

50



PERS 166

A PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF PSYCHOPATHIC
CRIMINAL OFFENDERS

CSIR Special Report No. Pers 166

UDC 343.96:159.923] : 301.151:
159.9.072.533.2

Johannesburg, South Africa

May, 1972.

001.3072068 CSIR NIPR PERS 166

A Personality Adjustment Questionnaire for the
Classification of Psychopathic Criminal Offenders

by

Liddicoat, Renée, M.A. Coulter and Valerie Fairbairn

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR PERSONNEL RESEARCH
COUNCIL FOR SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

JOHANNESBURG

May 1972

CSIR SPECIAL REPORT NO. PERS 166

U.D.C. No. 343.96:159.923]: 301.151:159.9.072.533.2



* P B 9 6 4 9 1 *

(Imprint Page)

ISBN 0 7988 0117 4

PERS 166 A Personality Adjustment Questionnaire
For the Classification of Psychopathic Criminal
Offenders. May, 1972. Liddicoat, Renée ,
M.A. Coulter and Valerie Fairbairn.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was directed by Mr. D.J.M. Vorster, Director of the National Institute for Personnel Research.

The research was carried out as part of the activities of the Psychometrics Division under guidance of Mr. D.W. Steyn.

This report forms part of project 7035, 72/9.

Samevatting.

Die moderne neiging in sowel psigiatrie en penologie is om psigopate en veral aggressiewe psigopate as 'n afsonderlike en duidelik identifiseerbare groep te beskou, wat gespesialiseerde behandeling verg wat nie noodwendig van toepassing op ander veroordeelde gevangenes is nie. Die betroubare diagnose van psigopatie is van groot belang om te verseker dat die huidige beperkte fasiliteite slegs aan diè persone beskikbaar gestel word vir wie dit bedoel is. Hoewel die verkorte vorm van Fourie se Aanpassingsvraelys nie as voldoende vir hierdie doel aanbeveel kan word nie, kan dit nogtans nuttig as 'n hulpmiddel aangewend word. Dit voorspel met 90% sekerheid dat misdadigers wat as nie-psigopate gediagnoseer word, inderdaad so is. Daar is derhalwe 'n veel kleiner gemengde groep psigopatiëse en nie-psigopatiëse misdadigers wat aan verdere ontleding onderwerp moet word alvorens klassifikasie onderneem kan word.

'n Verkorte subskaal van die vraelys toon belofte om aggressiewe en nie-aggressiewe psigopate te klassifiseer. Daar word egter verdere uitbreiding en wysiging geverg voordat dit van praktiese nut kan wees.

Abstract

The modern trend in both psychiatry and penology is to consider psychopaths, and particularly aggressive psychopaths, as a distinct and clearly recognizable group, in need of specialised treatment which is not necessarily applicable to convicted prisoners in general. In order to ensure that such presently limited facilities be available only to those for whom they were instituted, the matter of reliable diagnosis of psychopathy becomes of paramount importance. Although the presently prepared abbreviated form of the Fourie adjustment questionnaire cannot be recommended as sufficient for this purpose, it can be used as an aid towards this objective. It predicts with 90% certainty that those who are classified as non-psychopathic are indeed so. This leaves a very small group of mixed psychopathic and non-psychopathic criminals who would have to be subjected to further analysis before classification of a psychopathic group could be made.

For the purpose of classifying aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths, an abbreviated sub-scale of the Fourie adjustment questionnaire appears to be potentially useful. Extension and modification are required, however, before it can be of practical value.

INDEX

1. General
2. The Present Problem
3. Method
 - 3.1 Sample
 - 3.2 Patterns of Crime within these samples
 - 3.3 The Adjustment Questionnaire
 - 3.4 Types of Analyses carried out
4. Results
5. Discussion
 - 5.1 The Significant Items
 - 5.2 The Use of the Abbreviated Scales
 - 5.3 Cut-off Scores
 - 5.4 Scale (iv) and classification of aggressive psychopaths
6. Conclusions
7. Appendices

A Personality Adjustment Questionnaire for the Classification
of Psychopathic Criminal Offenders.

Liddicoat, Renée , M.A. Coulter and Valerie Fairbairn.

1. General

The question of psychopathy is, in both the legal and psychiatric fields, a vexed as well as a very pertinent one. The main difficulty in trying to come to practical grips with the problem appears to be rooted in two main causes; firstly, no acceptable definition of the word " psychopath " has as yet been put forward, and secondly, it is generally agreed that there are different psychopathic types as well as a neurotic-psychopathic continuum, along which a doubtful case might fall and be misdiagnosed in accordance with the number and strength of neurotic symptoms which might be manifested. The term " psychopath " conveys the etymological inference of a sick mind, or mental sickness, but in fact the psychopath may be free from psychosis, or even psycho-neurosis, and yet incapable of living a normal life. Cleckley ¹⁾ (1964) considers the term to be synonymous with sociopath, personality disorder and psychopathic personality. Different authors have included so many different types of behaviour problems under psychopathy that the concept has become semantically confusing.

In 1959, Albert, Brigante and Chase ²⁾ conducted a content analysis of available journal articles and books listed in Psychological Abstracts between January 1947 and April 1953. They found the chief grounds of disagreement among authors to be on aetiology and the efficacy of treatment, whilst attempts to define the psychopathic personality show many, mainly descriptive, areas of agreement. These include the following characteristics:

Anti-social aggression; lack of ability to delay satisfaction;
lack of insight; inadequacy of superego functioning; deficiency in

planning ability, lack of ambition, lack of goal-directed behaviour; emotional immaturity, shallowness of both social contacts and emotions; general irresponsibility and particularly in sexual behaviour; poor moral sense; narcissism, hyper-activity and callousness; and law-breaking and recidivism. The authors agree further that it is the total behaviour constellation which differentiates the psychopath from the psychotic or the neurotic.

Later publications, notably by Karpman³⁾ (1961), McCord and McCord⁴⁾ (1964), Gray and Hutchinson⁵⁾ (1964), Craft,⁶⁾ (1965), Foulds⁷⁾ (1965), Buss⁸⁾ (1966) and Arieti⁹⁾ (1967), confirm many of these features. Such broad agreement on the basic characteristics of the psychopath lends a wry appreciation to the quotation with which Curran and Mallinson¹⁰⁾ (1944) head their chapter on psychopathic personality in " Recent progress in psychiatry " : " I can't define an elephant, but I know one when I see one." (From Sim¹¹⁾ (1963) p. 347.) The difficulty arises in that it is not always easy to identify the individual who warrants the label ' psychopathic '. This appears to be due mainly to the problem of diagnostic reliability, where a combination or clustering of attributes which form the relatively distinct clinical and behavioural entity of psychopathy may appear separately or in other combinations in other disorders and even in normal people, as pointed out by Hare¹²⁾ (1970).

Because the behaviour of the psychopath, and particularly the aggressive psychopath, offends against society, and because laws are promulgated for the benefit and protection of society as a whole, the misdemeanours of the psychopath must be seen in the legal as well as the psychiatric context and, in particular, in relation to the court's interpretation of the concept of legal responsibility.

Cleckley¹³⁾ refers to the psychopath as " the orphan of both penology and psychiatry ". Whilst suffering from a basic serious disability, disorder or deviation which is no less crippling in its effect than a psychosis, he is at the same time technically ineligible for admission to a psychiatric institution. The present

trend in most countries is to view psychopathy as a specific disorder requiring some special facilities, rather than as misbehaviour deserving of punishment, which typically proves ineffectual in these cases. Furthermore, his first long stay in a prison exposes certain types of psychopathic offenders to the likelihood of secondary " processing " by hardened non-psychopathic criminals already dealt with by the penal machinery.

The criminal law of the U.S.S.R. distinguishes emotional disturbances of pathological and of physiological origins. Kuznetsov¹⁴⁾ (1967) reports that the former waives the responsibility of the offender completely, and that the latter accounts for his diminished responsibility. It is pointed out by Waider¹⁵⁾ (1967) that since psychopathy is not classified as illness, the criminal responsibility of psychopaths, as distinguished from that of mentally sick persons, remains a controversial issue, and he adds that the prevailing legal interpretation in West Germany maintains that psychopathy implies only diminished responsibility rather than full exculpation. In this context, it is interesting to note that the evidence submitted to the Royal Commission on capital punishment in England, and reported in the British Medical Journal¹⁶⁾ as long ago as 1950, recommended that diminished responsibility due to irresistible impulse should include the various manifestations of aggressive psychopathic disorder, and mentioned five abnormal mental states which included aggressive psychopathic states.

There would appear to be reasonable grounds for including some psychopathic behaviour under the heading of abnormality involving, at the least, a diminution of responsibility. Although the maladjustment, as Cleckley¹⁷⁾ emphasises, seems not to be attributable to defects in intelligence - indeed, the psychopath not infrequently achieves a high score on tests of intellectual ability - or to psychosis or neurosis, there is evidence to show that in some cases psychopathic behaviour may be related to other disabilities, including hypoglycaemia and epilepsy. Cloninger and Guze¹⁸⁾ (1970) confirmed other work

suggesting a significant association between sociopathy and hysteria. Hill and Watterson¹⁹⁾ (1942), having found that 65% of aggressive psychopaths showed abnormal EEG s, favour the concept of cortical immaturity as an aetiological factor. Investigating the groups to be discussed in this report, Murdoch²⁰⁾ (1971) found that the aggressive psychopaths showed more abnormal EEG responses to photic stimulation, and a significant increase in theta activity in response to hyper-ventilation, when compared with both non-aggressive psychopaths and non-psychopathic criminals.

Thus there would appear to be some justification for the clear recognition of psychopaths, and particularly aggressive psychopaths, as a separate group. Three clinical aspects of psychopathy must be kept in mind: the lack of a sound moral structure, the violation of laws which protect a social community, and lack of emotional ties to society or to individuals. These three features would suggest that psychopaths be dealt with by rules and methods specifically adapted to cope with their problems and behaviour, the degree of control being regulated by the degree of disability demonstrated. Rodriguez²¹⁾ (1965) uses the generic term "constitutional criminals" to denote a category of biologically determined dangerous offenders possessing no moral conscience, who are seriously disturbed and who remain unmoved by the consequences of their acts. He maintains that it is unquestionable that the responsibility of such criminals is greatly diminished if not completely absent. He points out further that the legislation of most countries recognises this fact and provides for institutional treatment rather than incarceration.

2. The Present Problem.

In a country such as South Africa, where such legislation has not yet been introduced, it is reasonable to assume that when special

facilities for the psychopath do become available , they are likely to be scarce for some time and will therefore have to be used with great discretion. This will require very careful diagnosis and further selection of those deemed most likely to benefit from special , and probably multidisciplinary , treatment .

A project was recently carried out under the direction of Col. J.P. Roux , head of psychological services of the South African Department of Prisons , to investigate the feasibility of utilizing some objective measurement techniques which might be of value in diagnosing the psychopathic offender. One of the instruments used in this project was an adjustment questionnaire developed by Fourie²²⁾ (1968). An analysis of these results by Nelson and Murdoch²³⁾ (1971) revealed a significant difference between the scores obtained by psychopathic and other offenders , and it was therefore decided to investigate in greater detail the usefulness of this questionnaire for diagnostic purposes .

The emphasis throughout this investigation was on the correct classification of non-psychopaths , i.e. the avoidance of wrongly classifying a non-psychopath as a psychopath. This is primarily because it is desirable to exclude all non-psychopathic criminals from the expensive and limited facilities for the treatment of psychopathy .

3.

Method

3.1 Sample: the sample consisted of 198 white adult male inmates of the Kroonstad , Sonderwater and Pretoria Central prisons . One group (N = 99) was diagnosed as psychopathic by a panel of two psychiatrists , a clinical psychologist , a psychiatric social worker and a psychiatric nurse , on the basis of the following criteria:

a) Constantly deviating (anti-social) problem behaviour from an early age , as reflected by running away from home , theft , playing

truant , general maladjustment at school , being committed to an industrial school or reformatory , and rebelliousness towards authority .

- b) Unstable school record: maladjustment , playing truant and inability to function on a par with intellectual abilities .
- c) Unstable work record: unemployment , inability to persevere with a particular job , and constant change of jobs .
- d) Poor social adaptation and an inability to conform to norms , with resulting conflict with the law from an early age as indicated by previous court records .
- e) An inability to learn from previous experience , as indicated by the constant repetition of anti-social and other misbehaviour .
- f) An inability to adjust to the prison situation as reflected by prison offences and escapades .
- g) Absence of any remorse over anti-social or other misbehaviour .
- h) The presence of irresponsible behaviour , impulsivity , a tendency to mendacity , and attempts to manipulate people .

The above information was obtained from personal interviews and the subject's personal files .

An attempt was made to subdivide the psychopaths into types , but this was not an easy task since few individuals reflect the classic syndrome of any maladjustment and many of these prisoners exhibited more than one symptom at different times . However , the panel was able to classify most of the subjects into subgroups , this breakdown being summarised in Table 1 .

Table 1

Classification of psychopaths into sub-types

Type	N
Rebellious and aggressive	41
Rebellious and aggressive but charming	10
Immature and unclassifiable , but with aggressive features	4
Total aggressive	55
Charming , suave and plausible	30
Other (immature or unclassifiable)	14
Total non-aggressive	44
Grand Total	99

A control group (N = 99) of prisoners who did not satisfy the criteria for a diagnosis of psychopathy was matched for age and IQ attained on the South African Wechsler adult intelligence scale. There was no significant difference between the means and distributions of IQs of the two samples.

3.2 Patterns of crime within these samples

The literature indicates that although psychopaths are a considerable nuisance to society, they are seldom dangerous. This is supported by the findings summarised in Table 2 below, from which it will be seen that this group of psychopaths committed more relatively minor crimes of housebreaking, theft, car-stealing and fraud than dangerous crimes such as assault, murder, rape and robbery. It is not suggested that they do not commit such felonies, but as a group they did not commit a significantly greater number of the more dangerous crimes than did the controls. In cases of assault, χ^2 tests applied to the results shown in Table 2 reveal no significant difference between the psychopaths as a group and the controls. On further breakdown, however, they do show a significant difference between aggressive psychopaths and controls, and between aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths. This finding would appear to emphasise the necessity for a separate classification of aggressive psychopaths.

Table 2

Percentages of crimes within main and sub-groups

Group	Theft	Car-Theft	House-Breaking	Fraud	Assault	Rape	Murder	Robbery
Rebellious-aggressive psychopaths n = 55	65,45% n = 36	36,36% n = 20	54,54% n = 30	12,72% n = 7	14,55% n = 8	5,45% n = 3	1,81% n = 1	9,09% n = 5
Charming Psychopaths n = 30	46,66% n = 14	33,33% n = 10	23,33% n = 7	50,0% n = 15	0% n = 0	6,66% n = 2	0% n = 0	0% n = 0
Psychopaths n = 99	57,58% n = 57	35,35% n = 35	41,41% n = 41	26,26% n = 26	8,0% n = 8	5,0% n = 5	1,0% n = 1	5,0% n = 5
Controls n = 99	47,47% n = 47	19,19% n = 19	23,23% n = 23	20,20% n = 20	4,0% n = 4	4,0% n = 4	3,0% n = 3	7,0% n = 7

Note: (a) Only those crimes most frequently committed are included.

(b) Inadequate and unclassifiable sub-groups are excluded, the N s being too small for statistical analysis .

The frequency of convictions for car-theft, house-breaking and fraud was investigated using the χ^2 test, and comparisons between the psychopathic and control groups, and between the sub-groups, are summarised in Table 3. The percentages do not add up to 100 because the majority of subjects were convicted for a multiplicity of crimes.

Table 3

Significance of type of crime within main and sub-groups

Crime	Group with Higher Frequency	Group with Lower Frequency	Significance Level
Car Theft	Psychopaths	Controls	99%
Housebreaking	Psychopaths	Controls	99%
Fraud	Charming Psychopaths	Controls	99,5%
Housebreaking	Rebellious-aggressive Psychopaths	Controls	99%
Housebreaking	Rebellious-aggressive Psychopaths	Charming Psychopaths	99,5%
Fraud	Charming Psychopaths	Rebellious-aggressive Psychopaths	99,5%

Note:(a) Inadequate and unclassifiable psychopaths were excluded from these sub-groups.

(b) Only those combinations which differ significantly from each other are shown.

From this table it is clear that car theft and housebreaking are more frequently committed by the psychopathic than the non-psychopathic convicted offenders. This type of offence is in keeping with the impulsivity, the inability to delay gratification and the irresponsible characteristics of the psychopath who might well take a car merely for the immediate pleasure of a " joy-ride", or who, without premeditation or planning, might break into a house without any particular motivation other than to take whatever might be available. Housebreaking is also an aggressive

anti-social act so that it is not surprising that the table shows that those psychopaths classified as rebellious-aggressive commit this type of crime more frequently than either the control group or those psychopaths classified as charming. Breaking into a house is symbolically both an attack on society in general and a means of revenge for real or imagined slights or injury.

The suave, charming type of psychopath is particularly adept at using gullible people for his own ends. He is persuasive and highly plausible, appears to be sane and well-balanced, and can lie with expert ease, a combination of traits that makes for the successful confidence trickster. Table 3 shows that this type of person is, predictably, convicted for fraud significantly more often than the rebellious-aggressive type or the non-psychopath.

This brief analysis of the patterns of crime within the groups under discussion and in relationship with personality characteristics supports in general the literature concerning the anti-social behaviour of psychopaths.

3.3 The adjustment questionnaire

This questionnaire was completed by all subjects taking part in this investigation. It was administered in the hope that it might prove to be a valuable adjunct to other methods of classification, either as a confirmatory tool or, possibly, even as a reliable substitute for the expensive and time-consuming convening of a panel of experts each time a diagnosis should be required.

The questionnaire comprises 150 items in each of which short, contrasting descriptions of two people, A and B, are given. The subject has to state which of the two, A or B, is more like himself. The items may be said to be divisible into four scales, as they attempt to measure the degree to which a person responds, positively or negatively, to four different characteristic attitudes or modes of behaviour in certain given circumstances.

(b) Using only these discriminating items, seven different abbreviated scales were prepared for further investigation into the relative merits of each for purposes of classification of offenders as previously discussed under "The present problem". These abbreviated scales were:

i) Scale (i), consisting of the 21 discriminating items from the original scale 1.

ii) Scale (ii), containing the 8 discriminating items from the original scale 2.

iii) Scale (iii), comprising the 19 discriminating items from the original scale 3.

iv) Scale (iv), consisting of the 16 discriminating items from the original scale 4.

v) A 37-item scale, consisting of (i) and (iv) above combined. Of the four characteristics which the questionnaire attempts to measure, emotional control and overt aggression (original scales 1 and 4) are generally considered to be more typical of psychopaths than are self-confidence and selfishness (original scales 2 and 3).

vi) A 48-item scale, consisting of (i), (ii), and (iii) above combined. The broad category of psychopathy includes many personality types which might be roughly divided into two main groups, namely aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths. As shown in Table 1, the numbers in each group were 55 and 44 respectively of the total psychopathic sample under discussion. Mann-Whitney "U" tests were carried out on each of the abbreviated scales (i) to (iv) above, using the aggressive and non-aggressive sub-groups of psychopaths separately. Only scale (4) (overt aggression) was found to discriminate significantly between these 2 sub-groups (see Table 5). This finding suggested that further statistical analysis of the total significant items of the questionnaire as a whole (64 items), and of the 34-item scale, might be invalidated by the bias contributed by the "overt aggression" items of scale (iv).

For this reason, the 48-item scale, eliminating scale (iv), was prepared.

vii) A 64-item scale consisting of (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) above combined, i.e. all discriminating items in the adjustment questionnaire.

(c) The raw scores on each of these seven scales were normalized and means, standard deviations and variances were calculated for the psychopathic and control groups separately. (See Table 6). Similar calculations were made for all scales for the aggressive and non-aggressive psychopathic groups (Table 7).

(d) As the distributions of all raw scores under consideration are J - shaped, there is some doubt as to the validity of using the t-tests to ascertain whether the means of the two groups differ significantly from each other. For this reason, Mann-Whitney " U " tests were considered to be more applicable in this case and were therefore carried out on each of the seven scales enumerated in paragraph (b). (See Table 5). The following groups were compared:

- (i) Psychopaths and controls
- (ii) Aggressive psychopaths and controls
- (iii) Non-aggressive psychopaths and controls
- (iv) Aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths

(e) An analysis was carried out in order to find the cut-off scores which would result in the minimum theoretical cost of misclassifying persons on the new scales (vi) and (vii) as enumerated in paragraph (b) above. (See Table 8).

(f) As only scale (iv) was found to discriminate significantly between the aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths, a more detailed investigation was carried out to see whether this scale could be of use in diagnosing aggressive psychopaths in a mixed group. All subjects, both psychopathic and control, who obtained a score of 23 or more on the 48-item scale, together with a score of 7 or more on scale (iv), were scrutinized for composition of type of subjects. This selection gave a total N of 54.

4. Results

1. The significantly discriminating items are summarised in Table 4 and enumerated in Appendix A.

2. Seven abbreviated scales. Results of the Mann-Whitney "U" tests, which were carried out to determine significant differences between the groups and sub-groups of psychopaths and controls, are given as z-scores in Table 5. From this it will be seen that scale (iv), which measures overt aggression, is the only one of the seven abbreviated scales which differentiates significantly between the aggressive and the non-aggressive psychopaths.

Table 5

Mann-Whitney test z scores

Scale	Controls/ Psychopaths	Controls / Aggre- sive Psychopaths	Controls / non- aggressive psycho- paths	Aggressive / non aggressive psychopaths
(i) 1	4,76*	-4,90*	-2,69*	1,70
(ii) 2	4,17*	-3,84*	-2,90*	0,62
(iii) 3	5,11*	-4,87*	-3,35*	1,08
(iv) 4	4,81*	-5,37*	-2,24	2,79*
(v) 37- item	5,46*	-5,46*	-3,09*	2,34
(vi) 48- item	5,56*	-5,28*	-3,36*	1,45
(vii) 64- item	4,93*	-5,59*	-3,31*	2,01

* z scores significant at >99%

3. Means, standard deviations and variances for psychopaths and non-psychopaths are given in Table 6 for each of the seven abbreviated scales, and Table 7 gives the same information for aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations and variances of seven abbreviated scales: psychopaths and controls.

Scale	Psychopaths				Controls			
	N	\bar{X}	SD	S ²	N	\bar{X}	SD	S ²
Scale i	99	9,58	6,05	36,59	99	5,68	5,22	27,21
Scale ii	99	3,33	2,50	6,24	99	1,89	2,27	5,15
Scale iii	99	6,79	4,55	20,71	99	3,71	3,36	11,30
Scale iv	99	5,07	4,58	20,95	99	2,28	3,07	9,46
Scale v -37	99	14,65	9,81	96,23	99	7,96	7,52	56,56
Scale vi -48	99	19,70	11,42	130,45	99	11,27	9,21	84,74
Scale vii-64	99	24,77	14,97	224,14	99	13,56	11,29	127,54

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations and variances of seven abbreviated scales: aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths

Scale	Aggressive Psychopaths				Non-Aggressive Psychopaths			
	N	\bar{X}	SD	S ²	N	\bar{X}	SD	S ²
Scale i	55	10,44	11,78	138,74	44	8,5	10,54	111,09
Scale ii	55	3,47	4,26	18,13	44	3,16	3,99	15,89
Scale iii	55	7,20	8,44	71,31	44	6,27	7,69	59,06
Scale iv	55	6,18	7,76	60,21	44	3,68	5,34	28,56
Scale v -37	55	16,71	9,67	93,63	44	12,07	9,57	91,65
Scale vi- 48	55	21,11	11,14	124,13	44	17,93	11,76	138,44
Scale vii - 64	55	27,27	14,83	219,92	44	21,61	14,89	221,71

Table 8 below shows the results of the analysis carried out in order to determine the scores with the minimum theoretical cost of misclassifying persons. Only the 64-item and the 48-item scales were used in this analysis. Given certain raw scores as cut-off points, the actual percentages of each group misclassified are shown in the last two columns. As neither of the scales has been corrected for length, the 48-item scale is slightly more valuable than is indicated by the Table.

Table 8

Cut-off scores and percentages of misclassification risks

Scale	Cut-off Score	Weighted percentage	Importance ratio: controls/psychopaths	Risk of misclassifications	
				Non-psycho-paths	Psychopaths
(vi) 48-item	21	17,68	1:1	14%	51%
	22	7,26	2:1	10%	57%
(vii) 64-item	21 or 22	19,70	1:1	18%	42%
	27	7,05	2:1	9%	61%

4. The more detailed analysis carried under paragraph 3.4 (f) showed following composition of types of subjects:
- (a) 16 of 27 aggressive psychopaths (59%)
 - (b) 7 of 17 non-aggressive psychopaths (49%)
 - (c) 6 of 10 controls (60%)

Due to the small numbers, these percentages do not differ significantly from each other.

5. Discussion

5.1 The significant items

Scale 1: Anxious insecurity and emotional control

The characteristics which this scale attempts to measure are expressed as (a) anxious insecurity and (b) emotional control.

A high number of positive responses would indicate (a) a certain emotional immaturity and lack of trust, and (b) irritability, impulsiveness and lack of self-control inappropriate to the situation.

It is of interest to note that of all the nine items reflecting emotional immaturity, none was endorsed significantly more often by the psychopathic than by the control group. The following are the relevant items:

- 23. very touchy when someone makes a sneering comment about his appearance
- 133. touchy about matters concerning his person
- 21. easily offended when it is insinuated that he is incompetent
- 111. feels hurt if his work is regarded slightly
- 4. easily embarrassed in front of an audience
- 9. experiences uncontrollable rage when someone tries to humiliate him in public
- 35. cannot bear to be contradicted in public
- 96. does not forget a mistake he has made in front of others
- 147. is often upset when others' opinions differ from his own

It will be seen that these items involve in the main the subject's self-image as reflected in his personal appearance, his work and his idea of how others see him. It would seem that some degree of narcissism in the psychopathic make-up leads to a kind of smugness or self-satisfaction which makes him as impervious as others to public censure and criticism, in spite of his persistent anti-social behaviour.

On the other hand, all four items indicating lack of trust were significantly more frequently endorsed by the psychopathic group. These items are:

- 42. always feels that others are harming his interests
- 68. always suspicious of the motives of others
- 24. takes sarcasm seriously
- 132. does not easily forget the rudeness of an acquaintance

From his own attitude and behaviour towards society, the psychopath might be expected to mistrust the motives of others.

The psychopaths in the present survey readily admit to irritability under slight provocation, a characteristic which might be equated with a low frustration tolerance. This is illustrated by the following items which they endorsed significantly more often than did the control group:

- 102. becomes very impatient under unpleasant circumstances
- 79. cannot be at all tactful when becoming cross
- 145. impatient with rebellious people
- 115. cannot tolerate much when he has problems at home
- 85. is very indignant if someone treats him inconsiderately
- 149. is easily upset in an insulting situation
- 131. is very easily irritated

The narcissism and self-satisfaction of the psychopath, often colloquially referred to as a "thick skin" and previously commented on, may help to explain why the following items dealing with irritability did not fall into the category of significant endorsements:

- 25. cannot bear others playing the fool with him
- 94. cannot bear others bothering him
- 98. is very easily offended
- 99. is almost always touchy

The responses to these items in Scale 1 which refer to impulsivity and lack of self-control appear in some cases to be contradictory and difficult to explain, particularly items 140 and 81, and 119 and 16 below. A significantly greater number of psychopaths endorsed the following three items suggestive of impulsive behaviour:

- 49. will not hesitate to attack someone who tries to make fun of him
- 140. loses his temper if an injustice is done to a member of his family (See item 81)
- 148. loses his temper when someone is wilful

The next two items were not among the significant endorsements :

81. loses his temper when he suffers loss

86. cannot act sensibly in a crisis

The apparent contradiction between items 140 and 81 might be due to the ambiguity of the word " loss " which could be interpreted in either an emotional or a materialistic sense .

Significantly more psychopaths than control subjects endorse items which indicate lack of self-control and which are worded in extreme terms. Such endorsements could be interpreted as indicating bravado and showmanship on the part of the psychopaths. These significant items are:

31. experiences uncontrollable rage when someone shows a defiant attitude

77. becomes furious if someone dare strike him

40. becomes unreasonably angry when someone harms his interests

70. has no control over his emotions

116. loses self-control when involved in an argument

119. is beside himself with rage when someone is rude to him

(See item 16 below)

144. unable to control his emotions when annoyed

Other items dealing with self-control but not endorsed significantly more often by the psychopathic group were , in general , phrased in less forceful language , as follows:

8. easily loses his temper with an impudent person

39. becomes extremely angry when he discovers he is being deceived

103. becomes extremely angry when he comes across irresponsibility

106. easily loses his temper

16. loses self-control when someone is rude to him (See item 119 above)

27. is beside himself with rage when provoked

The psychopath is typically not over-concerned with society's opinion of his behaviour and is therefore quite prepared to admit to uncontrollable rage , becoming furious or unreasonably angry or beside himself with

rage, or to losing or lacking self-control when his emotions are involved. The non-psychopath on the other hand is less likely to endorse such items, except when there is specific provocation as in 16 and 27 above, although he is prepared to admit to the relatively more socially acceptable responses of becoming extremely angry or losing his temper. Thus the basic difference between the two groups in their assessment of what is socially acceptable, as well as the propensity of the psychopath towards showmanship and bravado, could reasonably account for the fact that a significantly greater number of psychopaths than control subjects endorsed those items blatantly indicating lack of self-control in circumstances which would not seem to justify such extreme reactions.

Scale 2 Confidence, decisiveness

The characteristics of decisiveness in this scale implies the ability to make decisions and neither revoke nor have doubts about them, to handle and adjust to new or unusual situations, to take responsibility and to assume leadership without anxiety. Of the 52 items in this scale, 19 deal with the aspect of decisiveness and none showed a significant difference between the answers of the psychopathic and the control group.

The remaining 33 items of Scale 2 refer to self-confidence and embarrassment but mainly to feelings of inferiority, no less than 15 of the items incorporating the phrase "feels inferior" with or without an adverb such as always, very, extremely, painfully or irritatingly.

Of the four scales which make up the entire adjustment questionnaire, this one (Scale 2) shows the least discriminatory value between the two groups of subjects, only 15, 38% of the items revealing a significant difference in the number of responses. (See Table 4). This percentage is reflected in only eight items which all refer to self-confidence. They are:
128. feels inferior if someone of the opposite sex makes fun of him
71. always feels inferior to persons of the opposite sex who have achieved more than he has

- 56. feels inferior to people wealthier than himself
- 104. has difficulty in getting along with strangers in a strange place
- 5. feels uncomfortable in any company
- 1. is convinced that he never makes a good impression
- 22. always does the wrong thing
- 124. is inclined to be pessimistic

It is interesting to speculate, but difficult to infer, why these particular items should have been endorsed significantly more often by the psychopathic group, particularly in view of the fact that the following items showed no significant difference:

- 28. always feels inferior in the presence of the opposite sex
- 47. feels inferior if he is made fun of
- 130. always feels inferior to people who have made a success of their lives

It would appear that the psychopath feels inferior to the opposite sex only when he feels that there is some justification for it, i.e. personal teasing or greater success than his own; and that he only feels inferior to successful people when these are members of the opposite sex. In general it may be said that feelings of sexual inadequacy have a connotation of emotional immaturity. Some other non-significant items are:

- 19. always feels inferior to more highly educated people
- 17. always feels painfully inferior towards his superiors
- 142. always feels uncomfortable in the company of people who excel in some direction
- 33. feels inferior in the company of someone with a strong personality
- 67. always feels inferior to his friends
- 112. always feels inferior to anyone who overshadows him in any direction
- 138. feels inferior when he must take second place
- 89. is constantly aware of an irritating feeling of inferiority
- 44. feels extremely inferior because of his shortcomings

46. feels very inferior to people who are aware of his shortcomings

These answers suggest that the mundane or material acquisition of wealth is the only other matter that makes the psychopath feel inferior, and that such things as education, achievement, personality or his own shortcomings do not bother him unduly or any more than they bother other people. Further non-significant items are:

45. loses self-confidence as soon as he discovers he has made a mistake

58. loses all self-confidence when criticised

125. has no self-confidence

137. loses all self-confidence if the task is unsuccessful at first

12. is always self-conscious

84. is always very shy in company

41. finds it impossible to express his own views in conversation

91. is inclined to under-estimate himself

87. is always hesitant to tackle a difficult job

93. always feels incompetent to take on big responsibilities

139. always doubts his own ability to do a given job successfully

78. does not gain popularity quickly, in new surroundings

These non-significant items indicate that the psychopath has as much confidence in himself as have other people; and the apparent contradiction of the significant items 104, 5, 1, 22 and 124 above could be due to the actual results of experience from which he is unable to learn although being fully aware of both the experiences and the results emanating therefrom.

Scale 3 Selfishness, tactlessness.

The rationale behind some of the items in this scale is not easy to follow as they do not appear to refer directly to either of the two character dimensions being measured. Moodiness, unfriendliness, bad temper and impatience may conceivably be either selfish or tactless in essence, but a few of the items are either very subtle or ambiguously worded. Selfishness in the context of psychopathy implies the consideration of one's self above and before all others. A significantly greater number of the psychopathic than of the control group endorsed the

following items which in the main are clearly worded:

- 30. does only what will benefit himself
- 60. always places his own interests first
- 69. is very selfish where money is concerned
- 107. dislikes having to share his privileges
- 109. is very selfish when his own physical wellbeing is involved

(See item 65 below)

- 36. is only selfish when taking care of his own interests

(See item 72 below and footnote *)

Although items 109 and 36 appear to be contradicted by items 65 and 72 below , the balance of the following non-significant items tends to insinuate that although the psychopaths more readily admit that their own personal interests and wellbeing are of paramount importance , they are nevertheless no more insensitive than the control subjects, to the problems and tribulations of others. The following items

showed no significant difference between the two groups:

- 6. is unimpressed by other people's problems
- 66. believes all people have sufficient opportunities to be successful
- 76. never concerns himself with other people's misfortunes
- 80. never takes the grief of others to heart
- 92. cannot be bothered with poor people
- 114. is very insensitive to other's troubles
- 150. seeks personal comfort , even at the expense of others
- 126. is never concerned with the welfare of his fellow-man
- 65. is selfish when his own safety is involved (See item 109 above)
- 72. will never do anyone else a favour which will be to his own disadvantage (See item 36 above)

Tactlessness may arise from impulsivity, insensitivity, lack of forethought or for other reasons. the psychopaths in this study more readily ...

* Item 36 is badly phrased. Since the term " selfishness " implies taking care of one's own interests, the introduction of the word " only " becomes semantically confusing.

endorsed their tactlessness than their selfishness, as may be seen from the number of relevant items which follow and which revealed a significant difference between the two groups:

- 51. does not have the patience to be tactful
- 37. behaves tactlessly when someone adopts a challenging attitude
- 38. is often tactless when in a hurry
- 108. cannot be tactful when provoked
- 20. states his opinion regardless of time or place
- 50. usually talks even when it would be better to remain silent
- 59. his behaviour often offends others
- 74. often makes people angry with him
- 120. often hurts others' feelings

It will be noted that these items all have some causal qualification of impatience, haste or provocation and that, except for item 20, they are phrased as " usually " or " often ". The two non-significant items which follow show that the psychopath no more than the non-psychopath admits that such reactions are an invariable part of his behaviour pattern:

- 113. is always tactless
- 64. does not always act appropriately

Of the remaining, less specific, items included in Scale 3, only four show a significant difference in the number of responses by the two groups. These items suggest that the psychopath is aware of his unfriendly and unpleasant nature and may even be somewhat perturbed thereby:

- 26. can be very unfriendly
- 123. is often unfriendly towards acquaintances
- 55. always becomes very unpleasant when he has not been able to do his best
- 127. is a person who has no peace for his soul

Where the psychopaths as a group do not differ from the controls, the emphasis is on moodiness, impatience and general ill-humour, as follows:

- 73. is a very moody person
- 29. has regular " off days "
- 10. becomes very impatient for no reason
- 95. becomes dissatisfied with everything when the weather is bad
- 53. becomes ill-tempered quickly when hungry
- 117. becomes bad-tempered when overworked
- 100. is unable to foresee difficulties and avoid them

Scale 4 Overt aggression

Whilst hidden aggression may be detected in many of the items in the other three scales, Scale 4 pulls no punches, as it were, in its attempt to measure the degree to which a subject is prepared to express his aggression overtly. The items refer without subtlety to fisticuffs and pugnacity, and although it is by far the shortest scale, containing only 18 items, no less than 16 of these (88,8%) were endorsed significantly more often by the psychopaths than by the control group. From the items given below, the psychopath appears actually to enjoy and often to initiate this form of physical aggression and to use it on the slightest pretext:

- 146. is pugnacious by nature
- 14. likes physically attacking someone
- 90. enjoys being involved in a fist fight
- 52. always picks a quarrel with pugnacious people
- 15. always tries to settle things with a fight
- 18. is quick to settle an argument with his fists
- 75. never avoids a row
- 13. fights with his fists if anyone tries to boss him
- 63. is keen to use his fists should anyone dare to differ from him in opinion
- 82. is eager to fight if someone differs from him on politics
- 129. is always eager to fight when he loses
- 136. is always prepared to use his fists if his interests are harmed
- 143. will get involved in a fight if his friends encourage him
- 54. will fight if provoked
- 61. fights back if wronged
- 122. cannot bear any opposition

The non-psychopath endorsed the remaining two items as frequently as the psychopaths. Suggesting timidity if not cowardice, it would indeed have appeared unmanly and unnatural if they had not done so.

101. fights back when he is struck

43. will never walk away when someone wants to fight him

The format of the adjustment questionnaire is such that a subject's self-image is revealed by his responses. From a scrutiny of those items which discriminated significantly between the psychopathic and control groups in this investigation, as well as of those which did not, there emerges the following interesting characteristic picture of the psychopath as he sees himself:

1. He does not trust other people, but has no feelings of anxious insecurity.
2. He is irritable and impatient under little provocation, but is not easily offended.
3. He admits to a furious temper and lack of self-control when his emotions are involved or in circumstances which would not appear to justify such extreme reactions.
4. He is decisive and self-confident.
5. He feels inferior to successful women and to people wealthier than himself, but does not entertain feelings of inferiority regarding education, achievement, personality or his own shortcomings.
6. He is selfish and inconsiderate, but not unaware of other people's problems.
7. Although not invariably tactless, he is so more often than not.
8. Whilst being aware of his unfriendly nature, he does not consider himself to be unduly moody, impatient or ill-humoured.
9. He admits pugnacity, enjoyment and often initiation of aggressive behaviour without appropriate cause.

As the chief victim of the psychopath's repeated crimes and misdemeanours, society might perhaps be forgiven for interpreting the data as describing a smug, self-assured, self-confident, self-

satisfied, self-centred person, insensitive, pugnacious and lacking in self-control, who dislikes women who present either competition or threat.

5.2 The use of the abbreviated scales

Since only 64 of the 150 items in the original adjustment questionnaire proved to have discriminatory value for the classification of psychopaths in a prison population, the object of this investigation became threefold: , firstly, to devise the most effective abbreviated form of the questionnaire for classification purposes; secondly, to ensure as far as possible that non-psychopaths should not be wrongly classified and thus needlessly exposed to the expensive and limited treatment facilities which may be available for psychopaths; and thirdly, to make some attempts at differentiating between aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths. Hence careful consideration was given to seven different abbreviated scales, and the investigation indicated that the 48-item scale (see Appendix B) was the best for the purposes outlined above.

The individual scales, (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) are too short to be used singly as effective measuring devices. Scale (iv), however, is of special interest.

Scale (iv) is made up of items designed to measure the degree of overt aggression expressed by a subject. To this end, scale (iv) successfully discriminates between aggressive psychopaths and controls; it does not, however, differentiate the non-aggressive psychopaths from the controls. (See Table 5). This would indicate that overt aggression is not an essential component of psychopathy, but rather that the aggressive psychopath should be considered a distinct type, as recommended in evidence given to the Royal Commission on capital punishment in England²⁵. Scale (iv) by itself would fail to distinguish psychopaths who were of a non-aggressive type, and was therefore discarded as a possible effective measurement device for the purposes under discussion.

It does, however, appear to have some potential for distinguishing between aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths (See para. 5.4 below)

(b) 37-item scale. This scale comprised the discriminating items designed to measure emotional control and overt aggression, generally considered to be typical of psychopathy. Of the 37 items making up this proposed scale, 16, or 43%, dealt with overt aggression.

(c) 64-item scale. This tentative abbreviated scale was made up of all the discriminating items of the original questionnaire and thus included the 16 items relating to overt aggression, i.e. 25% of the total.

As these items on overt aggression fail to discriminate the non-aggressive psychopath from the non-psychopathic offender, it is clear that any scale of which they form a part is likely to become less sensitive to differentiating between non-aggressive (but psychopathic) and non-psychopathic groups. Because of the higher percentage of these items in the 37-item scale than in the 64-item scale, the former is likely to be even less sensitive than the latter as a tool for discriminating between psychopaths as a group and non-psychopaths. The bias thus introduced by the inclusion of the items on overt aggression, with the attendant loss of sensitivity in relation to those psychopaths who are not of the aggressive type, led to the exclusion of the 37- and 64-item abbreviated scales from further consideration.

(d) 48-item scale. This is the only abbreviated scale which does not include any of the items referring to overt aggression. It retains only those discriminating items designed to measure emotional control, self-confidence and selfishness, and tactlessness. (Appendix B)

5.3 Cut-off scores

These are the raw scores below which a diagnosis of non-psychopathic is indicated, and above which a diagnosis cannot be made with any certainty. When it is twice as important to classify non-psychopaths rather than psychopaths correctly, the ratio of 2:1 in Table 8 is relevant. Using the 48-item scale, and given a raw score of 22 or less, only 10% of non-psychopaths are likely

to be wrongly classified. This means that there is a 90% probability that an individual with a score of 22 or less on this scale is non-psychopathic. A score of 23 or higher does not necessarily indicate psychopathy but it may be said that there is a 43% probability that a psychopath will be classified as such, using a cut-off point of 22. Similarly, a raw score of 27 or less on the 64-item scale indicates a misclassification of 9% of non-psychopaths (i.e. a 91% probability of non-psychopathy), whilst a score of 28 or more would give a 39% probability that a psychopath would be classified as such.

In order to be meaningful, it is desirable that the cut-off scores should be centrally situated on a hypothetical graph showing the distribution of the scores. This requirement is better met by the 48-item than by the 64-item abbreviated scale, as shown in Table 8.

5.4 Scale (iv) and classification of aggressive psychopaths.

A score of 23 or more on the 48-item scale indicates a 43% probability of psychopathy. Hence an individual who obtained such a score and, in addition, a high score of 7 or more on scale (iv) (overt aggression) might be expected to be classifiable as an aggressive psychopath. The analysis of the group of 54 subjects who reached these scores revealed this expected trend, but, due mainly to the small numbers involved, the results were not statistically significant. However, the indication is that scale (iv) has some potential as a tool for the classification of aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths and to this end it is suggested that consideration be given to its extension and modification.

6. Conclusions

The Fourie adjustment questionnaire in its present form can be a useful aid in the detection of psychopathy amongst prisoners, as the over-all scores, as well as those of the separate scales, showed significant differences between a psychopathic and non-psychopathic group of convicted offenders (Nelson and Murdoch²⁶). These differences, however, have been found to be attributable to only

64 of the 150 items which make up the total questionnaire. It is therefore suggested that an abbreviated form be adopted, this form to contain only significantly discriminating items whilst the remaining items be considered redundant for the classification purposes required.

The emphatic objective of the present questionnaire is to avoid classifying as psychopathic those individuals who are in fact not so. The most reliable abbreviated scale for this purpose appears to be the 48-item scale (Appendix B) and it is therefore recommended that this be used, with 22 as the cut-off score.

The questionnaire may also have potential use for possible elimination of a diagnosis of psychopathy in individuals. Research concerning its reliability for individuals would have to be carried out before this would be possible.

Should reliable differentiation between aggressive and non-aggressive psychopaths be required, the present scale (iv), dealing with overt aggression, appears to have some potential for discriminating between these two groups. The extension or modification of this scale in order to increase its validity and reliability should therefore be given further consideration.

REFERENCES

- | | <u>Order of
Appearance</u> |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. ALBERT, R.S., T.R. BRIGANTE <u>and</u> Madeline CHASE (1959): <u>J. gen. Psychol.</u> 60, 17 - 28 | 2 |
| 2. ARIETI, S. (1967): <u>The intrapsychic self</u> . New York, Basic Books. | 9 |
| 3. <u>BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL</u> . Editorial. (1950): 1, 365 - 369 | 16, 25 |
| 4. BUSS, A.H. (1966): <u>Psychopathology</u> . New York, John Wiley. | 8 |
| 5. CLECKLEY, H.M. (1964): <u>The mask of sanity</u> . 4th Ed., St. Louis, Mosby Co. | 1, 13, 17 |
| 6. CLONINGER, R. <u>and</u> S.B. GUZE (1970): Psychiatric illness and female criminality. <u>Amer. J. Psychiat.</u> 127: 3, 303-311 (79-87) | 18 |
| 7. CRAFT, M.J. (1965): <u>Ten studies into psychopathic personality</u> . Bristol, John Wright. | 6 |
| 8. CURRAN, D. <u>and</u> P. MALLINSON (1944): Psychopathic personality. <u>J. ment. Sci.</u> , 90, 266 | 10 |
| 9. FOULDS, G.A. (1965): <u>Personality and personal illness</u> . London, Tavistock Publications. | 7 |
| 10. FOURIE, J.J. (1968): <u>'n Skaal om emosioele volwassenheid nader te bepaal, veral met die oog op die keuring van offisiere vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie</u> . D. Litt. <u>et</u> Phil. Thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria. | 22 |
| 11. GRAY, K.C. <u>and</u> H.C. HUTCHINSON (1964): The psychopathic personality: a survey of Canadian psychiatrists' opinions. <u>Canadian psychiat. Assocn. J.</u> , 9, 452-461 | 5 |
| 12. HARE, R.D. (1970): <u>Psychopathy: theory and research</u> . Toronto, John Wiley. | 12 |
| 13. HILL, D. <u>and</u> D. WATTERSON (1942): EEG studies of psychopathic personalities. <u>J. Neurol. Psychiat.</u> , 5, 47 | 19 |
| 14. KARPMAN, B. (1961): The structure of neurosis: with special differentials between neurosis, psychosis, homosexuality, alcoholism, psychopathy and criminality. <u>Arch. crim. Psychodynamics</u> , 4, 599-646 | 3 |

15. KUZNETSOV, A. (1967): Qualification of offences committed under the impact of strong emotional disturbances. Sovetskaia Iustitsia, 31 (7), 22-23 14
16. McCORD, W. and J. McCORD (1964): The psychopath: an essay on the criminal mind. Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand. 4
17. MURDOCH, B.D. (1971): Aggressie en psigopatie by gevangenes: 'n neuropsigologiese studie. Confidential Report, Pers 155, Johannesburg. SACSIR, NIPR 20
18. NELSON, G.K. and B.D. MURDOCH (1971): Brain-funksie, emosionele volwassenheid en aggressie by psigopatiiese en nie-psigopatiiese gevangenes. Confidential Report, Pers 143, Johannesburg. SACSIR, NIPR. 23, 24, 26
19. RODRIGUEZ, J.M.G. (1965): Constitutional criminals and psycho-surgery. Internat. Annals of Criminol., 2, 347-360 21
20. SIM, M. (1963): Guide to Psychiatry. Edinburgh and London, E. & S. Livingstone. 11
21. WAIDER, H. (1967): Criminological evaluation of psychopaths. Goltdammers' Archiv. für Strafrecht, no vol. (7), 193-199 15

Appendix A

Significantly discriminating items

Scale 1

1. Emotional immaturity: lack of trust.

- 42. always feels that others are harming his interests
- 68. always suspicious of the motives of others
- 24. takes sarcasm seriously
- 132. does not easily forget the rudeness of an acquaintance

2. Emotional control

a) irritability:

- 102. becomes very impatient under unpleasant circumstances
- 79. cannot be at all tactful when becoming cross
- 145. impatient with rebellious people
- 115. cannot tolerate much when he has problems at home
- 85. is very indignant if someone treats him inconsiderately
- 149. is easily upset in an insulting situation
- 131. is very easily irritated

b) impulsivity:

- 49. will not hesitate to attack someone who tries to make fun of him
- 140. loses his temper if an injustice is done to a member of his family
- 148. loses his temper when someone is wilful

c) lack of self-control:

- 31. experiences uncontrollable rage when someone shows a defiant attitude
- 77. becomes furious if someone dares strike him
- 40. becomes unreasonably angry when someone harms his interests
- 70. has no control over his emotions
- 116. loses self-control when involved in an argument

- 119. is beside himself with rage when someone is rude to him
- 144. unable to control his emotions when annoyed

Scale 2.

Self-confidence:

- 128. feels inferior if someone of the opposite sex makes fun of him
- 71. always feels inferior to persons of the opposite sex who have achieved more than he has
- 56. feels inferior to people wealthier than himself
- 104. has difficulty in getting along with strangers in a strange place
- 5. feels uncomfortable in any company
- 1. is convinced that he never makes a good impression
- 22. always does the wrong thing
- 124. is inclined to be pessimistic

Scale 3

1. Selfishness:

- 30. does only what will benefit himself
- 60. always places his own interests first
- 69. is very selfish where money is concerned
- 107. dislikes having to share his privileges
- 109. is very selfish when his own physical well-being is involved
- 36. is only selfish when taking care of his own interests

2. Tactlessness:

a) tactlessness:

- 51. does not have the patience to be tactful
- 37. behaves tactlessly when someone adopts a challenging attitude
- 38. is often tactless when in a hurry
- 108. cannot be tactful when provoked
- 20. states his opinion regardless of time or place
- 50. usually talks even when it would be better to remain silent
- 59. his behaviour often offends others

74. often makes people angry with him

120. often hurts others' feelings

b) unpleasantness

26. can be very unfriendly

123. is often unfriendly towards acquaintances

55. always becomes very unpleasant when he has not been able to do his best

127. is a person who has no peace for his soul

Scale 4

Overt aggression

146. is pugnacious by nature

14. likes physically attacking someone

90. enjoys being involved in a fist fight

52. always picks a quarrel with pugnacious people

15. always tries to settle things with a fight

18. is quick to settle an argument with his fists

75. never avoids a row

13. fights with his fists if anyone tries to boss him

63. is keen to use his fists should anyone dare to differ from him in an opinion

82. is eager to fight if someone differs from him on politics

129. is always eager to fight when he loses

136. is always prepared to use his fists if his interests are harmed

143. will get involved in a fight if his friends encourage him

54. will fight back if provoked

61. fights back if wronged

122. cannot bear any opposition

Appendix B

The 48-item questionnaire

Item No.	Scale	Item
1.	2	is convinced that he never makes a good impression
5.	2	feels uncomfortable in any company
20.	3	states his opinion regardless of time or place
22.	2	always does the wrong thing
24.	1	takes sarcasm seriously
26.	3	can be very unfriendly
30.	3	does only what will benefit himself
31.	1	experiences uncontrollable rage when someone shows a defiant attitude
36.	3	is only selfish when taking care of his own interests
37.	3	behaves tactlessly when someone adopts a challenging attitude
38.	3	is often tactless when in a hurry
40.	1	becomes unreasonably angry when someone harms his interests
42.	1	always feels that others are harming his interests
49.	1	will not hesitate to attack someone who tries to make fun of him
50.	3	usually talks even when it would be better to remain silent
51.	3	does not have the patience to be tactful
55.	3	always becomes very unpleasant when he has not been able to do his best
56.	2	feels inferior to people wealthier than himself
59.	3	his behaviour often offends others
60.	3	always places his own interests first
68.	1	always suspicious of the motives of others
69.	3	is very selfish where money is concerned
70.	1	has no control over his emotions
71.	2	always feels inferior to persons of the opposite sex who have achieved more than he has
74.	3	often makes people angry with him

Item No.	Scale	Item
77.	1	becomes furious if someone dares strike him
79.	1	cannot be at all tactful when becoming cross
85.	1	is very indignant if someone treats him inconsiderately
102.	1	becomes very impatient under unpleasant circumstances
104.	2	has difficulty in getting along with strangers in a strange place
107.	3	dislikes having to share privileges
108.	3	cannot be tactful when provoked
109.	3	is very selfish when his own physical wellbeing is involved
115.	1	cannot tolerate much when he has problems at home
116.	1	loses self-control when involved in an argument
119.	1	is beside himself with rage when someone is rude to him
120.	3	often hurts others' feelings
123.	3	is often unfriendly towards acquaintances
124.	2	is inclined to be pessimistic
127.	3	is a person who has no peace for his soul
128.	2	feels inferior if someone of the opposite sex makes fun of him
131.	1	is very easily irritated
132.	1	does not easily forget the rudeness of an acquaintance
140.	1	loses his temper if an injustice is done to a member of his family
144.	1	unable to control his emotions when annoyed
145.	1	impatient with rebellious people
148.	1	loses his temper when someone is wilful
149.	1	is easily upset in an insulting situation

