographic variables for criminal offenders examine each variable in much greater detail. While everyone might be exposed to a certain type of experience, the effect of that experience may be meaningless without knowing when the experience occurred, under what circumstances, to what degree, and with what effects.

## PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING

## Jackson Personality Research Form

For the most part scores obtained on the Jackson Personality Research Form by both offender groups were unremarkable. While there were consistencies in scoring on some of personality measures, these consistencies did not take the form of extreme scores as expected. In other words test scores may be interpreted as demonstrating a lack of psychopathology in most areas measured by this test. Both violent and nonviolent offenders scored in the 'average' range on the scales for aggression, impulsivity, endurance, and nurturance.

While violent offenders tended to score slightly higher on the aggression scale than did nonviolent offenders, the difference was not significant. Neither group scored extremely high or extremely low on this scale. It was suggested that homicide offenders would be aggressive individuals and therefore score high on a measure of aggression. Intuitively this assumption seems probable as homicide is the ultimate act of aggression. Revitch and Schlesinger (1981) cite a number of cases demonstrating a history of aggressive behavior among homicide offenders. Such behavior includes fighting in school with both students and teachers, fighting on the street, fighting during

sporting activities, and fighting at home and with friends. Satten et al. (1960) also report that homicide offenders have life long histories in which they have demonstrated erratic control over their aggressive impulses. Newman (1974) described homicide offenders as having aggressive personalities. The demographic data of this research supports the notion that many homicide offenders demonstrate aggressive personalities. For some reason, the measure of aggression does not seem to be recording this existing behavior. A number of explanations may account for this. Neutral responding may be a result of false responding by offenders. Offenders may have identified some of the items regarding aggression and purposely respond with a non-aggressive answer in the interest of 'looking good'. While it would be naive to suspect that all items were answered truthfully, it is felt that the majority of offenders did respond to the questions with what they felt were correct responses. At the time of testing all respondents were quite familiar with the author and knew that the test scores would not be used either for or against them in any way. Informal talks with the respondents after testing also suggested that most offenders had reported accurately. A more likely explanation for neutral scoring on the aggression scale might be accounted for by the fact that homicide

offenders as a group may not be aggressive individuals per se, but may become involved in aggression under certain situational conditions. It may also be the case that while homicide offenders are aggressive individuals, they do not perceive themselves as such. If they do not see themselves as aggressive they will not respond accurately to the items on the scale. This point will be examined in greater detail in the discussion on the Personal Belief Scale.

The scores obtained on the impulsivity measure were also unexpected. It was suggested that homicide offenders would score high on the measure of impulsivity. Many writers have suggested that homicide offenders are impulsive individuals (Heibrun et al., 1978; Revitch and Schlesinger, 1978, 1981). Some authors have stated that homicide offenders exhibit a disturbance in impulse control that could be classified as an impulse disorder (Campion et al. 1985; Getsinger, 1976; Satten et al., 1960). Both violent and nonviolent offenders achieved average scores on the impulsivity scale.

It is suggested that this measure of impulsivity is not well suited to a criminal population. In a study specifically investigating measures of impulsivity with a criminal population, Thies (1981) reported that offenders did not score as impulsives on the Jackson

measure. It seems necessary to make a distinction between impulsiveness and spontaneity. The impulsiveness of criminals is most often defined as behavior that is executed without consideration of the consequences. Eysenck & McGurk (1980) define impulsiveness as a complete failure to evaluate the situation. The Jackson measure puts a greater emphasis on behavior that is free flowing, not rigidly structured, and spontaneous. Examples include items such as: "I admire free spontaneous people"; "life is no fun unless it is lived in a carefree way"; "I like to take care of things one at a time"; "I often stop in the middle of one activity in order to start something else"; and "I always try and be fully prepared before I start working on something". Failure to evaluate the consequences of a given behavior is not stressed. As one can clearly see, the differing terms spontaneous (free flowing) and impulsiveness (no regard to consequences) hold different connotations in terms of the desirability of that behavior. Criminal populations may be considered to be more impulsive than spontaneous.

Homicide offenders generally scored low on the measures of achievement, affiliation, dominance, exhibitionism, and social recognition. It was suggested that homicide offenders would not be achievement

oriented. Respondents thought more in terms of 'getting by' than of achieving. Their low levels of education and unstable work histories also demonstrate a lack of desire to achieve. Interviews revealed that little emphasis was put on long term goals. Striving to accomplish something was most often only a fleeting thought, an idea that sounded good but in actuality would never be carried out.

Homicide offenders may not be achievement oriented because they have not had appropriate models from whom to learn this trait. In most cases they have been raised in families where achievement is not a high priority. Often the parents (through low levels of education and poor employment histories) also show little desire to achieve. Another reason that homicide offenders may not be achievement oriented is because they have been exposed to situations where the outcome of their behavior was not contingent upon their responses (Revitch, & Schlesinger, 1981; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985). This would cause an individual to feel a certain helplessness in terms of his ability to control outcomes. In such a situation the person would not be achievement oriented because he would feel that he does not really have the ability to achieve.

As suggested, the majority of homicide offenders scored low on the measure of affiliation. Many of the

homicide offenders reported having few friends. Most often the friends of these individuals were casual friends and were not considered to be close to the respondent. At work the majority of homicide offenders stated that they "stuck to themselves". They did not go out of the way to make or maintain friendships. Those that reported having friends at their place of employment rarely reported having any type of contact with these individuals outside of work. Homicide offenders also report having poor interpersonal relationships with women. While there were some respondents who reported having very few relationships, the majority of offenders reported having a number of short, casual relationships. In most cases these relationships were very shallow and not highly regarded by the offender. Very few of the respondents talked about being with someone special. Most of those that did have a serious or special relationship were unable to maintain that relationship. In fact, those individuals that killed their significant others (wife, girlfriend, lover) generally expressed these types of warm emotions toward them.

A number of authors have reported low levels of affiliation among homicide offenders. Blackmand et al. (1974) commented on inadequacies in the interpersonal relationships of homicide offenders. Satten et al.

(1960) described the relationships of homicide offenders with others as shallow and cold. They state that this lends a quality of loneliness and isolation to these men. Newman (1974) also talks about the social isolation of these offenders. He states that they keep to themselves and have few friends. Newman goes on to say that often these offenders never have a positive relationship in their lives.

This inability to maintain interpersonal relationships most likely reflects a disturbance in the attachment phase of development. If the parent is absent either physically (through separation, divorce, death, institutionalization, etc.) or psychologically (rejecting, indifferent, abusive), attachment between the child and the parent may not form. Pringle (1965) reports that adults who experienced significant rejection in childhood had serious difficulty giving and receiving affection as adults. Rutter (1972) suggests that the absence of attachment may lead to "affectionless psychopathy", in which the individual is unable to form lasting relationships. Ainsworth (1982) states that the inability to form and maintain friendships and relationships is the most significant long term result of the failure to form an emotional bond.

It was believed that homicide offenders would be dominant individuals. Contrary to expectation homicide offenders scored low on the measure of dominance. As we have already discussed homicide offenders have low levels of education, poor employment histories, and poor interpersonal relations. With this in mind it is likely that they will not demonstrate a dominant personality. Perhaps acts of aggression and ultimately homicide are used in an attempt to gain some form of dominance in an environment over which the offender has little control. Newman (1974) suggests that some individuals attempt to control through aggression. Ressler et. al. (1985) state that murder is the ultimate form of dominance. Inherent in these statements is the belief that murder is an attempt to gain control or dominate a situation.

Homicide offenders scored low on the measure of exhibitionism. While it was suggested that they would receive high scores on this measure of personality, it appears that homicide offenders are for the most part quiet individuals. This makes sense given their scores on the affiliation and dominance measures.

It was suspected that homicide offenders would have a history of risk taking behavior and would therefore score low on the scale of harmavoidance. Unexpectedly it was found that homicide offenders

scored high on the measure of harmavoidance. In general homicide offenders tended to be self-protecting, apprehensive, cautious, and fearful. While this finding was completely unexpected it was extremely interesting, most revealing, and intuitively appealing. Homicide offenders for the most part do not fit the public, and media stereotype of crazed individuals who inflict fear and pain as a means of self-gratification. They are timid and frightened people. They are frightened of being hurt emotionally and physically. This self protectiveness may in fact be one of the major determinants of their involvement in the crime of homicide. Rather than look for alternative responses when faced with a stressful situation they react immediately, often in a manner that far exceeds any reasonable or appropriate response. The sole motivation for such a reaction is fear and self-protection. When looking at this finding in terms of the interview data it becomes strikingly clear that homicides are most often self-protective acts and that fear can be fueled within the offender in many ways. Examples from this sample include murders that were committed because offenders felt that they were in physical danger, because they had been caught during the commission of another crime and panicked, because offenders felt their reputation was in danger, because offenders

feared getting in trouble, and because of rejection, or the fear of rejection. The following cases illustrate these examples:

Case #1- Offender A was involved in the criminal subculture and murdered one of his criminal contacts. "This guy was a bum. He wanted to move some jewellery, I acted as the middle man between him and the buyer. The guy liked the goods and contacted the other guy. They decided to settle up between them. The buyer stiffed this bum cause they had some beef between them and this lowlife came after me. He kept telling me it was my fault and he was going to get me." One time the "bum" pulled a knife on offender A and stabbed him in the arm. The two struggled and offender A got the knife away from him and stabbed him two times in the stomach and once in the back.

Case #2- Offender B lived in constant fear of being abused both physically and sexually by his step father. His father would often scream at him "I'll beat you to a bloody stump". Offender B felt that it was only a matter of time before his step-father would kill him. One day he felt that enough was enough. He went into his stepfathers bedroom and beat him to death with a baseball bat while he was sleeping.

Case #3- Offender C lived in a constant state of violence. He was fearful of being attacked to the point of paranoia. "I always carried a number of weapons. I carried two knives in sheaths mounted on my arms so they could slide into my hands easily. I cover the blades with this dark liquid so you couldn't see the glare of the blades when I pulled them out. I also carried one or two guns". The offence occurred as the culmination of a rivalry between offender C and a group of men. This group of men constantly threatened him, and were always trying to attack him. One night he decided to stop the constant intimidation by killing the leader of the group: He walked into the bar where the rival men hung out. "I walked right up to him and told him I was going to kill him. The guy laughed at me. I pulled out a knife and hit him two times in the body, cut his throat, and let him drop to the ground." Another rival and friend of the victims tried to intervene. "(he) grabbed at me to try and hold me back but I pushed him away, and cut the guys throat". After he left the bar he encountered four of the victims

friends who were also part of the rival's group. One of them said hello to offender C who responded by stabbing him four times to the throat area. The other three tried to step in but he stabbed each of them between two and four times. Only the originally intended victim died.

These cases demonstrate individuals sufficiently worried about their own safety that they overreacted to protect themselves.

The following cases illustrate individuals who committed murder as a result of panicking during the commission of another crime.

Case #4- Offender D was in the midst of committing his first break and enter with three acquaintances. He was led to believe that there was a large amount of money in the house and that there would be nobody home. All four arrived at the house armed. They rang the bell and knocked on the door to double check that no one was at home. No one answered so they made their way into the house. Offender D reported being very nervous. When he walked into the bedroom he noticed an older woman laying in bed. "she started screaming and wouldn't stop, I panicked". Offender D tried to subdue her but she was hysterical and he lost control. He grabbed his knife and stabbed and slashed at her until she released her grip on him (autopsy reported the victim was stabbed approximately 40 times). Offender D then ran out of the house without retrieving any money.

Case #5- Offender E and accomplice were in the middle of a break in when the residents awoke. "God they scared the shit out of me, I panicked and hit the guy with a knife that I picked up in the kitchen as a confidence builder. He kept after me so I kept hitting him". While they struggled the female woke up and tried to stop offender E. He then stabbed her. The male was stabbed 7 times, and the female was stabbed 11 times.

The following cases are examples of offenders who feared that they would suffer a personal loss if they did not defend their reputation.

Case #6- Offender F was highly involved in the criminal subculture. One night a rival threatened him outside of a bar with a crowd of his friends around him. He had avoided this individual before but stated that under these conditions he could not back down without losing face. The man charged offender F and struck him in the face. Offender F led a life of violence and was always armed, this night he was carrying a knife. "I warned the guy by holding the knife to his face and saying i'm going to stick you with this and hurt you bad. What can I say the guy was cocky and came at me again. Boy was he suprised when I stuck him".

Case #7- Offender G was involved heavily in the drug subculture. The victim of his crime stole some drugs from him. It became common knowledge in the drug world that offender G had been ripped off, and everyone knew who the thief was. Offender G and the victim (the man who ripped him off) were involved in several confrontations in which offender G asked for either the drugs back or the dollar value of the drugs. After constant refusal offender G took the thief at gun point to a semisecluded area and shot him 5 times. "I was in a criminal drug subculture. If I didn't kill him everyone would try and take advantage of me. I wouldn't be able to survive in that world if I didn't even the score".

Other offenders felt that committing murder was the only way to protect themselves from getting in trouble for some deviant act which they were responsible for.

Case #8- Offender H strangled his girlfriend because her parents would not let them be together and she wanted to die. He felt he was helping her by taking her life. After strangling her he put her in the trunk of his car and drove around. Hearing noises coming from the trunk he stopped the car to investigate. When he opened the trunk he was suprised to see that his girlfriend had only been rendered unconscious by the choking and was now coming to. He became very frightened. "I saw her gasping for air, she was reaching out to me. I didn't know what to do. I couldn't take her to the hospital because they would ask what had happened to her. There was a single shot

Table 1  
Jackson Personality Research From Scores for Violent and  
Nonviolent Offenders

Score	Type of Offence	
	Violent	Nonviolent
<b>Achievement</b>		
Low (33.5% or less)	14 (31%)	5 (21%)
High (66.5% or less)	10 (22%)	13 (54%)
<b>Affiliation</b>		
Low	20 (44%)	15 (63%)
High	8 (18%)	5 (21%)
<b>Aggression</b>		
Low	12 (27%)	9 (38%)
High	16 (36%)	7 (29%)
<b>Autonomy</b>		
Low	6 (13%)	2 (8%)
High	23 (51%)	14 (58%)
<b>Dominance</b>		
Low	24 (53%)	13 (54%)
High	6 (13%)	4 (17%)
<b>Endurance</b>		
Low	11 (18%)	5 (21%)
High	19 (43%)	16 (66%)
<b>Exhibitionism</b>		
Low	26 (58%)	12 (50%)
High	7 (15%)	3 (12%)
<b>Harmavoidance</b> $p < .05$		
Low	4 (9%)	9 (38%)
High	20 (44%)	6 (25%)
<b>Impulsivity</b>		
Low	16 (36%)	6 (25%)
High	11 (24%)	7 (29%)
<b>Nurturance</b>		
Low	14 (31%)	9 (38%)
High	26 (57%)	7 (29%)
<b>Social Recognition</b>		
Low	28 (62%)	15 (63%)
High	6 (13%)	2 (8%)

22 automatic rifle in the trunk that I used to shoot gophers. I picked it up and shot her 3 times".

A number of murders are the result of rejection.

The following are illustrations of such murders.

Case #9- Offender I stated that he felt very dependent on his girlfriend. He had felt rejected by everyone else in his life and she was his only stabilizing factor. "When she broke it off I told her I was coming over there with a gun". He entered her house. She had a bunch of friends over. He tried to talk to her but she was not taking him seriously. He felt if he brought the gun in she would pay attention. He chased all her friends out by waving the shot gun around. "I tried talking calmly to her like you would talk to a baby but she was hysterical". When attempts to reason with her failed he shot her. This case is fairly typical in terms of rejection murders. Usually the offender has a history of being rejected and when his emotional stability is threatened he panics. Often in such cases there is the thought of the attempt to commit suicide after the murder.

Case #10- Offender K was charged for the murder of one prostitute, however it is alleged that he may be responsible for murdering others. He states that the origin of his hatred towards prostitutes, and women in general, stems from an incident where a hooker laughed at him and made fun of his physical anatomy and his sexual abilities.

All of these cases illustrate murders that were largely motivated by self protection. Therefore, although high scores on the measure for harmavoidance were unexpected, they seem to be an accurate reflection of the personalities of homicide offenders.

The measure of harmavoidance was the only measure on which violent and nonviolent offenders differed at a significant level.

### Personal Belief Scale

It was suggested that homicide offenders would score as externals on the Personal Belief Scale. Contrary to expectation both violent and nonviolent offenders scored in the internal direction. Other offender populations have demonstrated an internal locus of control. Breen (1985) reported a mean I-E score of 9.5 for a population of 246 male inmates incarcerated in a provincial correctional institution. As a group these inmates tended to score internally. Ladwig (1963) also reported internal scores for a group of 80 male inmates incarcerated in a state penitentiary. Rotter (1972) was surprised by the results of Ladwig's research as he expected prison inmates to be externals.

Initially it was difficult to comprehend why both violent and nonviolent offenders would score as internals. Internals see themselves as very much in control of events in their lives, whereas externals believe control comes from sources other than themselves. Rotter (1975) has stated that research literature suggests that internals are always 'good guys', and that externals are always 'bad guys'. Williams & Vantress (1969) have reported that internals show significantly less hostility and aggression than

externals. Ryckman (1982) suggests that internals are competent, responsible, and independent people who, in comparison to externals, perform more effectively on a variety of skill determined tasks. These characteristics do not conform to the profiles of the violent and nonviolent offender groups.

When discussing belief in control one may differentiate between proactive control (anticipating a situation) and reactive control (responding to a situation). It is suggested that as a group, violent and nonviolent offenders with an internal locus of control are engaging in faulty reality testing if their belief in control is proactive. While offenders may believe they have the ability to control their environment, they certainly do not demonstrate a history of exerting control over that environment. There are simply too many contradictions between the control offenders suggest they have and the actual behavior that is exhibited. A number of examples can be given to illustrate this point. Both violent and nonviolent offenders believed they had the potential to succeed academically. However, we know that these individuals have minimal educational levels and that they most often did poorly while they were in the educational system. Offenders also report that they have no problem with employment. They state that they

have a variety of skills, and they believe that they can find and hold on to a job anytime they want. Employment histories demonstrate that these individuals actually have very few marketable skills. They have often held a number of jobs and only remain at each job for a short period of time. Homicide offenders often describe themselves as easy to get along with. However, many have a history of violence against schoolmates, teachers, and friends. They have also had difficulty getting along with co-workers and employers. Low scores on the measure of affiliation corroborate these facts. A number of homicide offenders perceive themselves as being successful in their relationships with women, however, they are unable to maintain meaningful and lasting relationships. The majority of their relationships are superficial and self-serving. Offenders also state that they are able to handle alcohol, yet at the same time their personal lives and criminal record often demonstrate alcohol involvement. This would tend to suggest that control over the use of alcohol does not in fact exist. As far as homicide offenders are concerned it is also interesting to note that these individuals do not perceive themselves to be aggressive ('normal' scores on the Jackson measure of aggression), despite the fact that the majority of

these offenders have demonstrated a past history of aggressive behavior.

While it is unlikely that violent and nonviolent offenders demonstrate proactive control over their environment it is possible that they display reactive control. Offenders do not seem to act on their environment but rather react to their environment. They demonstrate control only to the extent that they must deal with the situations that they have become a part of. This type of control can be related to the scores homicide offenders obtained on the harmavoidance scale. Self-protective behavior is reactionary. Rather than assuming control initially, offenders engage in self-protective behavior as a reaction to harmful situations.

#### Antisocial Personality Disorder

In current usage the terms psychopath, sociopath or present day antisocial personality are used interchangeably. The salient characteristics of this disorder include a history of antisocial behavior (ie. chronic violation of rules at home and at school, delinquency, substance abuse) before the age of 15. After age 18 antisocial personalities often demonstrate an inability to maintain employment, function as a

parent, and accept social norms with respect to lawful behavior. They are aggressive, impulsive, reckless, dishonest, financially irresponsible, and are unable to maintain lasting relationships (A.P.A., 1980). Cleckley (1967) describes sociopaths in terms of their considerable superficial charm, unreliability, insincerity, impulsivity, inadequately motivated antisocial behavior, pathological egocentricity, poor judgment, poverty of deep and lasting emotion, an absence of a conscience, and an inability to learn from experience. The D.S.M. III estimates the prevalence of the antisocial personality disorder at 3% for males. While the number of incarcerated males diagnosed as antisocial varies depending on the author cited and the method of assessment, criminals seem to be overrepresented compared to the general population. Despite the high incidence of antisocial personalities found in correctional institutions it should be noted that not all criminals are psychopaths, and not all psychopaths are criminals (Eysenck, 1983). Hare (1985a) has attempted to 'fine tune' the diagnostic criteria for the antisocial personality disorder so an offender is not predisposed to this diagnosis simply by implication of criminality.

It was postulated that homicide offenders would meet the diagnostic criteria for the antisocial

personality disorder as set by The Psychopathy Checklist (Hare, 1985b). This suggestion was confirmed. Homicide offenders scored significantly higher on the checklist than did nonviolent offenders. Close to 60% of the homicide offenders met the criteria for psychopathy set by the checklist. The relationship between homicide offenders and psychopathy has been reported by a number of authors (Bluglass, 1979; Davison & Neale, 1982; Guttmacher, 1960; Hare & McPherson, 1984; McKnight et al., 1966; Nettler, 1982; Pothast, 1956; Revitch & Schlesinger, 1981; Rosenhan & Seligman, 1984; Weiss et al., 1960).

The demographic 'profile' of the homicide offender developed to this point reflects an individual who meets a number of the diagnostic criteria for the antisocial personality. Many of the homicide offenders began exhibiting antisocial behavior at a young age. This antisocial behavior was carried out both in the home and at school. It often involved substance abuse, aggressive behavior, and criminal behavior. As adults many of the homicide offenders continued to express impulsive, reckless, irresponsible, and often socially unacceptable behavior. They were unable to function within the confines of a job and/or a relationship. The antisocial behavior which these individuals engage in is often inadequately motivated and reflects poor

Table 2

## Psychopathy Checklist Scores for Violent and Nonviolent Offenders

Checklist Score	Type of Offence	
	Violent	Nonviolent
<b>Low Scores</b>		
10	1	1
12	1	0
13	1	0
15	1	1
17	1	2
19	4	1
Percent scoring low	(16%)	(23%)
<b>Moderate Scores</b>		
20	1	2
21	1	2
22	2	2
23	1	1
24	2	1
25	1	0
26	1	1
27	3	1
28	3	4
Percent scoring moderate	(26%)	(54%)
<b>High Scores</b>		
30	5	1
31	4	3
32	1	2
33	5	0
34	5	0
35	4	0
36	1	0
37	3	0
38	3	0
39	2	0
Percent scoring high	(58%)	(26%)

judgment. The crime these offenders have committed is a perfect illustration of this. Many homicide offenders relate a casual attitude towards their victims and their crimes. This may be a demonstration of their general lack of remorse and absence of a conscience. The fact that so many offenders are unable to take responsibility for the offence may reflect an inability to learn from experience.

The psychological testing also reflects associations between homicide offenders and antisocial personalities. Aggressive behavior is characteristic of an antisocial personality (A.P.A., 1980). In fact manie sans delire, the original terminology for what is known today as the antisocial personality disorder, was conceived by Philippe Pinel to describe the violently insane (Davison & Neale, 1982). Correlations computed to investigate inter-test interactions suggested an association between offenders scores on The Psychopathy Checklist, and their scores on the Jackson measure of aggression. Individuals who scored high on the checklist tended to score high on the measure of aggression, thus demonstrating an association between psychopathy and aggression for homicide offenders. The demographic data indicate that many of the homicide offenders had a history of aggression preceding the commission of their offence.

Heilbrun (1979) has linked violent crimes to psychopathy. Hare & McPherson (1984) state that psychopaths are more likely to be involved in violent and aggressive behavior than criminals in general. Nettler (1982) states that psychopaths are more likely to have a history of aggressive behavior compared to other convicts. Nettler also reports that psychopaths are more likely than other criminals to use a weapon during the commission of an offence. Parker (1979) suggests that psychopaths are particularly susceptible to being involved in violent crimes such as homicide after the consumption of alcohol. Heilbrun (1979) differentiates between well-socialized intellectual psychopaths, and poorly-socialized less intelligent psychopaths. He states that of the two types of psychopaths the less intelligent psychopath is more likely to commit murder.

Homicide offenders scored high on the Jackson measure of autonomy. They can be described as unmanageable, rebellious, unconstrained, and non-conforming. Interviews also revealed that these individuals often had the desire to be unattached, free, not tied to people, places, or obligations. At times the antisocial behavior of these individuals is a reflection of these attitudes. Rosenhan & Seligman

(1984) state that this type of autonomous behavior is characteristic of antisocial personalities.

It has also been suggested that psychopaths engage in impulsive and risk-taking behavior as a form of stimulation (Rosenhan, & Seligman, 1984). It was for this reason that it was postulated that homicide offenders would score low on a measure of harmavoidance. It was felt that if homicide offenders displayed antisocial characteristics they would be risk takers who thrived on living 'on the edge' and who would not withdraw from danger for self-protection. For this reason the fact that homicide offenders were overly self-protective came as a surprise, especially when the majority met the diagnostic criteria for psychopathy. However, further investigation revealed that there was an association between offenders scores on The Psychopathy Checklist and the Jackson measure of harmavoidance. The higher homicide offenders scored on the checklist (the higher the degree of psychopathy), the lower they scored on the measure of harmavoidance. This finding suggests that those individuals who have strong psychopathic tendencies are in fact likely to demonstrate risk-taking behavior. Those individuals possessing psychopathic tendencies to a lesser degree are not as likely to show the same marked risk-taking behavior.

This result brings up an important point. It suggests that there are different degrees to which one can exhibit psychopathic symptomatology and behavior. The extent to which an individual possesses psychopathic characteristics may play an important role in determining other personality characteristics of that individual. Unfortunately, psychopathy is often thought of in terms of a black or white form of pathology. One either fits the diagnostic criteria for the antisocial personality disorder or one does not. It is suggested that there are different degrees and intensities to which one can be "antisocial". It is important to recognize that not all individuals who meet the diagnostic criteria for psychopathy demonstrate the disorder to the same degree.

Another quality of the antisocial personality observed within homicide offenders as a group was superficial charm. A number of the homicide offenders interviewed were charismatic individuals. Many were adept at manipulating others' perceptions of themselves. An excellent example of such behavior was observed at an Omega Club (Lifer) Meeting. The Lifers were organizing a baseball game between themselves and an all-women's team from the street. Prior to the game it was felt that the women should attend one of the lifer meetings. It was felt that the women would feel

more at ease with the institutional environment and the inmates if they had some prior exposure to them. At the beginning of the meeting the women were apprehensive about being placed in the middle of a federal institution with a group of killers. However as the meeting progressed the women and the inmates began to interact. At the end of this two hour meeting it appeared that the attitudes of the women had completely changed. They left the meeting laughing and joking with a number of the inmates. Some of the women felt so comfortable with the offenders that they were slapping them on the back and making snide and sarcastic remarks to them as one would with a close friend. They also began to exhibit an anti-administration attitude which to this point had not been evident. While this change of attitude might be accounted for as counter-phobic behavior, identification with the aggressor, or a manifestation of the Stockholm Syndrome it is suggested that the women had simply been manipulated by the prisoners. The inmates put on their best behavior and used this superficial charm to alter the womens' impressions of them. They were able to accomplish this task quickly and effectively. The women had totally forgotten that they were in federal correctional institution, and that each individual they were joking with had been convicted of murder. This created a

dangerous situation because the women had been manipulated to the point where the inmates had control over their thinking. Because they were so strongly taken in by this inmate 'con' it was felt that the actual game should not take place as it would give the inmates another opportunity to manipulate and most probably try and exploit these women in some manner.

This trait of superficial charm does not suggest that these individuals are attention-seeking and desire to have many friends. In fact psychological testing revealed that homicide offenders did not seek to be the center of attention and preferred not to be surrounded by friends. This charisma characteristic of antisocial personalities is most often simply superficial charm. This charm is exhibited solely in an attempt to manipulate a person or situation to the individual's advantage.

The above point is supported by the fact that homicide offenders also scored low on the Jackson measure of social recognition. This suggests a certain pathological egocentricity. These individuals are not concerned with other people. The only time they are concerned about how they appear to others is when it is for their own good.

A popular explanation accounting for the development of the antisocial personality disorder

assumes some form of early disturbances in family relations (Coleman, Butcher, & Carson 1984). A number of studies indicate that losing a parent through separation, divorce, or desertion is highly correlated with sociopathy (Greer, 1964; Gregory, 1958). However many individuals experience the loss of a parent at an early age without becoming psychopaths, therefore there must be some added variable. Hare (1970) suggests the key factor is not the loss of the parent per se, but rather the emotional disturbances in the family relationships created before the departure of a parent. Smith (1978) also explained that it was not the actual absence of the parent but rather the turbulent family environment existing prior to the separation of a parent which results in the most harm. He noted that a child is often exposed to arguments, violent fighting, alcoholism, and parental instability before a parent leaves home.

McCord & McCord (1964) state that severe parental rejection and lack of parental affection are the primary causes of an antisocial personality. Buss (1966) concluded that two types of parental behavior foster psychopathy. In the first, parents are cold and distant towards their child and allow no warm relationship to develop. The second type of parental behavior involves inconsistency. This type of parent

displays affection, rewards, and punishments in an erratic manner. It has also been suggested that psychopathic behavior is influenced by faulty parental models (Greenacre, 1945; Heaver, 1943, Hare, 1970). Smith (1978) noted the importance of a neglectful father in the socialization of a sociopath.

It has already been suggested that homicide offenders come from the type of backgrounds that are conducive to the development of an antisocial personality. However we also stated that violent and nonviolent offenders come from very similar backgrounds. Why then do homicide offenders fit the criteria for antisocial personalities more often than nonviolent offenders? Again it is believed that the answer lies in a more detailed account of the family histories of violent and nonviolent offenders. Differences in the age at which offenders experience trauma within the family, as well as differences in the intensity and degree of that trauma, may account for a higher presence of psychopathy among violent offenders. It is also important to realize that while poor family backgrounds have been found to predispose individuals to this form of pathology, a faulty family structure does not inevitably result in psychopathy. As well it is important to note that neither poor family environments or psychopathy are

solely responsible for any type of criminal activity, including murder.

#### CRIME INTERACTIONS

The interaction between the offender and the environment, as evidenced in their behavior at the scene of the crime, is of key importance in terms of understanding the offender. These crime-scene interactions may provide valuable information about the type of individual who commits a particular type of offence, as well as information related to the circumstances of that offence. The following associations constitute the data which is most relevant to psychological profiling.

##### Age

It is believed that no association was found between the ages of the offenders and their victims because so many other variables (eg. race of offender, age of victim, sex of victim) interact with the age variable. Offender-victim relationships were, however, associated with the victim's age. Offenders were more likely to have known or been involved with young victims (22 years of age or younger). Since the majority of homicide offenders are young individuals it is likely that most of the people they associate with

will be similar to themselves in age. If an offender kills someone they know, chances are that person will be close to them in age.

The victim's age was also associated with the sex of that victim. Young murder victims tended to be females. When offenders kill someone they know, most often that person is a female. Offenders are likely to be involved with females who are similar to themselves in age.

Another interesting association was that homicide offenders were likely to feel depressed after murders when their victims were young. Young victims tended to be females who were known to the offender, often within the context of an intimate relationship. Post-homicide depression may therefore be caused by the fact that the offender has taken the life of someone whom he had feelings for. The offender may also regret what has happened and therefore feel depressed.

#### Race

As expected a relationship was found between the race of the offender and the race of the victim. Almost all of the homicides were intra-racial. White offenders tended to kill whites, natives offenders tended to kill natives, and minority group offenders tended to kill individuals within their own racial group. Garfinkel

(1949) stated that generally speaking people kill their own kind. He found intraracial homicide to occur 90% of the time. Killing within one's own race has been found with great consistency (Wolfgang, 1961; Swigert & Farrell, 1976; Glaser, 1978; Centerwall, 1984).

People tend to associate with others who are similar to themselves with respect to certain demographic variables such as age and race (Kandel, 1978). If a murderer knows his victim it is highly probable that they are of the same age range and race because individuals similar in age and race are more likely to associate. Simple exposure may also account for intraracial homicides. Generally people have the greatest exposure to people of their own race. White people tend to live, socialize, and often work in predominately white environments. The same is true of natives. The immediate environment to which natives are exposed, and have the most contact with, is for the most part made up of other natives. This high exposure and contact with individuals of one's own race is likely to increase the odds of any type of behavior occurring within that race.

It was also suggested that the race of the offender would be associated with the sex of the victim. This was indeed the case. White offenders were more likely to kill females, where as native offenders

most often killed males. This differentiation is most likely due to the fact that white offenders often kill someone they are intimately or closely involved with, while natives most often kill acquaintances and strangers.

Other racial associations suggest that native victims are likely to precipitate violence through verbal or physical instigation. This might be accounted for by the sex of the victim and the native subculture of violence. As suggested above, natives most often kill males. It is probable that in the course of an argument or drinking spree male natives will become involved in some form of verbal or physical aggression. The way in which one responds to a personal attack in the native community is often through violence which sometimes leads to death.

#### Relationship

It was suggested that the majority of homicide offenders would know their victims. This association was observed for white offenders only. It is interesting to note the existence of a racial differentiation in terms of offender-victim relations. It is suggested that this difference is heavily influenced by the sex of the victim. It has been stated that the victims of white offenders tend to be females

who are typically known by their offenders, often in the context of close or intimate relationships. Natives on the other hand tend to kill males. In the vast majority of cases it is unlikely that the relationship between two males will be as close or as intimate as the relationship between a male and a female. Male victims are most often not known to the offender, or they are acquaintances of the offender.

The offender-victim relationship plays an important role in the act of homicide. The motive, the way in which the offence is committed, and the offender's emotional stability are all associated with the relationship between the offender and the victim.

White offenders often reported having experienced personal problems, depression, and troubles in a relationship prior to the commission of murder. It may be the case that these difficulties were a result of their relationship with the victim. The existence of such problems may be a motivational factor for the offence. It is interesting to note that white offenders reported that they were loners who did not associate with many people. They maintained positive feelings towards their victim and rated their victims as being physically attractive. If an individual with few social contacts felt that his relationship with an attractive woman whom he cared for was in jeopardy, his

insecurity, anger, and frustration might ultimately lead to murder. It is in this way that the offender-victim relationship may produce the motivation for murder.

It was suggested that the pattern of attack would vary as a function of the relationship between the offender and the victim. This was in fact observed. While offenders who knew their victims tended to commit murder on the spur of the moment, they often reported some prior thought of killing that person.\* A concentration of wounds to the facial area was associated with having expressed past feelings of aggression towards the victim. One offender reported "I thought about killing her sometimes, especially during the last two months that we were really having trouble ..... when I got the gun I felt calm, the indecision and worrying were over ..... I came back in the room and shot her once in the head". Another offender reported that he constantly thought about killing his step-father. Eventually he carried out his

\* Having thought about killing the victim prior to committing the offence was not considered to be the same as planning the murder. This is because offenders reporting such thoughts claimed they were only vague feelings of wanting to act in an aggressive manner towards the victim - they did not consist of actually planning out the mechanics of a murder.

thoughts and bludgeoned his step-father to death with repeated blows to the head. Offenders are likely to build up hostilities towards an individual about whom they have had past aggressive thoughts. Hostilities that have been built up are liable to vent themselves in an explosive personal attack. The facial area is likely to be highly vulnerable in such an attack as it is the focus of an individual's identity, and therefore a highly personal part of one's body.

Offenders who knew their victims most often committed the act of murder spontaneously with weapons that had been obtained at the scene of the crime. In most cases these types of weapons require a close contact form of killing. When the method of murder was intense and close contact the point of impact was often directed to the facial area. One offender reported physically beating and kicking his wife to death. Autopsy revealed the cause of death to be numerous blows to the head. The intensity of this attack can be illustrated from the police report which quoted the offender as stating "I'm going to need a new pair of boots" as he broke the toe of his cowboy boots kicking his wife. Two offenders who both killed their victims by repeated blows to the head with a hammer also showed this tendency to attack the head area in close contact killings. One of these offenders stated

"I kept striking with the hammer. I wanted to stop but I couldn't. I even dropped the hammer two Goddamn times. That would have been the perfect time to stop, but I just picked it up and kept going, both times!"

The above examples serve to illustrate the point that when an offender attacks a known victim in an intense close contact manner the result is often a concentration of wounds to the facial area. Homicides of known victims are often emotionally panicked, explosive attacks. Often the immediate motive of this type of murder is to "get rid of" the victim. The best way to destroy an individual's identity is to disfigure the facial area.

Geberth (1983) states that the neck and facial area are often main points of impact when there is a close or intimate relationship between the offender and the victim. Mowat (1966) found that the most common methods for killing an intimate were bludgeoning, cutting his or her throat, or strangulation - all of which are close contact forms of killing and entail the head or neck areas of the victim.

Overkill is the use of excessive or exaggerated force in the commission of murder. The offender exerts force beyond what is needed in order to kill the victim. Overkill often occurs in the form of multiple gunshot and/or stab wounds. The best predictor of

overkill was the race of the offender. White offenders were most likely to overkill while murdering their victim. White offenders, as previously stated, are more likely to kill someone they know, someone they are close to, or someone they are intimately involved with. Therefore it is in the killing of these victims that overkill is demonstrated. This may lead one to conclude that overkill is based not only on the race of the offender but on the relationship between the offender and the victim. Overkill is more likely to be observed with victims that have some past relationship with the offender. The type of relationship can vary when overkill is evident, however the relationship is generally a close one. One offender reported getting in an argument after a party with three of his good friends. As the three were about to leave the party the offender came out of the residence and smashed the window of the truck which the three were in. The offender then produced a knife and started slashing at his friends. The offender stabbed one of his friends 11 times, another 7 times, and the third 4 times. The third was the only one to die with a stab wound to the heart. Another offender attacked his young step-son. He beat the boy about the head with a car aerial and a leather belt. He then flung him against the bathtub, toilet bowl, the arm of a chesterfield, and the

refrigerator. The child's head was severely fractured and he died of multiple brain injuries. A final example of overkill occurring in close relations is illustrated by an offender who reported he killed his mistress after being rejected. The offender stabbed her 11 times. The stabbing was so vicious that a frontal stab through her chest resulted in the knife breaking and leaving 1.5 inches of the blade embedded in the front of her spine. Ressler, Burgess, & Douglas (1983) state that the tendency to overkill has been implicated in the murder of intimates. Mowat (1966) suggests that the methods of murder are especially direct and brutal in close relationships. Mowat states that killings are more likely to be intense and close contact when the victim is closely related to the offender.

The explanation accounting for why murders between people who know each other are so brutal may lie in the history of emotions that go along with such relationships. An offender may have an intense love-hate relationship with the victim (Mowat, 1966). Homicide may result from the release of aggressive impulses which were up to that point controlled. After holding in so much hostility the ultimate release could be devastating and manifest itself in the form of overkill.

Another emotional situation that may lead to overkill is when an offender feels he has been betrayed by someone he cares about. Simmel (1955) states "the deepest hatred grows out of broken love....To error, a failure in intuition, so compromises us before ourselves....that we unavoidably make the object of this intolerable feeling pay for it. We cover our secret awareness of our own responsibility for it by hatred, which makes it easy for us to pass all responsibility on to the other" (pg. 46).

Finally, the relationship between the offender and the victim may give some indication of the offender's emotional state after the offence. When the victim was a casual acquaintance or stranger, homicide offenders were likely to feel that they were in control of themselves emotionally and psychologically after the commission of the offence. However, if the offender and victim had been involved in a close relationship, offenders were likely to report feeling a total loss of control both emotionally and psychologically. Offenders killing females, who are usually known to them, often state that they regret committing the murder. Offenders who murdered males, who are usually acquaintances or strangers, often state that they do not regret committing the offence.

If the offender has taken the life of someone who was close to him they are likely to exhibit some form of emotional instability after the murder. This may make the offender vulnerable during the course of an investigation. Since these individuals do not have many serious relationships they are likely to feel greatly troubled after the loss of such a relationship.

#### Substance Abuse

As expected the majority of homicide offenders reported drinking prior to the offence. Holcomb & Anderson (1983) report that researchers have established over 50% of all murderers investigated had been drinking alcohol prior to committing the offence.

While offenders may have ingested alcohol prior to the commission of the offence, it was suspected that in the majority of cases they would not have consumed enough to render them not responsible for their actions. Interestingly, only a small number stated that they were sufficiently impaired to the point where they did not know what they were doing. Scott (1968) noted that extreme intoxication was negatively related to homicide because this type of consumption would tend to immobilize the assailant. Tanay (1969) thought that alcohol was used to relieve unbearable tension for the killer. He stated that small or moderate amounts of alcohol were ingested, enough to loosen inhibitions but

not enough to "paralyze the ego" and produce "drunkenness". The majority of offenders in this sample reported being only slightly or moderately intoxicated at the time of the offence. Some of the offenders reported using alcohol as a way to loosen inhibitions and build up courage to act. One offender commented "I drank before it happened because I was mad. I wanted to go out and get him", another stated "I drank before the offence because I was pissed off, angry and upset". Offenders reported other reasons for drinking prior to the offence. Examples include statements such as: "it was something to do when I was upset or depressed"; "I was depressed and angry, I drank to calm down". Other offenders commented "it was a way to escape the abuse, it also helped me to face it", "I needed to escape". These offenders suggested that they drank prior to the offence because they were experiencing problems and they hoped the alcohol would help them with their problems, or make them forget about them. For these individuals drinking prior to the offence was a way to help them deal with their reality. Part of that reality may have been the desire to kill their eventual victim. Alcohol would help them to accomplish that. The majority of offenders stated that there was no particular reason accounting for why they drank prior to the offence. Most reported that they had been

drinking while socializing with friends, however there is likely a more in-depth explanation for this alcohol intake.

While much has been reported about the use of alcohol prior to homicides, little work has been done investigating how the offenders feel at the time of the offence when they have consumed alcohol, and if they continue drinking after the commission of the offence. Homicide offenders reported feeling more aggressive and less inhibited than nonviolent offenders after they had consumed alcohol. Offenders who drank prior to the offence stated that the emotion they most often experienced at the actual time of the offence was anger. This anger is more likely to be acted out if the offender has consumed alcohol.

Slightly over half of the offenders reported drinking after the commission of the offence. Langevin et. al. (1982) have suggested that murderers drink after the offence to calm themselves down, and forget what had happened. They noted however, that there is no systematic evidence for this. A number of the homicide offenders who drank after the offence reported that they did so to calm down or to help them forget. When asked why they drank after the offence, offenders reported "I had to calm my nerves", "I was nervous and I drank to try and calm down", "I felt like I did

something wrong and I was trying to calm down", "I wanted to numb my mind until I was picked up by the police", "I knew something had happened and I drank to try and forget", "I didn't feel right. I was feeling bad about what I did. I wanted to blackout".

The majority of the offenders who drank after the offence stated that they had no idea why they did so. It is suspected that their motivation for drinking after the murder was similar to those described above. It may also be the case however that some individuals drank after the offence simply because they felt like it, or because they had some ulterior motive to get drunk. A small minority of offenders reported such reasons for drinking after the offence. One offender reported "I had a couple of beers after cause I was thirsty, It sure the hell wasn't because of guilt". Another stated "I knew I was going to get prison time, maybe life, so I drank because I thought I might not get a chance again". The most interesting reason for drinking after the offence came from a very street wise individual with a long criminal history and an extensive history of violence. He stated "I hated my step-father and I always thought of killing him. I decided to do it and picked up a 30/30 rifle and walked outside. I pointed the gun at him and said stop or i'll blow your fucking head off. He laughed at me and

stepped forward. That was it, bang". This inmate stated that he had drank prior to the murder but not very much. He went on to say "I felt trapped because so many people saw what happened. I knew that there was no way out of this situation and I was heading for a life bit. I thought that if I got really drunk everyone would think that it was an alcohol related killing. I went back in the house drank everything in sight, and then went and sat by the body. Instead of doing life I'm doing 3.5 years and I can do that standing on my head".

Only a few of the offenders reported combining alcohol and drugs prior to the offence. This most likely reflects the low incidence of drug use among homicide offenders.

#### Planning Offence

As suggested it was found that the majority of homicides were spontaneous and unplanned. While the majority of all killings were unplanned, homicides with an element of planning to them tended to be committed by white offenders.

Since natives most often kill acquaintances and strangers it is likely that such homicides are a result of spontaneous disputes that end in violence. It may be the case that white offenders are involved in the few planned murders because they generally have some

previous relationship with the victim. Offenders are more likely to be aware of hostile feelings that exist for a particular individual if they have some prior relationship with that person. They may therefore think of killing that person, and even plan how they are going to do it before any spontaneous dispute arises.

It was also believed that weapons used in unplanned killings would be obtained at the scene of the crime whereas weapons used in planned killings would be brought to the scene. The data indicated that this might in fact be the case. This suggestion seems to make intuitive sense. If a murder is unplanned and occurs on the spur of the moment the offender is not likely to be prepared for the commission of that offence. Therefore, it is not likely that he will be carrying a weapon at that time. In order to carry out the act of murder the offender will have to use his bare hands or obtain some weapon that is available in his immediate environment. Weapons most often obtained at the scene included household objects (eg. kitchen knife, steel cooking pot, electric cord) and hardware (eg. hammers, wood boards).

Offenders who brought a weapon to the scene of the crime tended to be younger (22 years of age or less). Younger offenders may be considered to be more aggressive and more likely to respond to a situation by

taking matters into their own hands (Glaser, 1978). Weapons that were most often carried by these offenders were guns and knives. This too seems obvious as they are very portable types of weapons. Offenders who arm themselves tend to feel nervous both prior to the offence and during the actual commission of the offence. This seems only natural as the offender is aware of what is going to happen prior to the event. The murder is not going to happen totally on the spur of the moment, and the offender is not going to be able to rationalize the offence as an accident, or an act that occurred because of spontaneous situation.

It was suggested that weapons obtained at the scene of the crime would most often be left at the crime scene following the murder. While the majority of weapons were removed after the commission of the offence, the weapons most often left behind were in fact those obtained at the scene of the crime. Offenders who obtained weapons at the scene of the crime often knew the victim. Therefore it is possible, particularly when the victim was a female, that there was some feeling of panic, fear, or loss of control after the homicide. An offender experiencing such emotions may be so involved in what has happened that he may not think about removing evidence such as a weapon.

### Remaining at the Crime Scene

It was suggested that offenders who felt comfortable at the scene of the crime were likely to spend more time there following the offence. The majority of offenders did not remain at the scene of the crime after the offence, however those offenders that did remain reported feeling comfortable at the location where the crime took place. Homicide offenders who remained at the scene of the crime for extended periods of time most often reported that they knew the location. An offender who reported killing his father in their home stated "I pulled the body off the bed and tried to get it upstairs to put it in the car. I couldn't move it so I just dragged it into the corner of the room out of view from the window and threw a blanket over it. I went upstairs sat down had a beer, some cookies, watched T.V., and thought of what I should do". Porter (1983) states that it has been established that offenders who take their time at the scene of the crime know their way around. The location may be close to where the offender lives, works, or spends a lot of time. The simple fact that the offender is familiar with the environment he is in is likely to make him feel more comfortable in that environment. If the offender does not feel he is threatened by

remaining at the scene of the crime he may not be in such a hurry to leave.

Offenders are likely to spend a long time at the scene of the crime when the victim is young, and when the victim is a female. These findings serve to strengthen the association demonstrating that offenders who remain at the scene of the crime often know their victim. Victims that are most frequently involved in some type of close relationship with the offender are young females. Under these conditions the offender may remain at the scene of the crime because he feels guilty about what he did. He may care about his victim and want to be with her even though she is dead. After killing his fiancée one offender responded "when I saw what I had done I tried to revive her. When I saw it wasn't doing any good I put her on the couch and sat up with her all night long".

Offenders who carried a weapon generally left the scene immediately following the crime. This suggests that offenders do not remain at the scene of the crime after planned killings, and after transfer of intent killings (a transfer of intent killing occurs when a crime other than murder was the primary intention of the offender). One offender was an interesting exception to this finding. He reported that prior to a robbery he would put his long hair under a hat and put

on red lipstick. In one robbery he was confronted with someone who was not willing to cooperate. When asked how he responded to this resistance, he stated "I put him down". After the shooting he wiped the lipstick off his face, and let his hair down. He stated "I went outside and stood around to see what was happening. I watched and listened to everyone talkin about the shooting. I even went up to the cops and started talking to them about what happened".

- Any indication suggesting that the body has been moved or altered suggests that the offender has spent time at the scene of the crime after the homicide. Often times when a body has been altered the offender will also alter the scene of the crime. This type of activity in itself is time consuming. One offender who reported remaining at the crime scene for an extended period of time recounted how he spent that time. He reported:

"I felt her pulse to see if she was alive. She wasn't. I took the rope off from around her neck and then I started to feel real panicky. I thought I would be able to think better if I got the body out of the room so I went to put it out on the fire escape. When I got outside, the door to the room started to swing shut. I grabbed for it cause I didn't want to get locked out of the room, and I dropped the body".

The offender then stated that he returned to the room and got dressed. He then went downstairs to look to look at the nude body in the alley way. He then went

for a short walk. Upon returning to the hotel room he put the victims clothes in a bag which he took outside and deposited in a garbage container. He again returned to the room and packed up his clothes and the rope into his knapsack.

One may gain some insight into the offender's emotional state if they remained at the scene of the crime for an extended period of time after the commission of a homicide.

Offenders who remain at the scene after committing murder often report feeling depressed both prior to the commission of the murder and after the murder. Offenders who remained at the crime scene also reported feeling a sense of humiliation at the time of the homicide.

#### Post-mortem Activity

It was suggested that post-mortem activity would give some indication as to the offender's emotional state. Altering the body was associated with the offenders emotional state, however other forms of post-mortem activity did not reveal anything about the offender's personality.

Individuals who alter the body in some way after the murder reported experiencing fear at the time of the offence, and stated that they were nervous after

the offence. The victim's body was most often altered when the weapon used to commit the murder was obtained at the scene of the crime. If the body was altered it was likely that the scene of the crime itself was altered. Often this includes removing evidence or property at the scene of the crime.

Any indication suggesting that the body has been moved or altered suggests that the offender has spent time at the scene of the crime after the homicide.

Further physical post-mortem damage was very seldom observed. Post-mortem disfiguration or mutilation was most likely when the victim was killed in an intense, close contact method (multiple method bludgeon) with a weapon requiring close contact (ie. hand held object). Post-mortem damage was observed only in terms of overkill where an offender would continue to bludgeon, stab, or shoot his victim after death had occurred.

All of the above points can be found in the following case study.

Case #11 - Offender K reported that he lived in constant fear of his father who was responsible for abusing the entire family both physically and psychologically. After being abused one day he asked himself if it was ever going to stop. He stated "I broke into a sweat and grabbed the baseball bat that was leaning up against the wall and I hit him. After I hit him I became terrified about what he was going to do to me now. I had never fought back because I knew the abuse I would get would be unbelievable. I had

broken an unwritten rule. I was too afraid to stop hitting him. I couldn't stop till he was dead". After the murder offender K locked the garage doors so no one could come into the garage and find the body. He took the keys and hid in the basement of his house. After his mom went to bed he snuck back upstairs. He entered the garage and covered up the windows so no one could see in. He loaded the body into the car and began to clean up the garage. He cleaned the floor and all the blood in the garage. He threw away all the clothes and other things that had been splattered that he would not be able to wash. He buried the bat and then disposed of the body a few miles away. Offender K returned home and washed his clothing the next day. The offender was not apprehended for a two week period. He reported being extremely nervous throughout this time period. He had to make believe nothing had happened and act suprised at his father's sudden departure both to his family, and the police. Offender K reported that all the pressure was removed from him when the police picked him up. It was as if a huge weight had been removed.

This case presents a situation where post-mortem activity was present. The offender was nervous both before and after the offence, the weapon was obtained at the scene of the crime, the crime scene and the body

were altered, the offender spent a great deal of time at the scene of the crime, and post-mortem damage was inflicted during overkill with a weapon that required an intense, close contact kill.

As expected, the treatment of the body after the homicide gave some indication as to the offender's emotional state. The way in which offender K disposed of the body was revealing. The fact that the body was left in an area where it would eventually be found suggests that the offender felt a sense of guilt for what he had done. The fact that the body had literally been "dumped", with the cardboard used to cover the floor of the trunk dropped on top of it demonstrates that the offender showed little or no concern for the victim. Offender K did in fact reveal that he felt guilty for doing "something like that", but he also states that his father deserved to die and that he does not regret his actions.

Geberth (1983) states that if an offender feels guilty about a killing, or has in the past cared for the victim, they will leave the body in an exposed area or hide it in an area where it is sure to be found. The following case demonstrates how an offender's concern for their victim can be evidenced in the manner in which the body is disposed.

Case #12 - After shooting his girlfriend 5 times offender L disposed of her body in a culvert. He stated that there was water in the culvert and he was very careful to position her body in such a way that her head would remain above water. His reasons for doing this were that he did not want her face to be exposed to the algae, or bugs in the water. In this case the offender is showing concern for the victim after her death. This is a good indication that the offender cares for the victim.

Geberth (1983) states if a body is cared for after death (ie. moved out of the sun, cleaned up, changed, positioned 'comfortably'), one may also assume that the offender feels guilty and cares for the victim.

#### SUMMARY

This research has attempted to integrate a number of areas in an effort to gain an understanding of how different variables relating to the offence of homicide interact. Offenders' backgrounds and personal histories, as well as their personality characteristics, have been investigated. The actual offences have been broken down into their most basic elements and have been examined for associations.

Homicide offenders did demonstrate consistencies in their responses to demographic information. While the majority of this information was not significantly different from the demographic data obtained for nonviolent offenders, it is suggested that a closer

examination of this type of data may produce the differences between these groups that one might expect.

Homicide offenders also demonstrated consistencies on a number of personality measures. Scores obtained on the personality measures for violent offenders did not significantly differ from those obtained by nonviolent offenders, with the exception of scores on the harmavoidance scale. It is interesting to note that homicide offenders were often fearful individuals who engaged in self-protective activities. Scores on the personality test also brought to light two important points. Firstly, the scores on the impulsivity scale suggest that perhaps the type of impulsive behavior that criminals (both violent and nonviolent) engage in is different from what we usually describe and measure as "impulsiveness". Secondly, offenders' scores on the aggression scale suggest that perhaps further research should be conducted investigating offenders self-perception.

Psychologically, homicide offenders demonstrated consistencies in their scores on the Personal Belief Scale and The Psychopathy Checklist. The majority of offenders rated themselves as having an internal locus of control, however they display almost none of the characteristics of internals in their daily behavior. The fact that these individuals may be engaged in

faulty reality testing in terms of proactive control is an important one. If this is the case, it would suggest that offenders do not think of themselves as they really are unless they are in reactive situations. This is an important concept for the apprehension, incarceration, and subsequent treatment of these offenders.

Psychopathy is most often regarded as a chronic disorder. One either fits the diagnostic criteria for an antisocial personality disorder or one does not. This research suggests that there are different degrees to which an individual can exhibit psychopathic behavior. How 'psychopathic' an individual is may play an important role in determining other personality characteristics. For example, there was a direct association between the score homicide offenders received on the Psychopathy Checklist and the scores they received on the measures of aggression and harmavoidance. It is suggested that these findings are most important and merit further investigation.

A number of suggestions were made in terms of associations that were believed to exist between the offender, the victim, and the crime. A number of these associations were observed. The data indicate that there are indeed consistencies in these interactions. Initially it was postulated that these consistencies

were a result of an interaction between a person-oriented model of personality and psychopathology. This initial view was used to account for psychological profiling and consistency in behavior because it fit well with the pathological populations that are most often the focus of profiling. While the offenders in this sample do demonstrate some forms of psychopathology (antisocial personality disorder, faulty reality testing), as a group they do not exhibit pathology to the degree that would be necessary to completely override interactions with the situation. Consistencies in the interactions between the offender/victim and crime scene were often situationally oriented or products of an interaction between the person and the situation. It is therefore suggested that for this sample of homicide offenders the observed consistencies can be accounted for best by an interactional model of personality in association with psychopathology.

This research has investigated the demographic backgrounds, personality characteristics, and behavior patterns of homicide offenders. Having obtained information which provides for a better understanding of the crime of homicide and homicide offenders, this research will contribute to the area of psychological profiling. Investigative agencies should be able to

utilize this data in order to make an educated attempt at describing the type of individual who may have perpetrated a specific homicide.

## References

- Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1982). Attachment: Retrospect and Prospect. In C.M. Parkes and J Stevenson (Eds.), The Place of Attachment in Human Behavior. London: Tavistock.
- Alker, H. (1972). Is personality situationally specific or intrapsychically consistent. Journal of Personality, 40, 1-16.
- American Psychiatric Association (1980). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (3rd. ed.). Washington D.C., Author.
- Ault, R., & Resse, J.T. (1980). A psychological assessment of crime profiling. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 22-25.
- Bachman, J.G., O'Malley, P.M., & Johnston, J. (1978). Adolescence to adulthood—Change and Stability in the Lives of Young Men, Vol. 6 of Youth in Transition. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. (1963). Social learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Principles of behavior modification. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

- Bandura, A. (1978). The self system in reciprocal determinism. American Psychologist, 1978, 33, 344-358
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 63, 575-582.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. (1963). Imitation of film mediated aggressive models. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 66, 3-11.
- Berkowitz, L. (1977). Situational & personal conditions governing reactions to aggressive cues. In D. Magnusson & N. Endlers (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in international psychology. New York: Erlbaum.
- Blackman, N., Lum, J.T., & Vanderpearl, R.J. (1974). Disturbed communications: A contributing factor in sudden murder. Mental Health Society, 1, 345-355.
- Block, R. (1977). Violent Crime: Environment, Interaction, and Death. Lexington Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Bluglass, R. (1979). The psychiatric assessment of homicide. British Journal of Hospital Medicine, 22, 366-377.
- Bohman, M. (1978). Some genetic aspects of alcoholism and criminality. Archives of General Psychiatry, 35, 269-276.
- Bowers, K.S. (1973). Situationalism in psychology. An analysis and a critique. Psychological Review, 80, 307-336.

- Breen, L.J. (1985, June). Inmate characteristics: Preliminary report of the Headingly Correctional Institution Classification Research Project. Unpublished Manuscript. Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba, Manitoba, Canada.
- Burgess, A.W., Ressler, R.K., & Douglas, J.E. (1980, September). Offender profiles—A multidisciplinary approach. F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin.
- Buss, A. (1966). Psychopathology. New York: Wiley.
- Campion, J., Cravens, J.M., Rotholz, A., Weinstein, H.C., Covan, F., & Alpert, M. (1985). A study of 15 matricidal men. American Journal of Psychiatry, 142, 312-317.
- Centerwall, B.S. (1984). Race, socioeconomic status & domestic homicide, Atlanta, 1971-1972. American Journal of Public Health, 74, 813-815.
- Clarke, K., Barnhorst, R., & Barnhorst, S. (1977). Criminal Law and the Canadian criminal code. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Cleckley, H. (1967). The mask of sanity (5th ed.). St. Louis, Mosby Co.
- Coleman, J.C., Butcher, J.N., & Carson, R.C. (1984). Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life. Glenview Illinois: Scott, Foresman and company.
- Cooley, C.H. (1902). Human nature and social order. New York: Scribner's.

- Cotton, N.S. (1979). The familial incidence of alcoholism: A review. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 40, 89-112
- Daly, M. & Wilson, M. (1982). Homicide & kinship. American Anthropologist, 84, 372-378.
- Davison, G.C., & Neale, J.M. (1982). Abnormal psychology: An experimental clinical approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Deur, J.I., & Parke, R.D. (1970). Effects of inconsistent punishment on aggression in children. Developmental Psychology, 2, 403-411.
- Dollard, J. & Miller, N.E. (1950). Personality and psychotherapy: An analysis in terms of learning, thinking and culture. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Duncan, G.M., Frazier, S.H., Litin, E.M., Johnson, A.M., & Barron, A.J. (1958). Etiological factors in first degree murder, Journal of the American Medical Association, 168, 1755-1758.
- Endler, N.S., & Hunt, J. (1966). Sources of behavioral variance as measured by the S-R Inventory of Anxiousness. Psychological Bulletin, 65, 336-345.
- Endler, N.S. & Hunt, J. (1968). S-R Inventories of Hostility and comparisons of the proportions of variance from persons, responses, and situations for hostility and anxiousness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 309-315.

- Endler, N.S., & Hunt, J. (1969). Generalizability of contributions from sources of variance in S-R Inventories of Anxiousness. Journal of Personality, 37, 1-24.
- Endler, N.S. (1973). The person versus the situation - a pseudo issue? A response to Alker. Journal of Personality, 4, 286-303.
- Endler, N.S., & Okada, M. (1975). A multidimensional measure of trait anxiety: The S-R Inventory of General Trait Anxiousness. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 43, 319-329.
- Endler, N.S. (1976). The role of person by situation: Interactions in personality theory. In F. Weizmann & I.C. Uzgiris (Eds.), The structuring of experience. New York: Plessum Press.
- Endler, N.S., & Magnusson, P. (1976). Toward an interactional psychology of personality. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 975-984.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1983). Personality, conditioning, and antisocial behavior. In W. Laufer & J. Day (Eds.), Personality theory, moral development, and criminal behavior. Lexington: D.C. Heath & Co.
- Eysenck, S.B.G., & McGrurk, B.J. (1980). Impulsivness and venturesomeness in a detention center population. Psychological Reports, 47, 1299-1306.

- Fareta, G. (1981). A profile of aggression from adolescence to adulthood: An 18 year follow up of psychiatrically disturbed and violent adolescents. American Journal Orthopsychiatry, 51, 439-453.
- Fenna, D., Mix, L., Schaefer, O., and Gilbert, J. (1971). Ethonal matabolism in various racial groups. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 105, 472-475.
- Garfinkel, H. (1949). Inter- and Intra-racial homicides. In M. Wolfgang (ed.), Studies in Homicide. New York: Harper & Row.
- Geberth, V.J. (1983). Practical homicide investigation: Tactics, procedures, and forensic techniques. New York: Elsevier.
- Geberth, V.J. (1981, September). Psychological profiling. Law & Order, 46-54.
- Geiwitz, J.P. (1969). Non-Freudian personality theories. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- George, C., & Main, M. (1979). Social interactions of young abused children: Approach, avoidance and aggression. Child Development, 50, 306-318.
- George, C., & Main, M. (1980). Abused children: Their rejection of peers and caregivers. In T.M. Field, S. Goldberg, D. Stern and A.M. Stostek (Eds.), High Risk Infants and Children: Adult and Peer Interactions. New York: Academic Press.

- Getsinger, S.H. (1976). Sociopathy, selfactualization, and time. Journal of Personality Assessment, 40, 398-402.
- Glaser, D. (1978) Crime in our changing society. New York: Holt Rinhart & Wilson.
- Gold, M. & Moles, O.C. (1978). Delinquency and violence in schools and the community. In J.A. Inciardi, & A.E. Pottieger (Eds.), Violent Crime: Historical and Contemporary Issues. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Goodwin, D.W., Schlusinger, F., Hermansen, L., Gauze, S.B., Winokur, G. (1973). Alcohol Problems in adoptees raised apart from alcoholic biological parents. Archives of General Psychiatry, 28, 238-243.
- Goodwin, D.W., Schlusinger, F., Moller, N., Hermansen, L. Winokur, G., and Gauze, S.B. (1974). Drinking problems in adopted and nonadopted sons of alcoholics. Archives of General Psychiatry, 31, 164-169.
- Goodwin, D.W., (1979). Alcoholism and heredity. Archives General Psychiatry, 36, 57-61.
- Greenacre, P. (1945). Conscience in the psychopath. American Journal Orthopsychiatry, 15, 495-509.
- Greer, S. (1964). Study of parental loss in neurotics and sociopaths. Archives General Psychiatry, 11, 177-180.
- Gregory, I. (1958). Studies on parental deprivation in psychiatric patients. American Journal of Psychiatry, 115, 432-442.

- Guttmacher, M. (1960). The normal and the sociopathic murderer. In M. Wolfgang. (ed.), Studies in homicide. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hall, G.S., & Lindzey, G. (1978). Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hare, R.D. (1985a). The psychopathy checklist. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Hare, R.D. (1985b). Comparison of procedures for the assessment of psychopathy. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 53, 7-16.
- Hare, R.D., & McPherson (1984). Violent and aggressive behavior by criminal psychopaths. International Journal of Law & Psychiatry, 7, 35-50.
- Hare, R.D., & Frazelle, J. (1980). Some preliminary notes on the use of a research scale for the assessment of psychopathy in criminal populations. Unpublished manuscript. Dept. of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Hare, R.D. (1980). A research scale for the assessment of psychopathy in criminal populations. Personality and Individual Differences, 1, 111-119.
- Hare, R.D. (1970). Psychopathy: Theory and research. New York: Wiley.

- Hare, R.D. (1965). Temporal gradient of fear arousal in psychopaths. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 70, 442-445.
- Hazelwood, R.R. (1983, September). The behavior oriented interview of rape victims: The key to profiling. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 8-15.
- Hazelwood, R.R., & Douglas, J.E. (1980, April). The lust murderer. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 18-22.
- Heaver, W.L. (1943). A study of forty male psychopathic personalities before, during, and after hospitalization. American Journal of Psychiatry, 100, 342-346.
- Heilbrun, A.B. (1979). Psychopathy and violent crime. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 47, 509-516.
- Heilburn, A.B., Heilburn, L.C., & Heilbrun, K.L. (1978). Impulsive and premeditated homicide: An analysis of subsequent parole risk of the murderer. The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 69, 108-114.
- Hjelle, L.A., & Ziegler, D.J. (1981). Personality theories: Basic assumptions, research, & applications. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Holcomb, W.R. & Anderson, W.P. (1983). Alcohol and multiple drug abuse in accused murderers. Psychological Reports, 52, 159-164.

- Hurley, J.R. (1965). Parental acceptance-rejection and child intelligence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 11, 19-32.
- Jackson, D.N. (1967). Personality research form manual. New York: Research Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Jesse, F.T. (1952). Murder and its motives (Rev. ed.) London: Harrar.McPoyal, T.J. (1981). The investigative technique of criminal profiling. Your Virginia State Trooper, 3, 87.
- Jessor, R.A. (1964). Toward a social psychology of excessive alcohol use: A preliminary report from the Tri Ethnic Project. In C.R. Snyder and D.R. Schweitzer (Eds.), Proceedings of Research Sociologist's Conference on Alcohol Problems. Southern Illinois University, 59-79
- Kandel, D.B. (1978). Similarity in real-life adolescent friendship Pairs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 36, 306-312.
- Kimble G.A., Garnezy, N., Zigler, E. (1984). Principles of Psychology. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ladwig, G.W. (1963). Personal, situational, and social determinants of preference for delayed reinforcement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Lamberti, J.W., Blackman, N., & Weiss, J.M.A. (1958). The sudden murderer. In. M. Wolfgnag (ed.), Studies in Homicide. New York: Harper & Row.

- Langevin, R., Paitich, D., Orchard, B., Handy, L. & Russon, A. (1982a). Diagnosis of killers seen for psychiatric assessment. Acta Psychiatry Scandinavica, 66, 216-228.
- Langevin, R., Paitich, D., Orchard, B., Handy, L. & Russon, A. (1982b). The role of alcohol, drugs, suicide attempts and situational strains in homicide committed by offenders seen for psychiatric treatment. Acta Psychiatry Scancinavica, 66, 229-242.
- Lefkowitz, M.M., Huesmann, L.R., Walder, L.O., Eron, L D. (1973). Developing and predicting aggression. Science News, 103, 40.
- McCord, W., & McCord, J. (1964). The psychopath: An essay on the criminal mind. Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand.
- McKnight, C.K., Mohr, R.E., Quinsey, R.E., & Erochko, J. (1966). Mental illness and homicide. Canadian Psychiatric Assessment Journal, 11, 91-98.
- McPoyle, T.J. (1981). The investigative technique of criminal profiling. Your Virginia State Trooper, 3, 87.
- Mead, G.H., (1934). Mind, self and society. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

- Megaree, E.I. (1982). Psychological determinantes and correlates of criminal violence. In M.E. Wolfgang and N.A. Weiner (Eds.), Criminal Violence. Beverly Hills Sage publications.
- Messer, S.B. (1976). Reflection impulsivity: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 1026-1052.
- Mischel, W. (1968). Personality and Assessment. New York: Wiley.
- Mischel, W. (1971). Introduction to personality. New York: Rinehart & Watson.
- Moos, R.H. (1968). Situational analysis of a therapeutic community milieu. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 73, 49-61.
- Moos, R.H. (1969). Sources of variance in response to questionnaires & in behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 74, 405-412.
- Moos, R.H. (1972). Assessment of the psychosocial environment of community oriented psychiatric treatment programs. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 79. 9-18.
- Mowat, R.R. (1966). Morbid Jealousy & Murder. New Jersey: Tavistock Publications.
- Murray, H.A. (1938). Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford Press.
- Nettler, G. (1982). Killing One Another. Cincinnati, Ohio Anderson Publishing Co.

- Newman, D.E. (1974). The personality of violence: Conversation with protagonists. Mental Health Society, 1, 328-344.
- Parker, N. (1979). Murderers: A personal series. Medical Journal of Australia, 1, 36-39.
- Pemberton, D.A., & Benady, D.R. (1973). Consciously rejected children. British Journal of Psychiatry, 123, 575-578.
- Peterson, D.R., Becker W.C., Hellmer, L.A., Shoemaker, D.J., & Quay, H.C. (1959). Parental attitudes and child adjustment. Child Development, 30, 119-130.
- Petursson, H., & Gudjonsson, G.H. (1981). Psychiatric aspects of homicide. Acta Psychiatry, Scandinavica, 64, 363-372.
- Phares, E.J. (1965). Internal-external control as a determinant of amount of social influence exerted. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 642-647.
- Phares, E.J. (1976). Locus of Control in Personality. New Jersey: General Learning Press.
- Pinizzotto, A.J. (1984). Forensic psychology: Criminal personality profiling. Journal of Police Science and Administration. 12, 32-40.
- Porter, B. (1983, April). Mind hunters: Tracking down killers with the FBI's psychological profiling team. Psychology Today, 45-52.

- Pothast, M.D. (1956). A personality study of two types of murderers. Dissertation. Abstracts, 17, 898-899.
- Poznanski, E.O. (1973). Children with excessive fears. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 43, 428-438.
- Pringle, M.L.K. (1965). Deprivation and education. New York: Humanities Press.
- Quay, H.C. (1965). Psychopathic personality as pathological stimulus seeking. American Journal of Psychiatry, 122, 180-183.
- Ressler, R.K. and colleagues (1985, August). Violent crime. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin,
- Ressler, R.K. (1981). Profiles in terror: The FBI probes the criminal mind. The Boston Globe, May, p. 33.
- Ressler, R.K., Burgess, A.W., Douglas, J.E. (1983). Rape and Rape-murder: One offender and Twelve victims. American Journal Psychiatry, 140, 36-40.
- Ressler, R.K., Douglas, J.E., Groth, A.N., & Burgess, A.W. (1980, September). Offender profiles: A multidisciplinary approach. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 1-5.
- Revitch, E., & Schlesinger, L.B. (1981). Psychopathology of Homicide. Springfield Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

- Revitch, E., & Schlesinger, L.B. (1978). Murder: Evaluation classification and prediction. In I.L. Kutash, S.B. Kutash and L.B. Schlesinger and Associates (Eds.), Violence: Perspectives on murder and aggression. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Riley, D., & Cohen, H. (1977). Psychodynamics in a case of homicide. International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 21, 26-30.
- Rosenhan, D.L., & Seligman, M.E. (1984). Abnormal Psychology. New York: W.W. Norton & Comp.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, 260-294.
- Rotter, J.B. (1975). Some problems & misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 43, 56-67.
- Rotter, J.B., Chance, J.E., & Phares, E.J. (1972). Applications of a Social Learning Theory of Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Rutter, M. (1972). Maternal Deprivation Reassessed. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ryckman, R.M. (1982). Theories of Personality. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

- Satten, J., Menninger, K., Rosen, I., Mayman, M. (1960).  
Murder without apparent motive: A study in personality  
disorganization. American Journal of Psychiatry,  
117, 48-53.
- Schmeiser, D.A. (1974). The Native Offender and the Law.  
Ottawa: Information Canada.
- Schneider, J.M. (1971). College students' belief in personal  
control, 1966-1970. Journal of Individual Psychology,  
27, 188.
- Schroeder, M.L., Schroeder, K.G., & Hare, R.D. (1983).  
Generalizability of a checklist for assessment of  
Psychopathy. Journal of Consulting & Clinical  
Psychology, 51, 511-516.
- Schuckit, M.A. (1980). Self-rating of alcohol intoxication  
by young men with and without family histories of  
alcoholism. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 41,  
242-249.
- Scott, D. (1968). Offenders, drunkenness and murder.  
British Journal of Addiction, 125, 1252-1258.
- Scott, E.M. (1975). The act of murder. International  
Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology,  
19, 154-163.
- Simmel, G. (1955). Conflict and the Web of Group  
Affiliations, trans. by Kurt H. Wolff & Reinhard  
Bendix (from G. Simmel, Sociologie, 1908). New York:  
Free Press.

- Skinner, B.F. (1953). Science and human behavior. New York: Macmillan.
- Skinner, B.F. (1971) Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Knopf.
- Smith, R.J. (1978). The Psychopath in Society. New York: Academic Press.
- Stierlin, H. (1973). A family perspective on adolescent runaways. Mental Health Digest, 5, 1-4.
- Swigert, V.L., & Farrell, R.A. (1976). Murder, inequality, & the law. Lexington: D.C. Health & Co.
- Tanay, E. (1969, March). Psychiatric study of homicide. American Journal of Psychiatry, 146-152.
- Thies, J.P. (1981). Development of impulsivness useful for rehabilitation. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Windsor.
- Weiss, J., Lamberti, J., & Blackburn, N. (1960). The sudden murderer. Archives General Psychiatry, 2, 669-678.
- West, D.J., and Farrington, D.P. (1977). The Delinquency Way of Life. New York: Crane Russak.
- Williams, C.B. & Vantress, F.E. (1969). Relations between internal-external control and aggression. Journal of Psychology, 71, 59-61.
- Wilson J.Q. & Herrnstein, R.J. (1985). Crime and Human Nature. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wolfgang, M.E (1958). Patterns in criminal homicide. London: Oxford University Press.

- Wolfgang, M.E. (1961). A sociological analysis of criminal homicide. In M. Wolfgang (ed.), Studies in Homicide, New York: Harper & Row.
- Wolfgang, M.E. (1966) Criminal homicide and the subculture of violence. In M. Wolfgang (ed.), Studies in Homicide. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wolfgang, M.E. (1978). "Rethinking crime and punishment". Across the Board, 15, 55-61.
- Wolfgang, M.E. & Ferracuti, F. (1982). The Subculture of Violence. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications. (First published in 1967).

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

OFFENDER DEMOGRAPHICS

1. \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Age of respondent at time of interview: Exact age \_\_\_\_\_
    - a) 20 - 26
    - b) 27 - 33
    - c) 34 - 40
    - d) 41 - 47
    - e) 48 - 54
    - f) over 55
  3. Age at time of offence: Exact Age: \_\_\_\_\_
    - a) 15 - 16
    - b) 17 - 19
    - c) 20 - 25
    - d) 26 - 30
    - e) 31 - 40
    - f) over 40
  4. Number of years in institution:
    - a) 1 - 2
    - b) 3 - 4
    - c) 4 - 6
    - d) 7 - 8
    - e) 9 - 10
    - f) 11 - 12
    - g) 13 - 14
    - h) over 15 \_\_\_\_\_
  5. Number of insititutions time served in for present offence:
    - a) 1
    - b) 2
    - c) 3
    - d) 4
    - e) 5
    - f) over 5
  6. Health of respondent:
    - a) physical problems specify \_\_\_\_\_
    - b) no physical problems
- Has the respondent ever seen a mental health professional?
7. Prior to offence:
    - a) yes
    - b) no
  8. After the offence, prior to incarceration:
    - a) yes
    - b) no

9. In the correctional institution:

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Ethnic origin:

- a) White
- b) Black
- c) Native
- d) Oriental
- e) other

11. Religion of respondent:

- a) Protestant
- b) Catholic
- c) Jewish
- d) other
- e) unknown

12. Does the respondent believe in God?

- a) yes
- b) no

13. How often did the respondent attend his religious institution?

- a) never
- b) seldom
- c) sometimes
- d) holidays
- e) on a regular basis as a child (church/sunday school)
- f) often

14. How important were the respondents religious beliefs to him PRIOR to the commission of the offence?

- a) not at all
- b) somewhat important
- c) important
- d) very important

IF THE RESPONDENT FEELS RELIGION IS IMPORTANT - How does he account for his criminal behavior based on his religious beliefs? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

15. Has the respondent seen a chaplain during his incarceration?

- a) yes
- b) no

16. How important are the respondents religious beliefs to him at the PRESENT?
- a) not at all important
  - b) somewhat important
  - c) important
  - d) very important
- specify \_\_\_\_\_

#### FAMILY HISTORY

17. Number of brothers:
- a) 0
  - b) 1 - 3            Exact # \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) 4 - 6
  - d) 7 or more
18. Number of sisters:
- a) 0
  - b) 1 - 3            Exact # \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) 4 - 6
  - d) 7 or more
19. Parents marital status:
- a) married
  - b) living together
  - c) divorced
  - d) deceased    d) mother e) father f) both
20. Who was responsible for raising the respondent?
- a) mother
  - b) father
  - c) both parents
  - d) siblings
  - e) other relatives (grandparents, cousins, uncles etc.)
  - f) foster homes/ home for boys
  - g) other specify \_\_\_\_\_
21. Occupation of father:
- a) unknown
  - b) unemployed
  - c) unskilled
  - d) semi-skilled
  - e) skilled
  - f) professional
22. Occupation of mother:
- a) unknown
  - b) unemployed
  - c) unskilled
  - d) semi-skilled
  - e) skilled
  - f) professional
  - g) housewife

23. Education of father:  
a) unknown  
b) 1 - 6  
c) 7 - 9  
d) 10 - 12  
e) over 12
24. Education of mother:  
a) unknown  
b) 1 - 6  
c) 7 - 9  
d) 10 - 12  
e) over 12
25. Family social class:  
a) upper  
b) middle upper  
c) middle  
d) middle lower  
e) lower
26. Alcohol problems:  
a) mother  
b) father  
c) both  
d) neither e) other care givers
27. Physical abuse by:  
a) mother  
b) father  
c) both  
d) neither e) other care givers
- Who was abused:
28. Respondent:  
a) yes  
b) no
29. Siblings:  
a) yes  
b) no
30. Mother:  
a) yes  
b) no
31. Sexual abuse:  
a) mother  
b) father  
c) both  
d) neither  
Who was abused \_\_\_\_\_

32. Attitude toward mother:  
hostile      1    2    3    4    5      happy

---

---

---

---

---

33. Was mother absent from family?  
a) yes  
b) no

34. Was mother psychologically absent?  
a) yes  
b) no

35. Attitude toward father:  
hostile      1    2    3    4    5      happy

---

---

---

---

---

36. Was father absent from family?  
a) yes  
b) no

37. Was father psychologically absent?  
a) yes  
b) no

38. Attitude towards sister(s):  
hostile      1    2    3    4    5      happy

---

---

---

---

---

39. Attitude towards brother(s):  
hostile      1    2    3    4    5      happy

---

---

---

---

---

40. Closeness of family:  
not close 1 2 3 4 5 very close

NOTE:

Does the respondent know whereabouts/well being of family ?

Does he see/communicate with them? \_\_\_\_\_

Who visits him in jail?, How often? \_\_\_\_\_

As a family did they do thing together? \_\_\_\_\_

As a child was the respondent:

41. Pampered?

a) yes

b) no

42. Ignored?

a) yes

b) no

43. Treated Inconsistantly?

a) yes

b) no

44. As a child does the respondent feel he was:

a) treated fairly

b) treated unfairly

45. How would the respondent describe his childhood?

a) very happy

b) happy

c) neutral

d) difficult

e) unhappy

f) very unhappy

---

---

---

---

46. At what age did the respondent leave home?

a) 8 - 11

b) 12 - 15

c) 16 - 19

d) 20 - 23

e) over 23 Exact age \_\_\_\_\_

47. Why did the respondent leave home?

a) run away

b) escape abuse

c) work

d) move to a new location

e) contact with criminal justice system (boy home, jail)

f) other specify \_\_\_\_\_

48. As a child who was responsible for discipline and punishment?  
a) mother  
b) father  
c) both  
d) neither (no discipline)  
e) other \_\_\_\_\_

49. Was punishment administered:  
a) fair  
b) unfair c) N/A

50. Was punishment:  
a) not given  
b) not strict  
c) strict  
d) very strict

51. Was punishment inconsistent?  
a) yes  
b) no

As a child living at home how was the respondent and/or his siblings disciplined?

52. Lecture:  
a) yes  
b) no

53. Remove privileges:  
a) yes  
b) no

54. Grounding:  
a) yes  
b) no

55. Spanking:  
a) yes  
b) no

56. Did punishment include:  
a) physical abuse  
b) psychological abuse  
c) both  
d) neither
- 
- 

57. Did alcohol play a role in how the respondent or his siblings were punished?  
a) yes  
b) no

58. Did the respondent ever act in a verbal or physically aggressive manner towards his parents?
- a) verbal
  - b) physical
  - c) both
  - d) neither

Explain and specify \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

59. Marital status of the respondent prior to the offence:

- a) single
- b) common law
- c) married
- d) divorced/seperated
- e) divorced/reinvolved ie. married/clw

60. How many times has the respondent been married/cl?

- a) 0
- b) 1
- c) 2
- d) 3
- e) 4 or more

61. At what age was the respondent first married/involved?

- a) 16 - 19
- b) 18 - 21
- c) 22 - 26
- d) 27 - 35
- e) 36 - 45
- f) over 45

62. Duration of relationship: (if more than one, on average)

- a) N/A
- b) less than 1 year
- c) 1 - 2 years
- d) 2 - 5 years
- e) longer than 5 years

63. List history of relationships ie. number, age at which involved, duration, seriousness, reason for break up, length of time before the next relationship.

- a) no prior relationships
- b) incarcerated prior to start of dating
- c) few casual relationships/short duration
- d) few casual relationships/long duration
- e) many casual realtionships/short duration
- f) many casual relationships/long duration
- g) few serious relationships/short duration
- h) few serious relationships/long duration
- i) many serious relationships/short duration
- j) many serious relationships/long duration

specify

How has the respondent's offence effected his relationship?

---

---

64. In the respondent's last relationship, was he involved with someone who had previously been married?  
a) yes  
b) no  
specify \_\_\_\_\_
65. Number of children:  
a) 0  
b) 1  
c) 2  
d) 3  
e) 4 or more
66. Number of step-children:  
a) N/A  
b) 1  
c) 2  
d) 3  
e) 4 or more
67. Does the RESPONDENT have children from:  
a) 1 relationship  
b) 2 relationships  
c) 3 relationships  
d) more than 3  
e) N/A
68. Ages of children:  
a) N/A  
b) 1 - 4 years  
c) 5 - 9 years  
d) 10 - 14 years  
e) 15 years or over
69. Is the respondent close to his children?  
a) no contact  
b) limited contact/poor relationship  
c) limited contact/close relationship  
d) high contact/poor relationship  
e) high contact/good relationship  
f) N/A

Do any members of the respondents family have criminal records:

70. father/step-father a) yes b) no  
71. mother/step-mother a) yes b) no  
72. brother(s)/sister(s) a) yes b) no  
73. other ie. uncle, cousin, grandparents, etc. a) yes b) no

What type of crimes have these relatives committed?

74. violent offences (assault, weapon, murder)  
a) yes b) no
75. offences against property (theft, B&E, etc.)  
a) yes b) no
76. alcohol/drug related crimes  
a) yes b) no

#### EDUCATION

77. Highest grade completed:      Exact Grade \_\_\_\_\_  
a) 1 - 6                              On The Street  
b) 7 - 9  
c) 10 - 11  
d) Completed high school
78. Age at which highest grade completed:      Exact Age \_\_\_\_\_  
a) 1 - 5  
b) 6 - 9  
c) 10 - 15  
d) 16 - 20  
e) 21 - 25
79. Has the respondent received any extra schooling?  
(GED, apprenticeships, courses, community college,  
university)  
a) yes on street  
b) yes in institution  
c) no  
specify \_\_\_\_\_
80. Reason for leaving school:  
a) N/A  
b) quit      Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
c) work  
d) jail  
e) other
81. General opinion of school and education:  
a) dislike  
b) neutral  
c) like  
d) like very much
82. How did the respondent do in school:  
a) fail  
b) poor  
c) average  
d) above average

83. Does the respondent feel that he lived up to his potential in school?  
a) yes  
b) no
84. While the respondent was in school was he a verbally and/or physically aggressive child ie. in trouble, fighting, bully?  
a) verbal  
b) physical  
c) both  
d) neither

How was aggression expressed? (verbal/physical)

---

---

---

85. In school did the respondent have a lot of male friends?  
a) yes  
b) no  
expand (what type of friends, relationships, # and closeness)

---

---

---

86. Did the respondent have any close friends?  
a) none  
b) 1  
c) 2  
d) 3 - 5  
e) over 5

87. Did the respondent hang around with a "bad group"?  
a) yes  
b) no

88. In school how did the respondent get along with girls?  
a) no contact  
b) limited contact  
c) moderate contact  
d) high contact  
expand (how felt about girls, dating habits)

---

---

---

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

89. Number of part time jobs:

- a) 0
- b) 1 - 3
- c) 4 - 6
- d) 7 - 10
- e) Over 10

90. Average duration of part time employment:

- a) N/A
- b) 1 - 3 months
- c) 4 - 6 months
- d) 7 - 10 months
- e) over 10 months

91. Number of full time jobs:

- a) 0
- b) 1 - 3
- c) 4 - 6
- d) 7 - 10
- e) Over 10

92. Average duration of full time employment:

- a) N/A
- b) 1 - 3 months
- c) 4 - 6 months
- d) 7 - 10 months
- e) Over 10 months

93. Type(s) of employment:

- a) labour
  - b) semi-skilled
  - c) skilled
  - d) professional
  - e) student
- specify trade(s) & how learned \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 

94. Employed at time of offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

95. Duration of employment:

- a) N/A
- b) under 1 month
- c) 1 - 3 months
- d) 4 - 6 months
- e) over 7 months

96. Duration of unemployment:

- a) N/A
- b) under 1 month
- c) 1 - 3 months
- d) 4 - 6 months
- e) over 7 months

97. If unemployed, reason:

- a) fired \_\_\_\_\_
- b) laid off \_\_\_\_\_
- c) quit \_\_\_\_\_
- e) N/A

98. Is the respondent able to take orders?

- a) yes
- b) no
- c) depends \_\_\_\_\_

99. Does the respondent prefer to work on his own?

- a) yes
- b) no
- c) does not matter

100. When the respondent was employed, among his co-workers did he have:

- a) many friends
- b) some friends
- c) few friends
- d) no friends

101. When the respondent was employed did he ever socialize outside of work with his co-workers?

- a) often (at least once a week)
- b) occasionally (a few times a month)
- c) very rarely (once every few months)
- d) never

102. Does the respondent prefer working on simple tasks?

- a) yes
- b) no
- d) does not matter

103. Was the respondent:

- a) earning a living through criminal activity
- b) supplementing his income through criminal activity
- c) not involved in criminal activity for financial gain

104. Did the respondent ever serve in the military?

- a) yes
- b) no, but thought of it
- c) no

105. Did the respondent ever work in a security related field?

- a) yes
- b) no, but thought of it
- c) no

SUBSTANCE ABUSE

106. Drinking behaviour:

- a) does not drink
- b) drinks low
- c) drinks medium/weekend drinker
- d) drinks high
- e) binge drinker

107. Has the respondent ever had what he has believed, or what others have indentified as a drinking problem?

- a) yes
- b) no

108. If a drinking problem was existant at what age did it begin? Exact age \_\_\_\_\_

- a) 15 - 19
- b) 20 - 25
- c) 26 - 30
- d) 31 - 40
- e) 41 - 50
- f) over 50
- g) N/A

109. For how long did it continue?

- a) 1 - 6 months
- b) 7 - 12 months
- c) 1 - 2 years
- d) 3 - 4 years
- e) 5 - 10 years
- f) over 10 years
- g) N/A

110. How many times have you stopped drinking, or gotten your drinking problem undercontrol?

- a) 0
- b) 1
- c) 2
- d) 3
- e) 4
- f) more than 4 times
- g) N/A

111. After having your drinking under control how many times have you returned to drinking heavily?

- a) 0
- b) 1
- c) 2
- d) 3
- e) 4
- f) more than 4 times
- g) N/A

What does the respondent feel caused his initial drinking problems, and if applicable, his return to drinking after he had successfully controlled his behavior?

---

---

---

---

---

112. Was the respondent drinking prior to the offence?

- a) yes
- b) no

If yes, why? \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

113. At the time of the offence how intoxicated was the respondent? (ie. how many drinks till impaired, how many drinks at time of offence)

- a) not at all
- b) a little
- c) moderately
- d) highly
- e) severely (more than usual)

114. Did the respondent drink after the offence?

- a) yes
- b) no

If yes, why? \_\_\_\_\_

---

115. Does the respondent believe that alcohol was in some way responsible for his criminal behavior?

- a) yes
- b) no

116. Drug behavior:

- a) does not use drugs
- b) has tried (not currently a user)
- c) uses occasionally
- d) uses regularly/frequently

117. Has the respondent used:  
a) non chemical drugs \_\_\_\_\_  
b) chemical drugs \_\_\_\_\_  
c) both  
d) N/A

118. Does the respondent feel, or has he been identified as having a drug addiction problem?  
a) yes  
b) no

119. At what age did the respondent's addiction begin? Exact \_\_\_\_  
a) 15 - 19  
b) 20 - 25  
c) 26 - 30  
d) 26 - 30  
e) 31 - 40  
f) 41 - 50  
g) over 50  
h) N/A

120. How long has the respondent been addicted?  
a) under 1 year  
b) 1 year  
c) 2  
d) 3  
e) 4  
f) over 4 years  
g) N/A

121. How many times have you stopped, or gotten your habit under control?  
a) 0  
b) 1  
c) 2  
d) 3  
e) more than 3 times  
f) N/A

122. How many times have you returned to using drugs heavily after having reduced, or stopped your addiction?  
a) 0  
b) 1  
c) 2  
d) 3  
e) more than 3 times  
f) N/A

Why does the respondent feel he became addicted to drugs, and if applicable, why did he return to using drugs after he kicked, or controlled the habit?

---

---

---

123. Had drugs been used prior to the offence?

a) yes

b) no

If yes, why? \_\_\_\_\_

124. How impaired by drugs was the offender at the time of the offence?

a) not at all

b) slightly

c) moderately

d) highly

e) severely

125. Had drugs been used after the offence occurred?

a) yes

b) no

If yes, why? \_\_\_\_\_

126. Does the respondent believe that drugs were in some way responsible for his criminal behavior?

a) yes

b) no

Were drugs and alcohol used in combination:

127. at some time prior to the offence:

a) yes

b) no

128. immediately before the offence:

a) yes

b) no

129. immediately after the offence:

a) yes

b) no

130. at some later time after the offence:

a) yes

b) no

How does the respondent feel when he is abusing alcohol and/or drugs?

131. calm, less anxious:

- a) yes
- b) no

132. powerfull:

- a) yes
- b) no

133. confident:

- a) yes
- b) no

134. happy:

- a) yes
- b) no

135. aggressive:

- a) yes
- b) no

136. less inhibited:

- a) yes
- b) no

other & explain

---

---

#### CRIMINAL HISTORY

137. Current charge:

- a) first degree murder
- b) second degree murder
- c) manslaughter
- d) non violent offence

Juvenile history of offences: (list #, and specify)

- 138. assault a) yes b) no
  - 139. assault with weapon a) yes b) no
  - 140. murder/attempted murder a) yes b) no
  - 141. property offences a) yes b) no
  - 142. alcohol/drug related offences a) yes b) no
  - 143. respondent has no juvenile history a) true b) false
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
-

Past history of adult convictions (list #, & specify):

- 144. assault a) yes b) no
- 145. assault with weapon a) yes b) no
- 146. murder/attempted murder a) yes b) no
- 147. property offences a) yes b) no
- 148. drug/alcohol related offences a) yes b) no
- 149. respondent has no prior adult convictions a) true b) false

---

---

---

---

Past prison sentences:

- 150. provincial a) 1 b) 2 c) 3 d) 4 e) 5 f) over 5 g) 0
- 151. federal a) 1 b) 2 c) 3 d) 4 e) 5 f) over 5 g) 0

Date Time Served Offence Institution

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Previous offences without police intervention:

- 152. assault a) yes b) no
- 153. assault with weapon a) yes b) no
- 154. murder a) yes b) no
- 155. attempted murder a) yes b) no
- 156. offences against property a) yes b) no
- 157. drug/alcohol a) yes b) no
- 158. respondent has been caught for everything a) true b) false

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

- 159. Conduct in prison (fighting, break rules, escape, etc.)
  - a) good
  - b) bad

---

---

---

---

160. Does the respondents conduct in prison (good/bad) reflect:  
a) feelings of helplessness  
b) attempts to gain control

---

---

161. Attitude toward fellow inmates:  
negative    1    2    3    4    5    positive

162. Attitude toward custody staff:  
negative    1    2    3    4    5    positive

163. Does the respondent feel that jail was appropriate for his offence?  
a) yes  
b) no  
If NO, how does the respondent feel he should have been handled within the criminal justice system?

---

---

164. Does the respondent feel he has learned to cope with his problems while institutionalized?  
a) yes, through programs in the institution  
b) yes, through own personal reflection  
c) both  
d) no  
e) no problems \_\_\_\_\_

---

165. Before committing the offence, did the threat of incarceration ever act as a deterrent from committing the offence?  
a) yes  
b) no

166. Would the threat of capital punishment/death penalty have acted as a deterrent?  
a) yes  
b) no

---

---

167. Does the respondent feel he might ever commit another violent offence?  
a) yes  
b) no  
c) possibly \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B

VICTIM QUESTIONNAIRE

VICTIM DEMOGRAPHICS

168. Number of victims: (If more than 1, answer each question for each victim)
- a) 1
  - b) 2
  - c) 3
  - d) more than 3 \_\_\_\_\_
169. Sex of offended person:
- a) male
  - b) female
170. Age of offended person at time of offence: Exact age \_\_\_\_\_
- a) 1 - 12
  - b) 13 - 18
  - c) 19 - 25
  - d) 26 - 45
  - e) 46 and over
171. Ethnic origin of person offended:
- a) White
  - b) Black
  - c) Native
  - d) Oriental
  - e) other
172. Relationship to offended person:
- a) none (stranger)
  - b) acquaintance
  - c) friend
  - d) intimate ( boyfriend/girlfriend)
  - e) rival (ie. the other man, enemy)
  - f) N/A
173. If victim was a relative, specify:
- a) wife
  - b) child (daughter, son)
  - c) step-child (female, male)
  - d) mother
  - e) father
  - f) brother/sister
  - g) other \_\_\_\_\_
  - h) N/A
174. How long had the offender known the victim?
- a) did not know the victim
  - b) under 1 year
  - c) 1 year
  - d) 2 - 5 years
  - e) 6 - 10 years
  - f) 16 - 20 years
  - g) 21 - 30 years
  - h) entire life

Victim's age when association began \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's age when association began \_\_\_\_\_

Short history of relationship with victim (ie. how did they meet, how did they get along generally, how close was the relationship)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

175. What was the interval between the start of the relationship and the homicide? Exact \_\_\_\_\_
- a) less than 1 year
  - b) 2 - 3
  - c) 4 - 5
  - d) 6 - 7
  - e) 8 - 9
  - f) 10 - 15
  - g) over 15
  - h) N/A

176. What was the interval between the start of the relationship and the onset of feelings of hostility/aggression? \_\_\_\_\_

177. What was the interval between the onset of hostile feelings and the homicide? \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the situation that led up to hostility, or friction in the relationship. (ie. specific difficulties)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Was there a reality base to the believed stressors between the respondent and the offended person?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

178. Prior to the offence was there any VERBAL threat of aggression/violence directed at the offended person?
- a) yes
  - b) no
- If YES, how many times, when, and what threats were made?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

179. Prior to the offence was a weapon ever used in a threatening manner against the offended person?  
a) yes  
b) no  
If YES, how many times, when, in what manner, type of weapon

---

---

---

180. Prior to the offence were there any aggressive ACTS directed towards the offended person? (ie. hitting etc.)  
a) yes  
b) no  
If YES, specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

181. If the victim was an intimate (CLW, spouse, lover) how many times were they seperated, for what length of time, and for what reasons?

- a) never
- b) rarely/short duration (a few days)
- c) " /moderate duration (3 - 5 days)
- d) " /long duration (over 5 days)
- e) a few times (3 - 5)/short duration
- f) " " " /moderate duration
- g) " " " /long duration
- h) a number of times/short duration
- i) " " " " /moderate duration
- j) " " " " /long duration
- k) N/A

---

---

---

---

---

182. If the offended person was a stranger how and why were they selected?  
a) random/chance  
b) at place of ongoing crime  
c) unknown  
d) other

---

---

---

183. Financial status of offended person:  
a) upper class  
b) middle upper  
c) middle  
d) middle lower  
e) lower

184. Did the offended person have a criminal record?

- a) yes
- b) no
- c) unknown

185. Did the offended person encourage the assault?

- a) yes
- b) no

How so \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

186. Did the offended person deserve it?

- a) yes
- b) no

Why \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

187. Rate victim blame:

No Blame      1    2    3    4    5    6    7      Total Blame

188. Does the respondent regret the offence for reasons other than being incarcerated?

- a) yes
- b) no

Why \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

189. At the time of the offence was the offended person under the influence of:

- a) alcohol
- b) drugs
- c) both
- d) neither
- e) unknown

190. Did the respondent find the offended person physically attractive?

- a) very attractive
- b) attractive
- c) neutral
- d) not attractive
- e) unattractive
- f) attractiveness not considered

unattractive    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    attractive

191. Did the respondent feel any type of emotion towards the offended person?

love            1    2    3    4    5            hate

APPENDIX C

CRIME QUESTIONNAIRE

MECHANICS OF OFFENCE

192. At what time of the day did the offence take place?  
a) 7:00 A.M. - 12:00 noon  
b) 12:00 noon - 6:00 P.M.  
c) 6:00 P.M. - 12:00 midnight  
d) 12:00 midnight - 7:00 A.M.
193. What day of the week did the offence occur on?  
a) Friday  
b) Saturday  
c) Sunday  
d) Monday  
e) Tuesday  
f) Wednesday  
g) Thursday
194. Did the homicide occur in conjunction with any other crime?  
a) yes  
b) no  
specify \_\_\_\_\_
195. Was the respondent familiar with the location where the offence took place?  
a) yes  
b) no  
If yes, how so?  
\_\_\_\_\_
196. Did the offence occur in area out of public view?  
a) yes  
b) no
197. Did the offender feel comfortable in the area where the offence took place?  
a) yes  
b) no
198. Did the offence occur:  
a) near the respondent's residence  
b) at the respondent's residence  
c) near the victim's residence  
d) at the victim's residence  
e) at a residence jointly resided in by the offender and the victim  
f) none of the above

199. What was the exact location where the offence occurred?  
(If in the home, what room? If outside of the home,  
where? ie. street, car, commercial place etc.)  
a) street  
b) car  
commercial place c) inside d) outside  
e) bedroom  
f) kitchen  
g) entrance  
h) hall i) living room
- 
200. Did the respondent CARRY a weapon on his person at the  
time of the offence?  
a) yes  
b) no
201. Did the respondent obtain any type of instrument, object,  
or weapon AT the crime scene?  
a) yes  
b) no
202. Did the respondent VERBALLY THREATEN to use any type of  
instrument, object, or weapon at any time immediately prior  
to the commission of the offence?  
a) yes  
b) no
203. Did the respondent VISIBLY DISPLAY, or PHYSICALLY  
THREATEN THE USE OF any type of weapon at any time  
immediately prior to the commission of the offence?  
a) yes  
b) no  
specify \_\_\_\_\_
204. Did the respondent USE any type of instrument, object  
or weapon in the commission of the offence?  
a) yes  
b) no
205. If a weapon was involved, what type of object was  
used?  
a) N/A  
b) gun specify (rifle, shotgun, handgun) \_\_\_\_\_  
c) knife  
d) house-hold object/hardware specify \_\_\_\_\_  
e) other specify \_\_\_\_\_
206. Where was the weapon obtained from?  
a) the respondents home  
b) the scene of the crime  
c) from the "street"  
d) other
-

207. What did the respondent do with the weapon after the commission of the offence?

- a) left at the scene of the crime
  - b) thrown away
  - c) hidden
  - d) taken home
  - e) destroyed
  - f) N/A
- 

208. Did the respondent verbally threaten (not including weapons threats), or order the offended person immediately prior to the commission of the offence?

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

209. Did the respondent ever use obscene names, racial slurs, or sexual putdowns in his conversation with the offended person?

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

210. Did the respondent ever refer to the offended person as if they were a "possession", or "property"?

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

211. Did the respondent ever make any personal inquiries regarding the offended persons thoughts, feelings, or behavior?

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

212. Did the respondent ever self disclose (real, or made up) facts about himself, or his feelings?

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

213. Did the respondent ever compliment, apologize, or express concern to the offended person prior to the commission of the offence?  
a) yes  
b) no  
specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

214. Was the respondents manner of speech:  
a) calm  
b) erratic  
c) frenzied/upset/angry

215. Was the respondents tone of voice:  
a) soft  
b) normal  
c) agitated  
d) loud

216. Did the respondent at any time during the assault demand that the offended person talk to him or say certain things to him?  
a) yes  
b) no

217. If response to the above question is YES, what did the offender ask the victim to say?

---

---

a) compliment the offender  
b) plead for mercy  
c) speak in a self-demeaning/derogatory manner  
d) admit to real/imagined infidelities to the respondent  
e) other  
f) N/A

218. How did the respondent approach offended person?

a) slow/gradual approach  
b) blitz/fast pace approach  
c) con/used some form of inticement or ploy to approach victim. specify \_\_\_\_\_  
d) suprise (ie. waits for victim in back of car, behind object, while sleeping)

219. Was there any form of physical struggle or fighting leading up to the homicide?

a) yes  
b) no

Was the victim the first person to:

220. use verbal force      a) yes    b) no  
221. use physical force    a) yes    b) no  
222. threaten with weapon a) yes    b) no  
223. use weapon            a) yes    b) no  
specify \_\_\_\_\_
- 

224. If a physical struggle occurred prior to the homicide, what amount of force was used by the respondent PRIOR to the commission of the offence?

- a) minimal force - little or no physical force is used (mild slapping, intimidation)  
b) moderate force - repeated slapping, or hitting of the victim in a painful manner, use of profanity  
c) excessive force - beatings to all parts of the body the presence of bruises and lacerations  
d) brutal force - sadistic torture, intentional infliction of physical and emotional pain is the primary aim of the offender  
e) N/A

225. Approximately how long did the physical struggle PRIOR to the offence last?

- a) 1 - 5 minutes  
b) 5 - 15 minutes  
c) 15 - 30 minutes  
d) 30 - 1 hour  
e) over 1 hour  
f) N/A

226. What was the motive for evoking force, prior to committing the offence?

- a) to gain control/subdue victim  
b) to intimidate  
c) anger  
d) revenge  
e) to hurt victim  
f) caught up in the situation

227. What type of resistance was demonstrated by the offended person?

- a) no resistance  
b) passive resistance  
c) verbal resistance  
d) physical resistance  
specify \_\_\_\_\_
-

228. How did the respondent react to resistance?

- a) N/A
- b) ceasing the demand/compromising
- c) use of threats
- d) increase use of force
- e) use of deadly force

At what area of the offended persons body was force directed at PRIOR to the commission of the offence?

229. facial/neck area a) yes b) no

230. arms/legs a) yes b) no

231. body area a) yes b) no

232. breasts/genitals a) yes b) no  
specify \_\_\_\_\_

233. Did the respondent at any time during the commission of the offence, restrict the movement of the offended person by binding, or locking them up?

- a) yes
- b) no

234. Method of homicide:

- a) shooting
- b) stabbing
- c) bludgeoning
- d) strangulation
- e) poison
- f) thrown from a height
- g) drowning
- h) physical beating
- i) suffocation
- j) multiple methods specify \_\_\_\_\_

At what area of the offended person's body was force directed at DURING the commission of the offence?

235. facial/neck area a) yes b) no

236. arms/legs a) yes b) no

237. body area a) yes b) no

238. breasts/genitals a) yes b) no  
specify \_\_\_\_\_

239. Was the force used to commit the murder "overkill" or extreme (ie. multiple gunshot wounds, multiple knife wounds, multiple methods etc.)

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

240. After the homicide was completed was there any type of postmortem activity carried out by the respondent?

a) yes

b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

241. After the homicide was completed did the respondent alter the body in any way? (ie. re-arrange clothing, clean up, re-position)

a) yes

b) no

242. After the homicide was completed did the respondent do anything to alter the crime scene? (any type of re-arrangement, removal, cleaning etc. of the surrounding area and its contents)

a) yes

b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

If anything was REMOVED from the crime scene was it:

243. evidence a) yes b) no

244. valuables a) yes b) no

245. personal possessions of victim a) yes b) no

246. nothing was removed a) true b) false

247. How long did the respondent remain at the crime scene following the homicide?

a) left prior to death of victim

b) left immediately after death of victim

c) left within 1 hour

d) between 1 - 2 hours

e) 3 - 4 hours

f) 5 - 10 hours

g) over 10 hours specify \_\_\_\_\_

h) until police arrived

248. What was the instigating factor in committing the offence?

a) domestic argument

b) infidelity

c) argument with friends

d) child abuse

e) alleged accident

f) alleged self defence

g) transfer of intent (homicide occurring as a result of another criminal offence ie. rape, armed robbery, drugs, arson)

h) money

i) suicide related

j) alcohol

249. What was the motive for the offence?

- a) revenge
  - b) uncontrollable impulse
  - c) show of power
  - d) feelings of inadequacy
  - e) frustration
  - f) jealousy
  - g) other \_\_\_\_\_
- specify \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

What emotions were associated with the offence?

250. fear:

- a) yes
- b) no

251. hatred:

- a) yes
- b) no

252. anxiety:

- a) yes
- b) no

253. anger:

- a) yes
- b) no

254. frustration:

- a) yes
- b) no

255. desperation:

- a) yes
- b) no

256. humiliation:

- a) yes
- b) no

257. spite:

- a) yes
- b) no

258. resentment:

- a) yes
- b) no

259. Was the assault:
- a) not planned "heat of the moment"
  - b) spur of the moment (may have been thought of previously but never actually planned out)
  - c) some planning
  - d) planned

260. Has the respondent ever had any uncontrollable recurrent ideas, thoughts, images, or impulses regarding killing anyone, or wondered what it would be like to kill someone before the occurrence of this offence?

a) yes

b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

261. How often did you have these thoughts?

a) never

b) rarely

c) sometimes

d) frequently

e) constantly

262. Has the respondent ever had any uncontrollable recurrent ideas, thoughts, images or impulses of killing the person that was the victim of this offence?

a) yes

b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

263. How often did you think of killing this person?

a) never

b) rarely

c) sometimes

d) frequently

e) constantly

If the respondent had thought about murder before how did the actual act compare to fantasy?

---

---

---

---

Did the respondent feel as if he were under an unusually high amount of stress before committing the offence?

264. work related stress:

- a) yes
- b) no

265. money related stress:

- a) yes
- b) no

266. relationship related stress:

- a) yes
- b) no

267. personal related stress:

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

268. Did the respondent experience any guilt feelings:

- a) prior to the commission of the offence
- b) during the commission of the offence
- c) both
- d) no guilt

Did the respondent feel nervous:

269. prior to the commission of the offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

270. during the commission of the offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

271. after the commission of the offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

272. while incarcerated:

- a) yes
- b) no

273. AFTER the commission of the offence did the respondent feel in control of himself: ie.

- a relief of tension
- strong/powerful/masculine
- confident

other \_\_\_\_\_

- a) yes
- b) no

274. AFTER the commission of the offence did the respondent feel a lack of control: ie

- guilty
- ashamed
- depressed

other \_\_\_\_\_

- a) yes
- b) no

Did the respondent feel depressed:

275. before offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

276. immediately before offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

277. during offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

278. immediately after offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

279. sometime after offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

280. while incarcerated:

- a) yes
- b) no

Has the respondent ever attempted suicide?

281. prior to the offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

282. immediately after the offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

283. sometime after the offence:

- a) yes
- b) no

284. while institutionalized:

- a) yes
- b) no

(how many times) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

285. Was anyone other than the respondent involved in the commission of the offence:

- a) N/A
- b) 1
- c) 2
- d) 3
- e) 4 or more

specify information about cohort & their involvement:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

286. Did the respondent inform anyone about the offence prior to its commission?

- a) yes
- b) no

(who, how many times/people, when in relationship to offence)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

287. Did the respondent take any precautions to protect his identity from the victim?

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

288. Did the respondent give any thought to his method of escape before the occurrence of the offence?

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

289. Does the respondent think what he did was wrong?  
a) yes  
b) no
290. Does the respondent feel he would repeat his actions  
if he were given a chance to go back and change things?  
a) yes  
b) no
291. Does the respondent take responsibility for the offence?  
a) yes  
b) no  
c) partially
292. Did the respondent confess to the crime?  
a) yes  
b) no  
(when, under what circumstances)
- 
- 
- 

What type of evidence was used against the respondent in his conviction?

293. confession:  
a) yes  
b) no
294. witness:  
a) yes  
b) no
295. fingerprints:  
a) yes  
b) no
296. weapon:  
a) yes  
b) no
297. physiological evidence (blood, skin, hair etc.):  
a) yes  
b) no
298. fiber:  
a) yes  
b) no
299. offender's property (clothing, gum, cigarette, etc.):  
a) yes  
b) no

300. statement made by accomplice:

- a) yes
- b) no

301. statement made by individual known to the offender with knowledge of the offence

- a) yes
- b) no

specify \_\_\_\_\_

other \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D

JACKSON PERSONALITY RESEARCH FORM

# PERSONALITY RESEARCH FORM

FORM A



DOUGLAS N. JACKSON, Ph.D.

## DIRECTIONS

On the following pages you will find a series of statements which a person might use to describe himself. Read each statement and decide whether or not it describes you. Then indicate your answer on the separate answer sheet.

If you agree with a statement or decide that it does describe you, answer TRUE. If you disagree with a statement or feel that it is not descriptive of you, answer FALSE.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement you have just read is the same as the number on the answer sheet.

Answer every statement either true or false, even if you are not completely sure of your answer.

Published by

RESEARCH PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS, INC.



Copyright © 1965; © 1968 by Douglas N. Jackson. All rights reserved. This test or any part of it may not be reproduced by any process without the written consent of the publisher. Printed in U.S.A. Published simultaneously in Canada.

1. I enjoy doing things which challenge me.
2. I pay little attention to the interests of people I know.
3. I get a kick out of seeing someone I dislike appear foolish in front of others.
4. If public opinion is against me, I usually decide that I am wrong.
5. I would enjoy being a club officer.
6. If I can't finish a task within a certain amount of time, I usually decide not to waste any more time on it.
7. Others think I am lively and witty.
8. I almost always accept a dare.
9. I admire free, spontaneous people.
10. I think a man is smart to avoid being talked into helping his acquaintances.
11. I often decide ahead of time exactly what I will do on a certain day.
12. I feel that adults who still like to play have never really grown up.
13. I consider it important to be held in high esteem by those I know.
14. Philosophical discussions are a waste of time.
15. I was born over 90 years ago.
16. Self-improvement means nothing to me unless it leads to immediate success.
17. I believe that a person who is incapable of enjoying the people around him misses much in life.
18. It doesn't bother me much to have someone get the best of me in a discussion.
19. I would like to wander freely from country to country.
20. I am not very insistent in an argument.
21. I don't mind doing all the work myself if it is necessary to complete what I have begun.
22. I am too shy to tell jokes.
23. I am careful about the things I do because I want to have a long and healthy life.
24. I have a reserved and cautious attitude toward life.
25. When I see someone who looks confused, I usually ask if I can be of any assistance.
26. I don't especially care how I look when I go out.
27. I love to tell, and listen to, jokes and funny stories.
28. I give little thought to the impression I make on others.
29. I often try to grasp the relationships between different things that happen.
30. I try to get at least some sleep every night.
31. I get disgusted with myself when I have not learned something properly.
32. Trying to please people is a waste of time.
33. I swear a lot.
34. Adventures where I am on my own are a little frightening to me.
35. I try to control others rather than permit them to control me.
36. If I find it hard to get something I want, I usually change my mind and try for something else.
37. I like to have people talk about things I have done.
38. I would enjoy learning to walk on a tightrope.
39. I find that I sometimes forget to "look before I leap."
40. All babies look very much like little monkeys to me.
41. When I am going somewhere I usually find my exact route by using a map.
42. I consider most entertainment to be a waste of time.
43. I very much enjoy being complimented.
44. I can't see how intellectuals get personal satisfaction from their impractical lives.
45. I have a number of outfits of clothing, each of which costs several thousand dollars.
46. I work because I have to, and for that reason only.
47. Loyalty to my friends is quite important to me.
48. If someone does something I don't like, I seldom say anything.
49. When I was a child, I wanted to be independent.
50. I have little interest in leading others.
51. If people want a job done which requires patience, they ask me.
52. I would not like the fame that goes with being a great athlete.
53. I would never want to be a forest-fire fighter.
54. Rarely, if ever, do I do anything reckless.
55. I feel very sorry for lonely people.
56. My personal papers are usually in a state of confusion.
57. I enjoy parties, shows, games — anything for fun.
58. Social approval is unimportant to me.
59. I do almost as much reading on my own as I did for classes when I was in school.
60. I make all my own clothes and shoes.
61. I will keep working on a problem after others have given up.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

62. Most of my relationships with people are business-like rather than friendly.
63. If someone has a better job than I, I like to try to show him up.
64. I don't want to be away from my family too much.
65. I feel confident when directing the activities of others.
66. The mere prospect of having to put in long hours working makes me tired.
67. I don't mind being conspicuous.
68. I would never pass up something that sounded like fun just because it was a little bit hazardous.
69. The people I know who say the first thing they think of are some of my most interesting acquaintances.
70. I dislike people who are always asking me for advice.
71. I keep all my important documents in one safe place.
72. When I have a choice between work and enjoying myself, I usually work.
73. The good opinion of one's friends is one of the chief rewards for living a good life.
74. If the relationships between theories and facts are not immediately evident, I see no point in trying to find them.
75. I have attended school at some time during my life.
76. I try to work just hard enough to get by.
77. I am considered friendly.
78. I am quite soft-spoken.
79. My greatest desire is to be independent and free.
80. I would make a poor judge because I dislike telling others what to do.
81. If I want to know the answer to a certain question, I sometimes look for it for days.
82. I feel uncomfortable when people are paying attention to me.
83. I can't imagine myself jumping out of an airplane as skydivers do.
84. I am not an "impulse-buyer."
85. People like to tell me their troubles because they know that I will do everything I can to help them.
86. Most of the things I do have no system to them.
87. Once in a while I enjoy acting as if I were tipsy.
88. The opinions that important people have of me cause me little concern.
89. I have unlimited curiosity about many things.
90. I rarely use food or drink of any kind.
91. I often set goals that are very difficult to reach.
92. After I get to know most people, I decide that they would make poor friends.
93. Stupidity makes me angry.
94. I usually try to share my problems with someone who can help me.
95. I am quite good at keeping others in line.
96. When someone thinks I should not finish a project, I am usually willing to follow his advice.
97. I like to be in the spotlight.
98. I think it would be enjoyable and rather exciting to feel an earthquake.
99. I have often broken things because of carelessness.
100. I get little satisfaction from serving others.
101. Before I start to work, I plan what I will need and get all the necessary materials.
102. I only celebrate very special events.
103. I constantly try to make people think highly of me.
104. When I was a child, I showed no interest in books.
105. I have never ridden in an automobile.
106. I would rather do an easy job than one involving obstacles which must be overcome.
107. I enjoy being neighborly.
108. I seldom feel like hitting anyone.
109. I would like to have a job in which I didn't have to answer to anyone.
110. Most community leaders do a better job than I could possibly do.
111. I don't like to leave anything unfinished.
112. I was one of the quietest children in my group.
113. I avoid some hobbies and sports because of their dangerous nature.
114. I make certain that I speak softly when I am in a public place.
115. I believe in giving friends lots of help and advice.
116. I can work better when conditions are somewhat chaotic.
117. Most of my spare moments are spent relaxing and amusing myself.
118. It seems foolish to me to worry about my public image.
119. I would very much like to know how and why natural events occur in the way they do.
120. I could easily count from one to twenty-five.
121. My goal is to do at least a little bit more than anyone else has done before.
122. Usually I would rather go somewhere alone than go to a party.
123. Life is a matter of "push or be shoved."

124. I often do things just because social custom dictates.
125. I seek out positions of authority.
126. When other people give up working on a problem, I usually quit too.
127. I would enjoy being a popular singer with a large fan club.
128. I would enjoy the feeling of riding to the top of an unfinished skyscraper in an open elevator.
129. I enjoy arguments that require good quick thinking more than knowledge.
130. I really do not pay much attention to people when they talk about their problems.
131. I dislike to be in a room that is cluttered.
132. Practical jokes aren't at all funny to me.
133. Nothing would hurt me more than to have a bad reputation.
134. Abstract ideas are of little use to me.
135. Sometimes I feel thirsty or hungry.
136. I really don't enjoy hard work.
137. I try to be in the company of friends as much as possible.
138. If someone hurts me, I just try to forget about it.
139. If I have a problem, I like to work it out alone.
140. I think it is better to be quiet than assertive.
141. When I hit a snag in what I am doing, I don't stop until I have found a way to get around it.
142. At a party, I usually sit back and watch the others.
143. I try to get out of jobs that would require using dangerous tools or machinery.
144. I am not one of those people who blurt out things without thinking.
145. I am usually the first to offer a helping hand when it is needed.
146. I seldom take time to hang up my clothes neatly.
147. I like to go "out on the town" as often as I can.
148. I will not go out of my way to behave in an approved way.
149. When I see a new invention, I attempt to find out how it works.
150. I have never seen an apple.
151. I prefer to be paid on the basis of how much work I have done rather than on how many hours I have worked.
152. I have relatively few friends.
153. I often find it necessary to criticize a person sharply if he annoys me.
154. Family obligations make me feel important.
155. When I am with someone else I do most of the decision-making.
156. I don't believe in sticking to something when there is little chance of success.
157. If I were to be in a play, I would want to play the leading role.
158. Swimming alone in strange waters would not bother me.
159. I often get bored at having to concentrate on one thing at a time.
160. If someone is in trouble, I try not to become involved.
161. A messy desk is inexcusable.
162. I prefer to read worthwhile books rather than spend my spare time playing.
163. When I am doing something, I often worry about what other people will think.
164. It is more important to me to be good at a sport than to know about literature or science.
165. I usually wear something warm when I go outside on a cold day.
166. I have rarely done extra studying in connection with my work.
167. To love and be loved is of greatest importance to me.
168. If I have to stand in line, I seldom try to cut ahead of the other people.
169. I delight in feeling unattached.
170. I would make a poor military leader.
171. I am willing to work longer at a project than are most people.
172. When I was young I seldom competed with the other children for attention.
173. I prefer a quiet, secure life to an adventurous one.
174. I always try to be fully prepared before I begin working on anything.
175. I would prefer to care for a sick child myself rather than hire a nurse.
176. I could never find out with accuracy just how I have spent my money in the past several months.
177. I spend a good deal of my time just having fun.
178. I don't care if my clothes are unstylish, as long as I like them.
179. I am more at home in an intellectual discussion than in a discussion of sports.
180. I think the world would be a much better place if no one ever went to school.
181. People have always said that I am a hard worker.
182. I seldom go out of my way to do something just to make others happy.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

183. I often make people angry by teasing them.
184. I respect rules because they guide me.
185. When two persons are arguing, I often settle the argument for them.
186. If I had to do something I didn't like, I would put it off and hope that someone else might do it.
187. I often monopolize a conversation.
188. To me, crossing the ocean in a sailboat would be a wonderful adventure.
189. It seems that emotion has more influence over me than does calm meditation.
190. I avoid doing too many favors for people because it would seem as if I were trying to buy friendship.
191. My work is always well organized.
192. Most of my friends are serious-minded people.
193. One of the things which spurs me on to do my best is the realization that I will be praised for my work.
194. I really don't know what is involved in any of the latest cultural developments.
195. I have no sense of touch in my fingers.
196. When people are not going to see what I do, I often do less than my very best.
197. Most people think I am warm-hearted and sociable.
198. I show leniency to those who have offended me.
199. I find that I can think better without having to bother with advice from others.
200. I would not do well as a salesman because I am not very persuasive.
201. When I am working outdoors I finish what I have to do even if it is growing dark.
202. I think that trying to be the center of attention is a sign of bad taste.
203. I never go into sections of a city that are considered dangerous.
204. I generally rely on careful reasoning in making up my mind.
205. When I see a baby, I often ask to hold him.
206. I often forget to put things back in their places.
207. I like to watch television comedies.
208. If I have done something well, I don't bother to call it to other people's attention.
209. If I believe something is true, I try to prove that my theory will hold up in actual practice.
210. If someone pricked me with a pin, it would hurt.
211. I don't mind working while other people are having fun.
212. When I see someone I know from a distance, I don't go out of my way to say "Hello."
213. I become angry more easily than most people.
214. I find that for most jobs the combined effort of several people will accomplish more than one person working alone.
215. If I were in politics, I would probably be seen as one of the forceful leaders of my party.
216. If I get tired while playing a game, I generally stop playing.
217. I try to get others to notice the way I dress.
218. I would enjoy exploring an old deserted house at night.
219. Often I stop in the middle of one activity in order to start something else.
220. People's tears tend to irritate me more than to arouse my sympathy.
221. I spend much of my time arranging my belongings neatly.
222. People consider me a serious, reserved person.
223. I feel that my life would not be complete if I failed to gain distinction and social prestige.
224. I would rather be an accountant than a theoretical mathematician.
225. If I were exploring a strange place at night, I would want to carry a light.
226. It doesn't really matter to me whether I become one of the best in my field.
227. I truly enjoy myself at social functions.
228. I do not like to see anyone receive bad news.
229. I would not mind living in a very lonely place.
230. I feel incapable of handling many situations.
231. I will continue working on a problem even with a severe headache.
232. I never attempt to be the life of the party.
233. Surf-board riding would be too dangerous for me.
234. If I am playing a game of skill, I attempt to plan each move thoroughly before acting.
235. I feel most worthwhile when I am helping someone who is disabled.
236. I rarely clean out my bureau drawers.
237. If I didn't have to earn a living, I would spend most of my time just having fun.
238. I don't try to "keep up with the Joneses."
239. I like to read several books on one topic at the same time.
240. I wear clothes when I am around other people.
241. Sometimes people say I neglect other important aspects of my life because I work so hard.
242. I want to remain unhampered by obligations to friends.

243. I have a violent temper.
244. To have a sense of belonging is very important to me.
245. I try to convince others to accept my political principles.
246. I am easily distracted when I am tired.
247. When I was in school, I often talked back to the teacher to make the other children laugh.
248. I would like to drive a motorcycle.
249. Most people feel that I act spontaneously.
250. I become irritated when I must interrupt my activities to do a favor for someone.
251. I keep my possessions in such good order that I have no trouble finding anything.
252. I usually have some reason for the things I do rather than just doing them for my own amusement.
253. I would not consider myself a success unless other people viewed me as such.
254. I would rather build something with my hands than try to develop scientific theories.
255. I can't believe that wood really burns.
256. I am sure people think that I don't have a great deal of drive.
257. I spend a lot of time visiting friends.
258. I do not think it is necessary to step on others in order to get ahead in the world.
259. Having a home has a tendency to tie a person down more than I would like.
260. I would not want to have a job enforcing the law.
261. I won't leave a project unfinished even if I am very tired.
262. I don't like to do anything unusual that will call attention to myself.
263. I will not climb a ladder unless someone is there to steady it for me.
264. I think that people who fall in love impulsively are quite immature.
265. Seeing an old or helpless person makes me feel that I would like to take care of him.
266. I feel comfortable in a somewhat disorganized room.
267. I delight in playing silly little tricks on people.
268. When I am being introduced, I don't like the person to make lengthy comments about what I have done.
269. I am unable to think of anything that I wouldn't enjoy learning about.
270. I can run a mile in less than four minutes.
271. I enjoy work more than play.
272. I am quite independent of the people I know.
273. I often quarrel with others.
274. I can do my best work when I have the encouragement of others.
275. With a little effort, I can "wrap most people around my little finger."
276. When I feel ill, I stop working and try to get some rest.
277. I perform in public whenever I have the opportunity.
278. I like the feeling of speed.
279. Life is no fun unless it is lived in a carefree way.
280. It doesn't affect me one way or another to see a child being spanked.
281. I can't stand reading a newspaper that has been messed up.
282. I would prefer a quiet evening with friends to a loud party.
283. I do a good job more to gain approval than because I like my work.
284. There are many activities that I prefer to reading.
285. I would have a hard time keeping my mind a complete blank.
286. It is unrealistic for me to insist on becoming the best in my field of work all of the time.
287. I go out of my way to meet people.
288. I try to show self-restraint to avoid hurting other people.
289. My idea of an ideal marriage is one where the two people remain as independent as if they were single.
290. I don't have a forceful or dominating personality.
291. I am very persistent and efficient even when I have been working for many hours without rest.
292. The idea of acting in front of a large group doesn't appeal to me.
293. To me, it seems foolish to ski when so many people get hurt that way.
294. I like to take care of things one at a time.
295. I can remember that as a child I tried to take care of anyone who was sick.
296. If I have brought something home, I often drop it on a chair or table as I enter.
297. Things that would annoy most people seem humorous to me.
298. Inner satisfaction rather than fame is my goal in life.
299. If I were going to an art exhibit, I would first try to learn about the artist, his style and technique, his philosophy of art, and the story behind each piece of work.
300. I am able to breathe.

APPENDIX E

PERSONAL BELIEF SCALE

CHOOSE THE STATEMENT THAT YOU BELIEVE IS CLOSER TO THE TRUTH  
THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS, JUST YOUR OPINION

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.  
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.  
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.  
b. There will always be wars no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.  
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.  
b. Most student's don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.  
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.  
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.  
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.  
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.  
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

- 11.a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.  
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
- 12.a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.  
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
- 13.a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.  
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
- 14.a. There are certain people who are just no good.  
b. There is some good in everybody.
- 15.a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.  
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
- 16.a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.  
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
- 17.a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.  
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
- 18.a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.  
b. There really is no such thing as "luck".
- 19.a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.  
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
- 20.a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.  
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
- 21.a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.  
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

- 22.a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.  
b. It is difficult for people to have control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23.a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.  
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
- 24.a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.  
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
- 25.a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over over the things that happen to me.  
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important part in my life.
- 26.a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.  
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
- 27.a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.  
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 28.a. What happens to me is my own doing.  
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29.a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.  
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

APPENDIX F

THE PSYCHOPATHY CHECKLIST

CHECKLIST FOR APD

Check off the statements that describe the respondent during interview. Check 2 if statement describes respondent, 1 if statements partially describe respondent, or 0 if the interviewer can not tell.

ITEM 1

entertaining conversationalist \_\_\_\_\_  
presents himself well, appears likable \_\_\_\_\_  
seems too slick/smooth \_\_\_\_\_  
appears to have knowledge (pseudo) in many areas \_\_\_\_\_  
appears cooperative, straightforward but gives little  
information directly \_\_\_\_\_  
comfortable during interview \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 2

inflated view of abilities and self worth \_\_\_\_\_  
self assured, opinionated, cocky \_\_\_\_\_  
does not feel he is a failure or social outcast \_\_\_\_\_  
not embarrassed about, or sensitive to his current  
situation \_\_\_\_\_  
feels he is the victim of bad luck, bad friends, bad system \_\_\_\_\_  
has not pursued any career goals successfully \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 3 \*\*

need for excessive & novel stimulation \_\_\_\_\_  
unusual proneness to boredom \_\_\_\_\_  
likes to take chances, live on edge/fast lane \_\_\_\_\_  
sees school and work as boring \_\_\_\_\_  
early drop out \_\_\_\_\_  
sporadic work history \_\_\_\_\_  
likes to be on the go \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 4 \*\*

able to lie & carry it off well \_\_\_\_\_  
can lie elaborately \_\_\_\_\_  
frequently lies \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 5 \*\*

able to manipulate others \_\_\_\_\_  
hustler/con-man \_\_\_\_\_  
able to see other's weakness \_\_\_\_\_  
does he think negatively of people who are gullible  
enough to be cheated \_\_\_\_\_  
has he ever tried to get a member of the institution to get him  
special benefits \_\_\_\_\_  
highly interested in rehabilitation programs, counsellor,  
clergy, A.A. \_\_\_\_\_  
does he try and manipulate interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 6

does not show real feelings of guilt \_\_\_\_\_  
no regrets other than being in jail \_\_\_\_\_  
say that they feel guilty but dont show it \_\_\_\_\_  
feel sentence was to hard \_\_\_\_\_  
feel judged unfairly \_\_\_\_\_  
externalize blame \_\_\_\_\_  
more worried about how he is effected by crime over victim \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 7

appears unable to show/express strong emotions \_\_\_\_\_  
affective states short lived \_\_\_\_\_  
not close to family \_\_\_\_\_  
not close with friends \_\_\_\_\_  
unable to talk about relationships indepth, becomes silent,  
uncomfortable, evasive \_\_\_\_\_  
deals with sickness & death in unemotional ways \_\_\_\_\_  
finds it difficult to describe emotions ie. fear, love,  
anger, grief \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 8

shows disregard for the feelings, rights, and welfare of  
others \_\_\_\_\_  
unable to put himself in another persons shoes emotionally,  
lack empathy \_\_\_\_\_  
look out for #1 \_\_\_\_\_  
finds it easy to manipulate others \_\_\_\_\_  
crime related to these statments \_\_\_\_\_  
persistent pattern of criminal activity, early onset \_\_\_\_\_  
casual attitude towards victim ie. what can I do now \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 9 \*\*

depends on others \_\_\_\_\_  
not worried about employment - relies on family, friends,  
welfare \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 10

bad /short tempered \_\_\_\_\_  
responds poorly to failure, discipline, criticism \_\_\_\_\_  
spontaneous unprovoked crime \_\_\_\_\_  
drinking involved in commission of crime \_\_\_\_\_  
irritable, annoyed, impatient during interview \_\_\_\_\_  
short temper \_\_\_\_\_  
what makes respondent lose his temper \*\*\* \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 11 \*\*

impersonal casual sexual relations \_\_\_\_\_  
frequent casual relations (1 night stands) \_\_\_\_\_  
many sexual partners at same time \_\_\_\_\_  
wide variety of activities \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 12

ever seen mental health prof. when young \_\_\_\_\_  
juvenile record \_\_\_\_\_  
when young- lie, cheat, theft, robbery, fire setting, truancy  
substance abuse, vandalism, violence, sexually active \_\_\_\_\_  
boys home \_\_\_\_\_  
police intervention \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 13 \*\*

does not think in terms of long term goals/plans \_\_\_\_\_  
lives day to day \_\_\_\_\_  
does not worry about future \_\_\_\_\_  
not interested in steady job \_\_\_\_\_  
can state goals but does not consider how he will achieve them  
does not have realistic release plans \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 19 \*\*

one or more revocations of a major conditional release or failure  
to meet conditions of bail or adult probation 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
one or more violations of terms of a major conditional release  
but not resulting in revocation; of one or more failures to meet  
legal or judicial obligations 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
none of the above 0 \_\_\_\_\_

ITEM 20

theft, robbery, drugs, assault, murder, weapons, fraud,  
driving, escape, UAL, kidnapping, arson, obstruction of justice,  
crimes against state, minor charges  
6 or more types of offences 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
4 - 5 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
1 - 3 0 \_\_\_\_\_