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Abstract

This study examined the impact of personality characteristics of individual raters on the scoring of the PCL-R to determine if individuals who endorsed psychopathic personality characteristics would be more adept at detecting psychopathy in other individuals. It was hypothesized that individuals who scored higher on the TriPM and displayed personality characteristics resembling psychopathy would be more accurate at detecting psychopathy in other individuals and thus would rate a sample case as higher in psychopathy. Although there were no significant correlations between PCL-R Factors and TriPM Dimensions, we found two negative correlations approaching significance: PCL-R Total Score and TriPM Meanness Score ($p=0.085$), and PCL-R Factor 2 Score and TriPM Meanness Score ($p=0.064$). This could indicate that individuals who endorse psychopathic personality characteristics, particularly Meanness, could interpret psychopathic behavior as normative and would not be able to detect psychopathy in a sample case file.
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The Influence of Personality on Individual’s Ratings of Psychopathy

Psychopathy has captured the attention of the general population for many years. According to NewsLibrary.com, from 1983-present there were 2,107 articles written about psychopathy in the United States. “Perhaps the obsession of the general population with psychopathy is a result that over 1 percent of US citizens can be classified as potentially psychopathic (Neumann and Hare, 2008).” Although psychopathy was originally used to describe a plethora of mental disorders, today’s media uses the term to describe particularly abhorrent and unnatural offenses.

Historical Overview of Psychopathy

The modern perception of psychopathy has been linked to the works of Pinel and Pritchard (1835) with their concepts of *manie sans délire* and *moral insanity*, which both described abnormal behaviors and emotions with the absence of delusions or hallucinations. The first documented use of a description related to psychopathy was *psychopatisch* used in Germany to describe a “suffering mind”. In 1891 the idea of “psychopathic inferiority” became a popular term for all mental disorders and social aberrations. The word psychopath was shortened by the media to the slang word *psycho* and has become jargon in American pop culture society.

*The Mask of Sanity*, published by Hervey Cleckley in 1941, was the first to shape modern American conceptualizations of psychopathy. Cleckley’s work paved the way for modern psychologists and depicted psychopathy as “an outwardly perfect mimic of a normally functioning person, able to mask the fundamental lack of internal personality structure and chaos” (Cleckley, 1941).

For the purposes of this study, the term psychopathy will be used to describe personality traits influenced by both genetic and environmental factors, characterized by enduring antisocial
behavior, diminished empathy or remorse, and disinhibited or bold behavior. While there are multiple ways to measure psychopathy in individuals, some of the most commonly used measures are described below.

**Measurements of Psychopathy**

**Psychopathy Checklist-Revised**

The Hare Psychopathy Checklist- Revised (PCL-R) is the most common tool used to assess psychopathy in individuals (Vitacco et al, 2005; DeMatteo and Edens, 2006; Venables et al, 2013). It is a 20-item inventory assessing perceived personality traits and observable behaviors. A semi-structured interview along with official records and additional information on the individual are used for scoring. Mental health professionals rate individuals and the dimensional score of the individual on the PCL-R is used for clinical, research, and legal purposes (Hare Psychopathy Checklist).

The PCL-R has two factors: Factor 1 (Interpersonal/Affective) and Factor 2 (Lifestyle/Antisocial). PCL-R Factor 1 is correlated with Narcissistic Personality Disorder and is generally thought of as the personality trait component of the PCL-R (Huchzermeler et al, 2007). PCL-R Factor 2 is correlated with Antisocial Personality Disorder and Borderline Personality Disorder and is generally thought of as the behavioral component of the PCL-R (Skeem et al, 2003).

Although the PCL-R is still the most widely used measurement for assessing psychopathy, meta-analyses have found that the inclusion of past offending history, rather than personality traits, is responsible for high scores on the PCL-R (Franklin, 2011). Inter-rater reliability has been weak, with Factor 1 scores differing the most. One of the main criticisms of the PCL-R is its two-factor structure with “a focus on antisocial and criminal behaviors rather
than personality features (that) detract(s) from its overall utility” (Edens, Poythress, & Watkins, 2001).

**Psychopathic Personality Inventory**

The Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI-R) is an alternative personality test for traits associated with psychopathy in adults. It is comprised of 154 items that are organized into eight subscales, are generally grouped into two separate factors, and can be used to study non-clinical samples (Skeem et al., 2011). Factor 1, called Fearless Dominance, includes subscales such as social influence, fearlessness, and stress immunity. Factor 2, called Impulsive Antisociality, includes subscales such as Machiavellian egocentricity, rebellious nonconformity, blame externalization, and carefree nonplanfulness. However the PPI, like the PCL-R, uses only two factors to describe psychopathy. Given the criticisms of two factors measures, Cooke and Michie (2001) have proposed using a three-factor structure rather than a two-factor structure for detecting psychopathy.

**Three Factor Measures of Psychopathy**

According to Patrick and Drislane (2013), The Triarchic Model of Psychopathy defines psychopathy as three distinctive, but interactive phenotypic tendencies: boldness, meanness, and disinhibition.

The Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM, Patrick 2009) is a personality questionnaire developed to operationalize the Triarchic Model of Psychopathy that measures these three phenotypic dimensions. Unlike the PCL-R, which only relies on two factors and requires a criminal component, the TriPM examines personality traits in the general population by using three factors: boldness, meanness, and disinhibition.
Impact of Personality Characteristics on PCL-R Ratings

Boccaccini, Turner, and Murrie (2008) found that more than 30% of the variability in PCL-R scores was attributable to differences among evaluators, with mean PCL-R scores given by two of the most prolific evaluators differing by almost 10 points. Murrie et al. (2012) found that scores on the PCL-R reported by state experts were much higher than those reported by defense experts in sexually violent predator cases. Miller et al. (2011) were the first to propose that discrepancies in PCL-R scores could depend on the personality of the person doing the rating. “Because PCL-R scoring may have substantial implications for offenders, it is important to examine rater characteristics that may help explain differences in the PCL-R scores they assign” (Miller et al., 2011).

Miller et al. (2011) suggested that personality characteristics including agreeableness, interpersonal dissonance, impulsiveness, and psychopathy resemblance are all factors that may influence a rater’s scores for the PCL-R. By comparing the PPI and the PCL-R, Miller’s study was the first to examine the relationship between raters’ personality characteristics and their PCL-R ratings. Miller et al. (2011) suggests “raters’ resemblance to… psychopathy facets… related to higher scoring of the offenders on the PCL-R”.

This study however, had a relatively small sample size (n=22), admittedly “speculative hypotheses”, and participants with varied training and experience with the PCL-R (Miller et al, 2011). Miller’s study did not use a validity check to ensure that participants attended to the stimulus. Examining the relationship between the PCL-R and a new, three-factor measure of psychopathy, such as the TriPM, will provide further insight into whether specific rater characteristics impact PCL-R ratings and the implications these characteristics have for both offenders and individuals selecting raters.
The Current Study

Given the popularity of psychopathy and the PCL-R, this study re-examined the study of Miller et al. (2011) and attempted to mitigate the problems associated with it (i.e., small sample size, inconsistencies with training, and lack of a validity check). This study examined the impact of personality characteristics of individual raters on the scoring of the PCL-R to determine if individuals who endorsed psychopathic personality characteristics would be more adept at detecting psychopathy in other individuals.

This is, to our knowledge, the first comparison of a three-factor psychopathic personality assessment (TriPM) with the PCL-R. Both the TriPM and the PCL-R measure personality traits typically associated with psychopathy such as glibness/superficial charm, grandiose sense of self-worth, pathological lying, cunning/manipulation, lack of remorse or guilt, shallow affect, lack of empathy, and failure to accept responsibility.

The current study measured psychopathy characteristics in raters and examined the impact of these traits on their ratings of the PCL-R. A non-trained sample population was used during the course of this study, as there is evidence that even non-trained raters can detect psychopathy (Patrick, Fowler, and Lillienfeld 2009). It was hypothesized that individuals who scored higher on the TriPM and displayed personality characteristics resembling psychopathy would be more adept at detecting psychopathy in other individuals and thus would rate a sample case as higher in psychopathy.

Methods

Participants

This study was conducted using undergraduate psychology students at Florida State University who received credit for their participation in this study. Data was collected from 108
participants, however only 100 participants were used in final analyses. Ages for all participants ranged from 18-34 years old. The mean age of the participants was 20.1 (SD= 2.1). See Table 1 for self-identified gender and race/ethnicity of participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics Of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The race/ethnicity of participants was similar to Florida State University’s student population. The distribution of race/ethnicity at Florida State University is as follows: 64.8% Caucasian, 8.5% African-American, 15% Hispanic, 2.0% bi-racial, and 3.1% American-Indian/Asian/Pacific Islander (FSU Office of Institutional Research, 2013).

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Florida State University. A copy of the approval letter can be found in Appendix A.

**Measures**

**Triarchic Psychopathy Measure**

The Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM) is a 58-item self-report questionnaire developed by Patrick (2009) that aims to operationalize the Triarchic Model of Psychopathy (Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger, 2009). Items on the TriPM Disinhibition (20 items) and Meanness (19 items) scales are from the Externalizing Spectrum Inventory (ESI; Krueger et al., 2007). The TriPM Disinhibition scale focuses on traits including Impulsivity, Irresponsibility, Boredom
Proneness, Impatient Urgency, Alienation, Theft, Fraudulence, and lack of Dependability and Planful Control. The TriPM Meanness scales focuses on the following traits: Lack of Empathy, Relational Aggression, Excitement Seeking, Destructive Aggression, Physical Aggression, and Dishonesty (Patrick and Drislane, 2013). The TriPM Boldness scales consists of 19 items examining fearless tendencies such as persuasiveness, social assurance, dominance, resiliency, self-assurance, optimism, courage, thrill seeking, and tolerance for uncertainty (Kramer et al., 2012). Stanley et al. (2013) reported incremental validity for the TriPM in predicting personality traits of known relevance to psychopathy over and above a comparable-length short form of the PPI.

Items are answered using a 4-point Likert scale: true, somewhat true, somewhat false, and false. Using both positive and negative questions, the ranges of scores for each scale are as follows: Boldness (0-57), Meanness (0-57) and Disinhibition (0-60). (See Appendix B for a copy of the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure). The average scores for a criminal population sample on the TriPM is as follows: Disinhibition ($\mu = 37.05$, SD= 12.76) and Meanness ($\mu =17.89$, SD=12.55). The average scores for a student sample are lower than the criminal population: Disinhibition ($\mu = 11.80$, SD= 7.60) and Meanness ($\mu =11.15$, SD.7.37) (pers. comm., C.J. Patrick).

**Psychopathy Checklist-Revised**

The Psychopathy Checklist- Revised (PCL-R) is a 20-item, clinician-scored instrument for the assessment of psychopathy (Hare, 2003). Standard administration of the PCL-R requires a semi-structured interview, records, and collateral information to score each item. Each item is rated on a 0-2 scale (absent, equivocal, or present) and is summed to yield a total psychopathy score, with scores of 30 or higher considered indicative of psychopathy (Hare, 2003).
There are two factors or sub-dimensions of the PCL-R: Interpersonal-Affective Factor (Factor 1) and Impulsive-Antisocial Factor (Factor 2). Factor 1 items include superficial charm, grandiosity, cunning/deceptiveness, absence of remorse or empathy, shallow affect, and externalization of blame. Factor 2 items include early behavioral problems, impulsivity, irresponsibility, boredom proneness, lack of long-term goals, and hot-tempered aggressiveness (Harpur, Hakstian, & Hare, 1988; Hare, Harpur, Hakstian, Forth, Hart, & Newman, 1990). Scores on Factor 1 can range from 0-16, and scores on Factor 2 can range from 0-18. (See Appendix C for a copy of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised)

PCL-R Instructions Sheet and Item Description Packet

PCL-R Instructions Sheet and Item Description Packet was given to participants along with the PCL-R. This instruction sheet explains how the PCL-R is scored and includes an example for scoring an item on the PCL-R. Participants were also given a PCL-R Item Description Packet that contained a definition of each item, a list of characteristics, and examples for possible scores on each item. Participants were allowed to review these materials at any point during the study. (See Appendices D and E for copies of the PCL-R Instructions Sheet and the PCL-R Item Description Packet).

Sample Case File

A Sample Case File (CF) was given to the participants to score using the PCL-R. The participants each received a de-identified case of an individual suspected of being psychopathic to rate during the study. The case file included: interviews with the individual, background information on the individual, demographics of the individual, and the individual’s rap sheet. The CF interview was conducted professionally and was intended to provide the information needed for the PCL-R. Background and Demographic Information on the individual includes
personal history (date of birth, hometown, school records, etc.) to further clarify information given in the interview. The rap sheet will show details of the individual’s crime and convictions. The sample case file was provided by Dr. Chris Patrick (Florida State University, 2014).

**Distractor Task**

A Distractor Task was administered to the participants between the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure and the PCL-R rating. This was a one-page work sheet containing 10 questions consisting of various brainteasers and riddles. The participants were given explicit instructions that all questions must be answered before they could move to the next section. The distractor task was not used in data analysis but rather was used to divert attention from the purpose of the study. (See Appendix G for a copy of the Distractor Task).

**Procedure**

For this study, participants entered the lab and were seated at separate cubicles. One to four people participated in each session. A copy of the protocol can be found in Appendix H. Participants were given the consent form and read the following (See Appendix I for a copy of the consent form):

*Here is the consent form that I need you to read and sign. This study will consist of three parts and should take no more than one and a half hours to complete. During this study you will be answering questions and filling out answers on paper. All of your answers will be kept confidential and nothing will have your name on it. Your participation is voluntary and you can stop at anytime. However, to receive full credit you must finish the study.*

Once each participant had read and signed the consent form, participants were each given the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM) (Appendix B). Participants were read the following:
Now we will begin the first part of the study. Please read the questions carefully. Bubble in the most appropriate answer for you. If you have any questions please raise your hand. When you have finished the questionnaire please raise your hand and I will give you the next part.

Following completion of the TriPM, the experimenter collected the TriPM questionnaire. Participants were then given instructions individually based on the speed with which participants completed each questionnaire. Participants were then given the distractor task (Appendix G) and read the following:

Now we will begin the second part of this study. There are a total of 10 questions. All of the items must be answered so if you feel you do not know an answer take your best guess. Once you are done please raise your hand and I will give you the final part.

Once a participant completed the distractor task, the experimenter collected the task and handed the participant the PCL-R Instruction Sheet (Appendix D) and the PCL-R Item Description Packet (Appendix E). The participants were then read the following:

This is the final part of the study. The PCL-R is a 20-item checklist used to determine if a criminal offender is psychopathic. Please thoroughly read through each item description on the PCL-R Item Description. While you read you should look over the PCL-R checklist to see how each item is scored. When you have finished reading each item description please raise your hand.

Once finished, participants were asked if they had any questions concerning the PCL-R. If not, the experimenter gave each participant the sample case file (Appendix F) and read the following:
This is a case file of an actual prison inmate, which includes an interview with the inmate and their rap sheet (crimes they’ve committed). Your task is to read through this interview and score this inmate on the PCL-R. As you previously read; a score of 0 means that item is not applicable to the inmate, 1 is somewhat applicable, 2 is completely applicable. If at any point you need an example, look on the instructions page given to you with the PCL-R Item Description. You can refer back to the PCL-R Item Description at any point while reviewing the case file. Take your time reading through the case and score the inmate. Once you have finished scoring the inmate on the PCL-R Checklist please raise your hand.

After the participant read through all of the materials, they were given the PCL-R Checklist (Appendix C) to complete. Participants were asked to complete a demographics sheet with basic information including: age, gender, race, and questions regarding prior PCL-R training. (See Appendix J for a copy of the Demographics Sheet). Participants were then given a credit slip and debriefed on the true purpose for the study. At the conclusion of the study, participants were asked if they would like a copy of the Debriefing Form. (See Appendix K for a copy of the Debriefing Form).

Results

Sample Population

Four of the 108 participants had received prior training on the PCL-R in psychology courses at Florida State University and were not included in the analyses. The remaining 104 participants had not received any training. Item 20 on the PCL-R, “Criminal Versatility”, was used in this study as a measure of validity. To assess whether the participants were attentive and
careful when scoring on the PCL-R, we took Item 20 “Criminal Versatility” and looked at what score participants gave to the person depicted in the CF.

Item 20, “Criminal Versatility”, is an objective item that requires participants to count the number of different crimes the individual has committed, which can be found on the individual’s rap sheet that was provided to them. Directions for scoring Item 20 on the PCL-R were as follows:

- 6 or more types of offenses is scored as 2,
- 4 or 5 types of offenses is scored as 1, and
- 3 or fewer types of offenses is scored as 0.

Based on the Sample Case File given to the participants, the person depicted in the CF should be scored a 2. Four of the 104 remaining participants scored the individual as a 1 or 0 and were removed from final analyses, as they appeared not to have attended to the stimuli. The remaining sample \( n=100 \) was used in all analyses.

**TriPM**

The mean total score on the TriPM was 61.36 with boldness, meanness, and disinhibition having mean scores of 34.57, 11.45, and 15.56, respectively (Table 2). These mean scores appear similar to other populations who were administered the TriPM: Boldness Score \( (\mu = 33.58, \ SD = 7.71) \), Meanness Score \( (\mu = 13.52, \ SD = 8.41) \), and Disinhibition Score \( (\mu = 15.23, \ SD = 7.40) \) (pers. comm., C.J. Patrick).

The TriPM total score was positively correlated with Boldness \( (r = 0.581) \), Meanness \( (r = 0.763) \), and Disinhibition \( (r = 0.666) \) scores \( (p = 0.00) \). TriPM Boldness scores were positively correlated with Meanness scores \( r = 0.237 \) \( (p = 0.009) \). TriPM Meanness scores were also positively correlated with Disinhibition scores \( r = 0.342 \) \( (p = 0.00) \). However, TriPM Boldness scores were not correlated with Disinhibition scores \( r = -0.022 \) \( (p = 0.415) \) (Table 4).
Table 2
TriPM Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>61.36</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boldness</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanness</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinhibition</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD, Standard Deviation

PCL-R

The mean total score in this study of the PCL-R was 31.89 with Factor 1 and Factor 2 having mean scores of 11.80 and 15.00, respectively (Table 4). These scores were relatively low, when compared to scores by a trained psychologist: PCL-R Total Score (39.00), Factor 1 (16.00), and Factor 2 (17.00) (pers. comm., C.J. Patrick). PCL-R Total score was positively correlated with Factor 1 ($r = 0.902$) and Factor 2 ($r = 0.801$) scores ($p = 0.00$). PCL-R Factor 1 scores were positively correlated with Factor 2 scores ($r = 0.512$, $p = 0.00$; Table 4).

Table 3
PCL-R Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>31.89</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD= Standard Deviation


Relationships Between and Within PCL-R and TriPM

Overall, PCL-R Total scores were not correlated with TriPM Factors (Pearson’s correlation, \( r = 0.034, p = 0.507 \)). PCL-R Total scores were not correlated with TriPM Total (\( r = -0.12, p = 0.117 \)), Boldness (\( r = -0.05, p = 0.325 \)), or Disinhibition (\( r = -0.03, p = 0.376 \)) scores (Figure 1). There was a negative correlation, approaching significance, between PCL-R Total score and Meanness score (\( r = -0.14, p = 0.085 \)) (Table 4).

Conversely, TriPM Total scores were not correlated with PCL-R Total scores or PCL-R Factors (Pearson’s correlation, \( r = 0.016, p = 0.666 \)). TriPM Total scores were not correlated with PCL-R Total (\( r = -0.12, p = 0.117 \)), PCL-R Factor 1 (\( r = -0.11, p = 0.136 \)), or PCL-R Factor 2 (\( r = -0.11, p = 0.144 \)) scores (Table 4).

PCL-R Factor 1 scores were not correlated with TriPM Total scores or TriPM Boldness, Meanness, or Disinhibition scores (Pearson’s correlation, \( r = 0.028, p = 0.602 \)). PCL-R Factor 1 scores were not correlated with TriPM Total score (\( r = -0.11, p = 0.136 \)), Boldness (\( r = -0.12, p = 0.119 \)), Meanness (\( r = -0.10, p = 0.152 \)), or Disinhibition scores (\( r = 0.01, p = 0.454 \)) (Table 4).

PCL-R Factor 2 scores were not correlated with TriPM Total scores or TriPM Boldness, Meanness, or Disinhibition scores (Pearson’s correlation, \( r = 0.046, p = 0.338 \)). PCL-R Factor 2 scores were not correlated with TriPM Total score (\( r = -0.12, p = 0.144 \)), Boldness (\( r = 0.05, p = 0.321 \)), or Disinhibition score (\( r = -0.80, p = 0.215 \)). There was a negative correlation, approaching significance between PCL-R Factor 2 score and TriPM Meanness score (\( r = -0.15, p = 0.064 \)) (Table 4).
Table 4
Correlation Matrix of PCL-R and TriPM Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PCL-R T</th>
<th>PCL-R F1</th>
<th>PCL-R F2</th>
<th>TriPM T</th>
<th>TriPM B</th>
<th>TriPM M</th>
<th>TriPM D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCL-R T</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.00)</td>
<td>(p=0.00)</td>
<td>(p=0.136)</td>
<td>(p=0.05)</td>
<td>(p=0.00)</td>
<td>(p=0.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCL-R F1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.00)</td>
<td>(p=0.117)</td>
<td>(p=0.12)</td>
<td>(p=0.009)</td>
<td>(p=0.009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCL-R F2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.144)</td>
<td>(p=0.321)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriPM T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.321)</td>
<td>(p=0.064)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriPM B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.009)</td>
<td>(p=0.415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriPM M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.009)</td>
<td>(p=0.415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriPM D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.009)</td>
<td>(p=0.415)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCL-R T= PCL-R Total Score, PCL-R F1= PCL-R Factor 1 Score, PCL-R F2= PCL-R Factor 2 Score, TriPM T= TriPM Total Score, TriPM B= TriPM Boldness Score, TriPM M= TriPM Meanness Score, TriPM D= TriPM Disinhibition Score.

Regression Analysis of PCL-R and TriPM Total Scores

A regression analysis was conducted with PCL-R Total Score as the criterion variable and TriPM Total Score as the predictor. TriPM Total Score was not a significant predictor of PCL-R Total Score ($\beta = 0.39, t(98) = -1.208, p = 0.230$) and accounted for 1.4% ($R^2 = 0.01468$) of the variance in PCL-R Scores. (See Figure 1).

Regression Analysis of PCL-R Total Score and TriPM Meanness Score

A regression analysis was also conducted with the PCL-R Total Score as the criterion variable and TriPM Meanness Score as the predictor. TriPM Meanness Score was a marginally significant predictor of PCL-R Total Score ($\beta = 0.21, t(98) = -1.390, p = 0.167$) and accounted for 1.9% ($R^2 = 0.01937$) of the variance in PCL-R Scores. (See Figure 2).
Discussion

It was hypothesized that individuals who scored higher on the TriPM, indicating they endorsed more psychopathic personality characteristics, would be more adept at detecting psychopathy in other individuals and cause them to rate a sample case higher on the PCL-R. The results indicated that a subject’s individual score on the TriPM was not correlated with the
scoring of the sample case on the PCL-R. There were no significant correlations between PCL-R Factors and TriPM Dimensions.

The lack of predictive power between an individual’s TriPM Total Score and their rating of the sample case on the PCL-R indicated that in the student population studied, an individual’s score on a measure of psychopathy did not make them more accurate at detecting psychopathy in other individuals. Many other factors including but not limited to training, cultural biases, and perhaps genetic effects could influence an individual’s ability to detect psychopathy.

Mean scores on the PCL-R for this sample population was lower on average when compared to a trained psychologist. The largest discrepancy between the sample population and the trained psychologist scores was Factor 1 scores. One possibility is that participants in this study were unable to detect attributes indicative of Factor 1 scores; which included Affective/Interpersonal personality characteristics. Factor 2 scores in this study were much more accurate when compared to a trained psychologist. This could indicate that an untrained sample was more adept at detecting behavioral characteristics of psychopathy when examining a sample case file.

**TriPM Meanness Scores and the PCL-R**

Although there were no significant correlations between PCL-R Factors and TriPM Dimensions, we found two negative correlations approaching significance: PCL-R Total Score and TriPM Meanness Score (p=0.085), and PCL-R Factor 2 Score and TriPM Meanness Score (p=0.064). There was no relationship between PCL-R Factor 1 Scores and TriPM Meanness scores (p=0.064), indicating that the negative correlation approaching significance between PCL-R Total Score and TriPM Meanness score was due to PCL-R Factor 2 Scores.
TriPM Meanness Scores are associated with personality characteristics such as lack of empathy, detached attachment styles, and cruel behavior, and PCL-R Factor 2 Scores are characterized by Lifestyle and Antisocial personality traits such as: need for stimulation/proneness to boredom, impulsivity, poor behavior behavioral controls among other traits. Participants who scored higher on TriPM Meanness may have seen the behavior of the person depicted in the CF as normative and, therefore, did not score the individual high on Factor 2. This indicates that individuals who endorse psychopathic personality characteristics, particularly Meanness, could interpret psychopathic behavior as normative and would not be able to detect psychopathy in other individuals.

Because the PCL-R is the most widely used tool for detecting psychopathy, it is important to understand extraneous factors that could affect overall PCL-R scores. Individuals who have personality characteristics in the TriPM Meanness Dimension such as lack of empathy, relational aggression, and dishonesty may be inherently biased toward perceiving psychopathic behavioral patterns as non-psychopathic. To get an accurate depiction of psychopathy, it is important to examine the rater’s personality characteristics because raters who score high on the TriPM Meanness Dimension could potentially confound PCL-R ratings and produce false negative classifications.

**Implications for Future Research**

This study examined whether or not psychopathic personality characteristics in a student sample population influence the sample’s ability to rate psychopathy in a sample case file. Mean PCL-R Factor 1 scores (11.80) compared to PCL-R Factor 2 Scores (15.00) were slightly lower, indicating that participants could not identify psychopathic personality characteristics as easily as behavioral patterns of psychopathy.
Because participants in this study had no prior training on the PCL-R, it is possible that Factor 1 scores, characterized by interpersonal/ affective characteristics, were more difficult to rate. Therefore, replicating this study with participants who received prior training on the PCL-R may increase the probability of a positive correlation between TriPM Total Scores and PCL-R Total Scores.

An individual’s culture can also have a substantial impact on one’s personality and subsequently, one’s ability to detect psychopathy in others. The prevalence of the term psychopathy in American pop culture society could influence participants’ ratings on the PCL-R. The base knowledge, along with misconceptions, surrounding psychopathy in American pop culture society could influence participants’ abilities to detect psychopathy, and conducting a cross-cultural comparison with a culture where psychopathy is not as widely covered in mainstream media would allow one to test for specific cultural influences on the ability to detect psychopathy.

Because an individual’s behavior is influenced by both genetic and environmental factors, it is possible that certain genetic influences could influence ones ability to detect psychopathy. One genetic effect that could potentially influence an individual’s personality is an enzyme, Monoamine oxidase A (MAOA). Low activity MAOA, in combination with environmental factors, showed higher levels of aggression. High testosterone, maternal tobacco smoking, poor material living standards, and low IQ can also trigger violent behavior in men with low-activity alleles (Fergusson et al., 2012). Replicating this study, while accounting for genetic effects such as MAOA, would help elucidate innate factors that could affect an individual’s ability to detect psychopathy in other individuals.
This study attempted to re-examine the findings of Miller et al. (2011) while increasing the sample size and standardizing the population by using only untrained participants, using a three factor models of psychopathy, and including a validity check. Contrary to the findings of Miller et al. (2011), the findings of this study indicated that there was no relationship between TriPM scores of untrained participants and their scoring of a CF on the PCL-R. The lack of relationship between the TriPM and PCL-R Scores could be due to a number of factors including: possible genetic or culture influences and the lack of training for the participants.
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APPENDIX A

Office of the Vice President for Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 01/09/2014
To: Kristin Klimley <kek11d@my.fsu.edu>
Address: 800 Basin Street Apt 6204, Tallahassee, FL 32304
Dept.: PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair
Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
   The influence of personality on individual's ratings of psychopathy

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 01/08/2015 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Joyce Carbonell <carbonel@psy.fsu.edu>, Advisor
HSC No. 2013.11898
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Questionnaire: TriPM
Study ID: __________________
Subject ID: __________________
Date: ____________________

Directions: This questionnaire contains statements that different people might use to describe themselves. Each statement is followed by four choices: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐. The meaning of these four different choices is as follows:

☐ = True ☐ = somewhat true ☐ = somewhat false ☐ = False

For each statement, fill in the bubble for the choice that describes you best. There are no right or wrong answers; just choose the answer that best describes you.

Like this: ● Not like this: ✓ X /

Remember: Fill only one bubble per item. If you make a mistake cross out the incorrect answer with an X and fill in the correct option. Answer all of the items. Please work rapidly and do not spend too much time on any one statement.

1. I'm optimistic more often than not. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
2. How other people feel is important to me. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
3. I often act on immediate needs. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
4. I have no strong desire to parachute out of an airplane. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
5. I've often missed things I promised to attend. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
6. I would enjoy being in a high-speed chase. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
7. I am well-equipped to deal with stress. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
8. I don’t mind if someone I dislike gets hurt. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
9. My impulsive decisions have caused problems with loved ones. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
10. I get scared easily. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
11. I sympathize with others' problems. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
12. I have missed work without bothering to call in. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
13. I'm a born leader. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
14. I enjoy a good physical fight. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
15. I jump into things without thinking.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
16. I have a hard time making things turn out the way I want.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
17. I return insults.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
18. I've gotten in trouble because I missed too much school.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
19. I have a knack for influencing people.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
20. It doesn't bother me to see someone else in pain.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
21. I have good control over myself.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
22. I function well in new situations, even when unprepared.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
23. I enjoy pushing people around sometimes.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
24. I have taken money from someone's purse or wallet without asking.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
25. I don't think of myself as talented.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
26. I taunt people just to stir things up.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
27. People often abuse my trust.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
28. I'm afraid of far fewer things than most people.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
29. I don't see any point in worrying if what I do hurts someone else.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
30. I keep appointments I make.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
31. I often get bored quickly and lose interest.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
32. I can get over things that would traumatize others.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
33. I am sensitive to the feelings of others.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
34. I have conned people to get money from them.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
35. It worries me to go into an unfamiliar situation without knowing all the details.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
36. I don't have much sympathy for people.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
37. I get in trouble for not considering the consequences of my actions.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
38. I can convince people to do what I want.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
39. For me, honesty really is the best policy.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
40. I've injured people to see them in pain.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
41. I don't like to take the lead in groups.  \(\_\) \(\Box\) \(\_\) \(\Box\)
42. I sometimes insult people on purpose to get a reaction from them.  
   _ = True  □ = somewhat true  △ = somewhat false  ▶ = False
43. I have taken items from a store without paying for them.  
44. It's easy to embarrass me.  
45. Things are more fun if a little danger is involved.  
46. I have a hard time waiting patiently for things I want.  
47. I stay away from physical danger as much as I can.  
48. I don't care much if what I do hurts others.  
49. I have lost a friend because of irresponsible things I've done.  
50. I don't stack up well against most others.  
51. Others have told me they are concerned about my lack of self-control.  
52. It's easy for me to relate to other people's emotions.  
53. I have robbed someone.  
54. I never worry about making a fool of myself with others.  
55. It doesn't bother me when people around me are hurting.  
56. I have had problems at work because I was irresponsible.  
57. I'm not very good at influencing people.  
58. I have stolen something out of a vehicle.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject ID #:</th>
<th>Rater:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Psychopathy Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Glibness/superficial charm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grandiose sense of self worth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Need for stimulation/proneness to boredom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pathological lying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conning/manipulative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lack of remorse or guilt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shallow affect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Callous/lack of empathy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Parasitic lifestyle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Poor behavioral controls</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Promiscuous sexual behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Early behavior problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of realistic, long-term goals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Impulsivity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Irresponsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Failure to accept responsibility for own actions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Many short-term marital relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Juvenile delinquency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Revocation of conditional release</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Criminal versatility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: Total 16 / F1 18 / F2
Appendix D

PCL-R

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Complete diagnostic ratings for this male prison inmate using Hare's (2003) (PCL-R), and DSM-IV criteria. The relevant diagnostic information consists of: (i) a verbatim transcript of a structured life history interview with the offender, (ii) a file data form containing information transcribed from the inmate's prison files, and (iii) a copy of the inmate's criminal record ("rap sheet"). Make your ratings on the diagnostic rating forms provided.

- Assign a rating of 0, 1, or 2 for each item based on the diagnostic information provided (file, interview, rap sheet); for your convenience, the current file contains a summary of features to consider in rating each of the PCL-R items (see below, following APD rating form). To score APD, simply check the characteristics on the form that are evidenced in the interview or file.

EXAMPLE RATING:

Item 1 is “glibness/superficial charm". A rating of “0” would indicate that this person was not at all a smooth talker or a superficially personable, outgoing individual. A rating of “2” would indicate that he showed these characteristics to a high degree. A rating of “1” would indicate that he showed only modest evidence of this characteristic, or that information was mixed.
Appendix E

Psychopathy Checklist - Revised Item Criteria
(PCL_criteria.doc)

The following criteria are to be used in completing the PCL-R Ratings Form. These criteria are adapted directly from Hare’s PCL-R Manual, however, they are intended as a handy reference and aid to scoring rather than a substitute for comprehension of Hare’s full description of each item. Scoring conventions have been developed in our lab to promote valid and reliable scoring of psychopathy. These conventions, if applicable, follow the abbreviated versions of Hare’s item description.

1. Glibness/Superficial Charm
   - glib
   - verbally fascile
   - insincere, superficial charm
   - amusing and entertaining conversationalist
   - tells unlikely but convincing stories which tend to place subject in good light
   - seems too slick and smooth to be entirely believable

Scoring Conventions: Subjects who present as superficial but not charming, e.g. “tough guy” image, are typically scored “1”. Subjects who present as sincere and straightforward, shy and reserved, or immature and inadequate are typically scored, “0”.

2. Grandiose Sense of Self Worth
   - grossly inflated view of abilities/self worth
   - braggart, self assured, opinionated, cocky
   - not embarrassed by current circumstances, may view them as result of bad luck, unfaithful friends, sees self as victim of the system
   - does not see future as adversely affected by his/her contacts with the law
   - feels he's better than other inmates
   - wants to pursue a career with status

3. Need for Stimulation/Proneness to Boredom
   - takes chances/engages in risk taking behaviors
   - multiple drug use
   - complains that school, work, relationships are boring and tedious
   - frequently start and stops school, work, and relationships
4. Pathological Lying
- lying and deceit are characteristics of interactions with others
- easily and readily lies about events he knows can be checked out
- simply changes story when confronted with the facts
- lying may have intrinsic value as well as instrumental consequences
- discrepancies between interview and file information
- use of aliases or false identities

5. Conning/Manipulative
- use of deceit and deception to con, cheat or manipulate others
- use of schemes and scams: collecting social assistance under different names, bad checks, phony businesses
- use/manipulation of family members/intimate partners
- will do almost anything for money
- predatory belief that it would be foolish not to exploit the weaknesses of others

6. Lack of Remorse or Guilt
- general lack of concern for the negative consequences his actions have on others
- failure to appreciate the severity of his crime
- belief that sentence was too severe
- may blame victim, society, or extenuating circumstances for his crime
- repeated behavior that is clearly harmful/dangerous to others

7. Shallow Affect
- unable to experience a normal range and depth of experience
- can he provide details: health, whereabouts, financial status of those he claims to be close to
- how have deaths of sig. Others affected him: did he go to hospital, funeral
- are strong verbal accounts of emotion accompanied by appropriate nonverbal behavior

8. Callous/Lack Empathy
- profound lack of empathy and callous disregard for the feelings, rights, welfare of others
- cynical and selfish
- mocks those less fortunate
- may describe self as “loner by choice”
- callous sadistic treatment of others
- excessive violence towards people and property
9. Parasitic Lifestyle
- financial dependence on others is characteristic of lifestyle: family, friends, social assistance
- presents self as helpless, deserving of sympathy and support, uses threats or coercion or exploits victims weaknesses to get what he wants
- supports self through crime, pimping, “managing” prostitutes

10. Poor Behavioral Controls
- short tempered/ hot headed; takes offense easily
- responds to frustration, failure, discipline, and criticism with threats, violent behavior and verbal abuse
- becomes angry and aggressive over trivialities
- already poor behavioral controls are further weakened by alcohol

11. Promiscuous Sexual Behavior
- sexual relations are impersonal, casual or trivial
- frequent “one-night-stands”
- indiscriminate selection of sexual partners
- maintains more than one sexual relationship at a time
- frequent infidelities
- willingness to participate in a wide variety of sexual activities

12. Early Behavior Problems
- serious behavior problems age 12 and under
- persistent: lying, cheating, theft, robbery, fire-setting, truancy, disruption of classroom activities, substance abuse, vandalism, violence, bullying etc.
- more serious than those problems experienced by most children

13. Lack of Realistic, Long-Term Goals
- inability or unwillingness to formulate or carry out realistic long-term plans and goals
- lives day-to-day
- changes plans frequently
- does not give serious thought to the future, and doesn’t worry about it much
- may describe self as a “drifter”

14. Impulsivity
- behavior is impulsive, unpremeditated, and lacking in forethought
- does not weigh pros and cons or consider consequences of actions
- often breaks off relationships, quit jobs, change plans suddenly, or move place to place
- look for impulsivity in crimes, jobs, relationships, and general decision-making
15. Irresponsibility
- habitually fails to fulfill of honor obligations or commitments to others
- no sense of duty or loyalty to family, friends, employers, society, ideas or causes
- look for: poor credit rating, defaulting on loans, behavior that puts others at risk (drunk driving, recurrent speeding), frequently late or absent from work, failure to provide financial support for children

16. Failure to Accept Responsibility for Own Actions
- unable or unwilling to accept responsibility for own actions or consequences
- may blame: society, family, accomplices, victim, or claim that he was framed
- denial and minimization of own actions and their consequences

17. Short Term Marital Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Relationships Under Age 30</th>
<th>Number of Relationships Age 30 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>4 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 or none</td>
<td>2 or fewer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring Conventions: This item may be omitted if the subject is very young or has spent much of his/her adult life in prison, (unless the subject has still managed to have relationships).

18. Juvenile Delinquency
- history of serious antisocial behavior age 17 and below
- has charges and/or convictions for criminal and statutory offenses

19. Revocation of Conditional Release
- has violated conditional release (probation, parole, bond) or escaped from custody
- Examples: failure to report, dirty urines, new charges while on conditional release
- major violations (revocations) or escapes warrant a score of “2”
- minor violations including suspensions and fail to appear warrant a “1”

20. Criminal Versatility
- 6 or more types of offenses is scored “2”
- 4 or 5 types of offenses is scored “1”
- 3 or fewer types of offenses is scored “0”
- see PCL-R Manual for list of categories of offenses
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PCL-R CASE EXAMPLE: INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Date: February 26, 1985
ID: 85-HC-046
Age: 21
POB: Vancouver, BC

GENERAL INFORMATION:

A. HOW MUCH TIME DO YOU HAVE LEFT TO SERVE IN THIS INSTITUTION?
   4-8 months.
B. HAVE YOU EVER TAKEN A POLYGRAPH TEST BEFORE?
   No.

I. EDUCATION:

1. COMPLETED GRADE
   Grade 10.

2. FAILED GRADES
   Grade 1--too interested in showing off—thought I was a karate expert—chopped
   the toys. Got caught stealing in grade 4—put in another school. Grade 6—passed me
   through to grade 7.
   Started in I.T.A.—switched me to regular—couldn’t adapt.

3. ENJOYMENT LEVEL

   DID YOU FIND SCHOOL BORING OR THAT YOU COULDN’T PAY ATTENTION?
   Waste of time—a drag—I’d rather be out swimming and partying—something
   like that. Also, didn’t like authority.

4. ATTENDANCE LEVEL

   ABSENT AT LEAST 5 DAYS/YEAR FOR AT LEAST 2 YEARS, NOT INCLUDING FINAL YEAR IN
   SCHOOL?
   Every day—most of time, if at school, would be doing my own thing—not school
   work—might sit in classroom but would invent things like spitballs—go every day—but
   left early; or not go to school—> 5 days/year missed, at least.

5. PEER INTERACTIONS
   Depends—got along with kids who liked to skip out, etc.—Other kids—no! We
   were known to be troublemakers.

6. NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED
   (laugh) 12 or 13.

7. BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOL (ANY PROBLEMS?)

   DID YOU EVER GET IN TROUBLE AT SCHOOL (E.G. EVER HAULED DOWN TO THE PRINCIPAL’
   OFFICE?) HOW OFTEN?
EVER SUSPENDED OR EXPelled FROM SCHOOL FOR MISBEHAVIOR?
Fighting with principal--grade 8--charged with assault. Always troublemaker
in school--kicked out; sent home--harming other kids--tying teachers' legs together
with pants pulled down and making him run down the hall--funny, but wish I hadn't
done it. Kicked out first day of kindergarten. Every week someone would phone my
home--principal said to me: "Have you done your Christmas shoplifting yet?" Expelled
6 or 7 times--big red file on me: "Do not let in".

II. OCCUPATION
1. NATURE OF
2. LONGEST JOB
   1 month, Allied Aluminum--"legal" job, that is.
3. SHORTEST JOB
   1 day, carpet cleaner.
4. WHAT IS THE MOST JOBS THAT YOU'VE HAD IN ANY 5 YEAR PERIOD YOU CAN
   REMEMBER (MORE THAN 3?)
   Since 1974, I've had a permanent job--crime and filling up bed space.

5. EMPLOYMENT RECORD (AT LEAST 5 JOBS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>WHY LEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sterling Carpet Cleaners</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Quit because customer didn't pay--so I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demanded $ from the company--then quit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 day job--carpet cleaning--good job--guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>didn't like it--I figured &quot;What the hell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is this?&quot;--was upset--told company to give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>me $, then quit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Aluminum Window</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td>Got fired because of my record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas station</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Ripped them off blind--they couldn't prove it--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or 88</td>
<td></td>
<td>but got fired. They actually went bankrupt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They wouldn't give me my $--I got drunk and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>went back and robbed them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: Dickie Dee Ice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cream, Orange Julius--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stuff like that years ago--Odd jobs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roofing, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. WHAT DID YOU DO FROM THE TIME YOU LEFT SCHOOL TO THE TIME YOU STARTED YOUR FIRST JOB, I. E. FROM ___ TO ___?

7. HAVE YOU EVER HAD AN ILLEGAL OCCUPATION, E. G. PIMPING OR DRUG DEALING? IF YES, WHEN AND FOR HOW LONG?

   Run diamonds for people downtown. Sell coke, pot, stolen TVs. Launder $ for people, sell stolen beer to restaurants for 1/3 of price.

8. EVER COLLECTED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE? FOR HOW LONG? (laugh)—Have\n   n't worked long enough to collect UIC—but have cashed UIC checks. I "find" ‘em.

9. EVER COLLECTED WELFARE? FOR HOW LONG?

   easiest scam going—get everything you need—get $ for clothes, damage deposit,\n   anything. Can't count the number of times I collected—long time—since 17 or 18.

10. LONGEST TIME UNEMPLOYED? IF UNEMPLOYED FOR MORE THAN 2 MONTHS, WHERE DID YOU LIVE?

   Age 0-14. Since school, age 15-19; age 20 on. Where lived? Everywhere—have\n   own place sometimes—ever hear the song, "Wherever he hangs his hat is his home?"
   Lived with families as a front; friends; girlfriends; cousins; my own; in car; back of\n   motor bike.

11. WHY WERE YOU UNEMPLOYED?

    Party ing, having fun.

12. HOW MADE MONEY AT THIS TIME?

    Stole it; welfare; conned it. I've got stories that would make you chin hit the\n    floor—e. g. walk into a store—give guy sob story—explain why guy should believe me—\n    he does.

13. EVER TRAVEL FOR A LENGTH OF TIME WITHOUT A JOB OR ANY REAL PLANS? LONGEST TIME YOU'VE LACK A FIXED ADDRESS?

    Cross Canada—age 16—sent back several times by police. Always had an address—wherever I've gone I've had a place to stay.\n    Never had a fixed address—just places to stay.

14. RELIABILITY AS AN EMPLOYEE

HOW OFTEN ABSENT FROM WORK? (AVERAGE OF 3 OR MORE DAYS/MONTH LATE OR ABSENT?)

Good worker. Only when things started getting bad—gave up. Missed 3 days work\nin police station for B & E—my mom lied for me so I could keep my job.

15. TRADE/OCCUPATION WOULD LIKE TO WORK TOWARDS

    I'm a carpenter by trade—went to Fraser Valley College, Douglas College and all\n    that—built houses under the table—got my certificate—not legally done—but I have\n    built lots of houses. Know what I'd really like to do? Would like to sit back in a big\n    chair with 100,000 million dollars and say, "You do this, you do that"—would like to run\n    Ewing Oil.

16. HAVE YOU BEGUN PREPARING FOR THIS OCCUPATION IN ANY WAY?

    Carpenter? No—haven't checked. Have a job now when I get out—water works.\n    You asked me what I wanted to do, not what I'm looking for now. Wouldn't mind going\n    to school—take electronics course—be a computer technician—could do that if I wanted.

17. PERSONAL SATISFACTION WITH PAST JOBS
Right pissed off at Aluminum job—fired me—said they had too many workers—but was because of my record.

18. FINANCIAL SATISFACTION WITH PAST JOBS
   It was a job. Only one job I'd like to have. I just explained that to you (i.e. Ewing Oil).

19. WHAT WOULD YOUR CREDIT RATING BE LIKE? EXPLAIN
   Yes and no—owe people but they say I don't have to pay them. Does anyone owe me $—ask me that—Yes, but can't find them—it's like trying to get blood from a stone. Even my old lady did that—pawned my rings—my ex C/L—told her to hit the road.

III. FAMILY LIFE

1. BIRTH ORDER AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN
   1 of 3.

2. RAISED BY PARENTS?
   Yes and no. Until age 5 with family—then mom left dad—was raised with mom and boyfriend and other sibs.

3. DESCRIBE HOME LIFE
   Pain in the ass—I had to steal our Xmas presents; our food—had to thump out people who insulted my mom—that's where I got my aggressiveness from.

   DID YOU BREAK THE RULES AT HOME A LOT WHEN YOU WERE YOUNGER?
   No rules for me—did what I wanted, or else left. Mom's boyfriend tried to make me obey—tried to hit me; I beat the shit out of him. When younger—7, 8, 9—mom tried to make rules—I ignored them.

4. PARENTAL DRINKING, DRUG USE, VERBAL OR PHYSICAL FIGHTING
   Mom used to be a junkie—drank—used to try to hit me—I'd catch her hands—stop her—frustrated her.

5. WHICH PARENT LIKED BEST AND WHY
   Real father? Know him well. What's he like? He's an asshole—have you ever seen a dead cat? Used to beat on me when I was younger. My feelings are, they're family—neither one is my favorite—but if I do something to them, they deserve it—gave dad slap across the head every once in awhile.

6. CONTACT WITH WHILE ON THE STREET
   All the time.

7. CONTACT WITH WHILE INCARCERATED
   Talk to them all the time.

8. FAMILY ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE INCARCERATION
   Don't like it—but it's my problem—I have to live with it. Dad thinks, "Alright, I have an inside connection". Father's a junkie; mother's a millionaire—she married into it—far as I know anyway. Father is undependable, mother is dependable.

9. AT WHAT AGE LEFT HOME? ANY REASON FOR LEAVING AT THIS TIME?
   Age 14—don't know why—just wanted to go—bigger and better things.
EVER RUN AWAY FROM HOME AS A CHILD? HOW MANY TIMES?
Yes--how many times? That's hard to say--as many times as there are dots on
the TV screen after you turn it off--once ran away 3 times in one day.

10. RELATIONSHIP WITH SIBLINGS

PAST:
Brother--when we run into each other, have a good time; then don't see each
other for 2 years.

NOW:
Sister--see once very 5 years. We're really close, but doing our own thing now.

11. WHAT ARE THEY CURRENTLY DOING?
Sister--straight now--hasn't had any serious trouble. Brother trying to pull
himself out of trouble; so he doesn't end up like me.

12. OCCUPATION OF PARENTS
Mom--horse breeder at Exhibition Park. Dad--truck driver.

IV. MARRIAGE AND CHILDREN

1. MARRIAGE-LIKE RELATIONSHIPS
Current girlfriend--met her through "Easy Rider" magazine--she saw my ad in
there--wrote me a letter--1 month relationship. Visits; phone her every night, good
Ever married? Not legally. One time snuck into church at night--friend
married us; one time married in a pickup truck.
3 of 4 C/L.
C/L 1974 or 1975 until recently. Lived with her the longest time for a year or
two. Be with her on and off. Relationship? Hell—if I had my choice I'd strangle her—
she ripped me off.
C/L 1982--lived with her for 9 months. Living with 3 different women at that
time—but that's OK. Was difficult—hard to say "Hi" to the right name—if you're drunk,
you don't talk at all. Lots of times don't remember—get drunk. Don't remember unless
it's a real special occasion.

2. WHAT IS THE LARGEST NUMBER OF SEXUAL PARTNERS YOU HAVE HAD IN ANY ONE
YEAR SINCE THE AGE OF 18?
Many—i.e. 18th birthday—started in White Rock—1 after the other for 9 to 10
months.

3. HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU HAD MORE THAN ONE SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP AT ONE TIME?
Just about all my life—one's good for cooking, other for cleaning. Leave one at
home, take other out; if you spoil the one at home, she might not cook or clean as well.

4. HOW MANY ONE NIGHT STANDS HAVE YOU HAD?
1000's. I was brought up in group homes, on the street, etc.

5. HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU BEEN UNFAITHFUL TO A SPOUSE OR LIVE IN LOVER?
All the time.

6. CHILDREN THROUGH MARRIAGE
They say I do—-who? A few of them—-They don’t come and tell me for 2 months—
then, I don’t care. Never seen any of them.

V. PRESENT OFFENSES

1. CHARGE, DESCRIPTION OF EVENT AND ARREST, SENTENCE OF ACCOMPILCES:
   Assault causing bodily harm (ACBH)—Guy was playing with my girlfriend—back
   in 1983—gave him four warnings—started to smack him—don’t feel bad about it now—
   only thing I feel bad about is missing my freedom. Guy deserved what he got—lucky he
   didn’t get worse.

   WERE YOU NERVOUS OR FEARFUL AT THE TIME YOU COMMITTED THE OFFENSE? HOW
   ABOUT AT THE TIME OF ARREST?
   Went to hide—-passed out—-woke up—-cuffs on—-cops slapping me out—-felt sore—
   broke my toe on the guy’s head. No worry—figured I’d beat-it—get out on bail next day.
   No remorse.

2. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE (FAIR?):
   I year too much—because guy was provoking me, so I challenged him—he said
   O.K.—-that was enough for me.

3. WHY THAT PARTICULAR VICTIM/STORE/HOUSE?

4. TO WHAT EXTENT SHEER ACCIDENT, OR VICTIM OR CIRCUMSTANCES TO BLAME:
   Girlfriend’s fault—actually it was the other guy’s—if he’d listened to my
   warning instead of being a showoff, it wouldn’t have happened.

5. TO WHAT EXTENT ACCOMPILCES (IF ANY) TO BLAME FOR COMMISSION OF OFFENCE OR
   ARREST:
   N/A

6. DRUNK OR STONED AT TIME OF THIS OFFENCE?
   Half and half.

VI. JUVENILE OFFENCES

1. BEFORE AGE 15:
   Alot of robberies, assaults, things like that.

2. AFTER AGE 15:
   Was in juvenile jail at age 16. Then ACBH, etc.

3. FIRST INVOLVEMENT WITH LAW:
   Stole car—-age 11.

4. DID YOU GET INTO ALOT OF FIGHTS BEFORE AGE 15? HOW ABOUT SINCE THEN?
   Yes—believed in what I had to say—first fight—grade 1—tried to poke a guy’s
   eyes out—told a toy I was playing with. Same grade—guy took my Xmas present—I
   strangled him half to death. Mellowed out some—but lots of fights since age 15—every
   day in Surrey.

5. EVER VANDALIZE THE SCHOOL OR SOMEONE ELSE’S PROPERTY AS A YOUTH? EXPLAIN:
   Yes—e.g., was drinking—went over to house—guys tried to kick us out—kicked
   hell out of whole house.
Before 15—kicked hell out of group home—sabotaged school, businesses, etc.—whenever we wanted to do willful damage, did it—had contests.

VII. PAST OFFENCES

1. ALWAYS/EVER DRUNK OR STONED DURING OFFENSES:
   -- always -- have a drinking problem.

2. MOTIVATED BY ADDICTION (DRUG OR ALCOHOL)?
   Yes -- sometimes -- now just steal booze.

3. SPONTANEOUS VERSUS PLANNED CRIMES:
   Spur of moment.

4. INDIVIDUAL VERSUS GANG CRIMES (CRIMES WITH ACCOMPlices):
   Either -- both just as often. Spur of moment -- depends if someone is with me.

5. MOTIVATION (REASON) FOR COMMISION OF OFFENSES?
   Get drunk -- main thing I steal is booze (e.g. from brewery).

6. FAULT OF VICTIMS/CIRCUMSTANCES?
   Not anybody's fault -- do it cause I need it -- don't do it for sport. Sometimes
   their fault -- e.g. really nice Corvette -- I thought, "What an idiot to leave keys in a car"
   -- I parked three blocks away and stole his wallet -- just to show him not to be so stupid.

7. WHAT IS THE LONGEST PERIOD SINCE AGE FIFTEEN DURING WHICH YOU'VE KEPT
   STRAIGHT (i.e., NOT BEEN INVOLVED IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY)? WHEN WAS THAT?
   Five months -- January 27, 1984 to June 25, 1984. Tired of going to jail. Only
   reason I'm in now is cause everything caught up with me.

VIII. ALCOHOL/DRUG USE

1. AGE OF FIRST INVOLVEMENT WITH DRUGS:
   Five years old -- living with dad -- used to fill medicine bottle with booze and
   take to school -- I liked the taste. Mom was an alcoholic -- stole booze from her.

2. HOW WERE YOU INTRODUCED TO DRUGS?
   Pot -- five years old -- babysitter smoked with me.

3. DRUG USAGE:
   TYPE OF DRUG  FIRST USE  LAST TIME USED  AGE PERIODS  USAGE

   Alcohol: started using regularly gr. 4 -- only quit when in jail -- on street -- drink
   every day, every night, every minute -- except when sleeping -- If I had an IV I'd
   probably drink then, too.

   Other drugs -- Everything: Pot, coke, acid, PCP, mescaline, heroin -- used to be a junkie
   -- age 17 & 19; then switched to MDA.

4. ADDICTIONS (GIVE DATES AND TYPE OF DRUG):
   Alcohol -- gr. 4
   Heroin -- age 17
   MDA, morphine, codine, alcohol, peyote buttons, methadone
5. EVER DRIVE WHILE INTOXICATED?
   Yes.

IX. HEALTH PROBLEMS

1. MEDICAL HISTORY:
   Car accident -- April 9, 1984
   Allergies -- dust and pollen

2. EVER SEEN BY A PSYCHIATRIST OTHER THAN FOR COURT?
   All my life -- off and on -- Think I am just putting a con on them -- don't want to see me anymore. Just give me drugs. I think all psychiatrists are crazy -- honest to God.

3. HOSPITALIZATIONS FOR BEHAVIORAL/EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS:
   Tried, but they wouldn't take me. For alcohol and temper problems. Tried to commit myself but they wouldn't take me.

X. GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. MOST IMPORTANT INFLUENCE ON YOUR LIFE?
   Money -- learn a lot of things from it -- besides my family, $ means the most to me ( & I take family for granted) -- You need $ for anything.

2. WHAT KIND OF KID WERE YOU (UNDER AGE TWELVE)?
   Aggressive. I didn't like authority. Was totally "free". Did anything I wanted; fought; argued.

3. DID YOU GENERALLY OBEY YOUR PARENTS OR WERE YOU A DISCIPLINE PROBLEM?
   Discipline problem -- did what I wanted.

4. DO YOU EVER GET "ITCHY FEET", i.e., FEEL RESTLESS AND MOVE FROM TOWN TO TOWN AND/OR FROM JOB TO JOB?
   Would like to get out of jail. When I'm outside, I'm always on the move.

5. ARE YOU OPTIMISTIC/PESSIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE?
   Feel I'm gonna do it this time -- know I can -- gonna stay out of trouble.

6. DO YOU THINK YOUR SENTENCE WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON YOUR LIFE?
   It is pissing me off cause I haven't done anything since last time out -- trying to change myself -- doesn't help -- I'm screwed left, right, and center.

7. WHAT ARE YOUR PLANS FOR THE FUTURE?
   Alcohol program, work, start a life for myself.

8. WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOURSELF AS SPONTANEOUS AND IMPULSIVE?
   Yes.

9. DO YOU GET ANNOYED WHEN FORCED TO DEAL WITH STUPID OR BORING PEOPLE?
   Depends -- if I've got the time -- in here it annoys me -- out there, I'm courteous unless they get on my nerves. Then piss them off; tell them to F'Off -- make them feel this high. Most of the people in here are liers, idiots, and assholes.
10. **DO YOU LOSE YOUR TEMPER EASILY?**
   Tried to commit myself for temper problems -- have assaulted and tried to kill people.

11. **DO YOU ENJOY PULLING THE WOOL OVER OTHER PEOPLES EYES?**
   Have to have good memory in my racket (i.e., conning) -- don't want to hit on the same guy twice -- mind you, I have. Need to have a good head for numbers. Conned my uncle once without knowing it. I have a way of twisting words around when I want.

12. **DO YOU GET DEPRESSED WHEN THINGS GO WRONG?**
   Yes -- e.g., today doing my job -- got shit from inspector. But, why kill myself if I can kill the problem?

13. **DO YOU GET NERVOUS UNDER PRESSURE?**
   Depends on mood I'm in -- if I'm off guard, get nervous -- if prepared, I'm like a stone wall -- hard to break.

14. **HAVE YOU EVER DONE ANYTHING THAT MADE YOU FEEL GUILTY OR THAT YOU ARE SORRY YOU HAD DONE? IF SO, WHAT?**
   Shot my girlfriend's cat with a pistol crossbow. She gave me shit for it -- I don't like cats pissing on my bed -- shot it three times, but it still wasn't dead -- So I strangled it, then strung it up -- I hate cats.

15. **IF THE PRICE WAS RIGHT, IS THERE ANYTHING YOU WOULDN'T DO? IF SO, WHAT?**
   Better believe I'll do it -- even a hit (murder).

16. **HAVE YOU EVER BEEN DEEPLY IN LOVE?**
   No.

17. **IS THERE ANYONE IN YOUR LIFE NOW WHOSE DEATH WOULD UPSET YOU?**
   Family -- that's my blood -- without your family what would you do.

18. **HAVE MANY FRIENDSHIPS LASTING SIX MONTHS OR MORE HAVE YOU HAD?**
   No real friends in the world -- can never trust anyone, except family -- Even they let you down. Everybody has a price. You'd have a price if I took one of your family.

19. **WOULD YOU LIKE TO SETTLE DOWN AND GET MARRIED OR WOULD YOU RATHER HAVE A VARIETY OF SEXUAL PARTNERS?**
   Yes -- sooner or later -- hard to find the right one -- has to be exactly right.

20. **DO MOST PEOPLE INTEREST YOU OR DO YOU GENERALLY FIND PEOPLE TO BE BORING OR SILLY?**
   Interesting -- everybody has a way about them -- e.g., new people here in prison -- I like to find their weak spots -- stare at them -- they get really paranoid, twisted, freaked out -- like to find out what makes people crack. If they're hard to crack, I provoke them -- if they put something down, I move it -- Play head games.

21. **HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT SOCIETY AND THE STATE OF THE WORLD?**
   Should all be blown up and started over. Too many rules -- too many people who think they know. No, not enough rules -- why should there be rich and poor -- rich shouldn't be able to make the rules. Should be no money, no government, no police, just barter -- no one can own anything.
22. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE JUSTICE SYSTEM?
   It sucks -- I'm innocent of some of the things I'm in for, and I get time for them. They give parole based on how bad you've been in past. They give parole to skinners (sexual offenders), not to people trying to make a life for themselves.

23. DO YOU FEEL THAT PEOPLE THAT PEOPLE HAVE A RIGHT TO SEEK HELP FROM FRIENDS AND RELATIVES?
   Yes.

24. DO YOU THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA TO HELP OTHER PEOPLE WHEN YOU HAVE NOTHING TO GAIN BY IT?
   Yes, I always help people out -- but if they fuck me up, they'll never get anything else, not even a bat out of the corner of my eye.

25. HAVE YOU EVER USED ALIASES? HOW MANY?
   As a juvenile, used names. Not as an adult. Except when I have a warrant out -- slip them a name to get away.

XI. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSIONS
   [Describe how verbal, charming, confident, composed, friendly/hostile, evasive, opinionated subject was in interview (any comments related to the checklist items
glibness/superficial charm, egocentricity/grandiose sense of self-worth, proneness to boredom/low frustration tolerance, conning/lack of sincerity, lack of remorse or guilt, lack of affect and emotional depth, callous/lack of empathy, and short-tempered/poor behavioural controls)]

   Contemptuous of other inmates who "are stupid and keep getting in jail".
   Laughed about shooting dogs that belonged to neighbors -- "like a shooting gallery".
   Talks alot, lots of bravado, charming. Seemed like he was bullshitting at times, though. Laughed about his exploits. Malicious, seemed to reek of evil.
   Seemed forthright, good eye contact, convincing. Seemed to enjoy telling stories, tales of his misbehavior and exploits. Superficially charming, believable. No remorse, nor feelings for others. Little affect other than amusement. Very confident, offhand. "I worked my way up from grade three in here (prison)." Lots of feeling for his own abilities.
   Argumentative -- would snap "I've already told you that" if interviewer asked him a question over again. Said, "I like to argue, whether right or wrong -- argue till I'm blue in the face." Liked to play things for effect -- if he saw that something he said had made an impression (e.g., elicited a laugh, interest, etc.) he would go with it.
   Seemed to challenge the interviewer -- very cocky attitude -- like "so what do you want to know". Definitely acted like he was in control of the situation. Obviously felt himself superior to most other inmates.
I. IDENTIFYING DATA

DATE: February 27, 1985
ID: 85-HC-046
DATE OF BIRTH: 04/9/63
YEARS OF EDUCATION: grade 8/grade 10
RACE: White
NATIONALITY: Canadian

II. EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

OCCUPATION:
--Construction/Carpenter
--Presentence Report (PSR/84)--lists usual occupation as "unskilled".

EMPLOYMENT RECORD:
--Presentence Report (PSR/84)--"He is now 21 years of age, unemployed and unskilled, dependent upon welfare and currently sharing rental accommodations in Vancouver with a young woman and her two children."
--Classification Report/82--"Has been employed in construction and as a swamper. He terminated his last job (short term nature) just before Christmas, 1981."
--January 31, 1985--Temporary Absence (T.A.) application lists "Vancouver Taxi" on his job release plan. Community Assessment says "This is a job prospect only... will have to look for a job after release."
--PSR/81--"Subject said that for most of 1981, he lived on the streets, in cheap motels, and friends' places... admits to being involved in mostly illegal activities to support himself... claimed some casual work."
--PSR/81--"Says he served a sentence at Center Creek Camp from April 1980 to September 1980. Says he showed "natural ability in outdoor activities and carpentry... following his release, he enrolled in a Carpentry Training Course at Douglas College... remained in it for two months before withdrawing due to problems at home."
--Classification Report/March 1982--Listed as no fixed address.

Release Plan:

Jan/85--"Plans to live with mother on release. His mother and her husband operate a thoroughbred breeding farm. Subject has not lived with his mother for any length of time since age 14. Mother feels his main problem is drinking. Feels he has had a change of attitude since his near brush with death in a 1984 car accident."

Probation file--"Subject lived with his mother in Feb/83, with little success."

Oct/82--Community Assessment--"Plans to live with mother, although she has limited funds."

May/82--Community Assessment--Subject gave his mother's address as his release residence. Mother said she would support him financially until he finds employment, but she said that under no circumstances would her husband allow the subject to live with them. "Work plan: 'Work in the mines' or 'Go to Douglas College.'"

Note: File included several letters from his mother on his behalf.

III. BACKGROUND DATA
BIRTH ORDER:
--the first of three

FAMILY LIFE:
--Institutional Report 1/24/85--"His family life has been extremely disrupting, resulting in little parental care and guidance."
--"Two siblings are with mother; have not shown as serious a disturbance as the subject, although some delinquent behavior recently."

Any Mental Disorders in Family? Describe:
--Father was an alcoholic and a drug addict; he was also physically abusive.
--Mother is ineffectual.
--They separated when the subject was age 7.
--"Both have remarried and subject keeps in touch, but relationships appear unsatisfactory."

Comments:
--PSR/82--"Mother says by the time she separated from first husband, subject was showing definite signs of unmanageability and personality disturbance. Did not get along with any of his mother's boyfriends. Was disruptive of all efforts towards peaceful family life."
--"Mother said she had difficulty handling subject since his childhood years...drove her to extremes by the time he was age 5-6...took him for counseling at Burnaby Mental Health for one year."
--PSR/84--"Experienced developmental difficulties essentially from the outset."

SCHOOL:
--PSR/84--"Left home and school at age 14 for the street and the inherent lifestyle of alcohol and drug abuse, hustling, and criminal activity."
--PSR/82--"As early as grade one, a teacher identified him as a problem child who was a potential dropout...failed grade one...commenced a career of frequent school changes, partly due to school suspensions... school records have always been poor...was often involved in disruptive and aggressive behavior toward peers and authority figures...often engaged in petty crimes for which he was not caught or dealt with through the courts. By May 1977, behavior was intolerable at home...conflict with mother, her common-law husband, and siblings...serious problems in school, mischief in neighborhood. Subject was sent to live with his real father, who began making the same complaints (i.e., lying, stealing, aggression, running away, generally unmanageable)."

IV. MEDICAL DATA

HISTORY OF PHYSICAL DISORDERS:
--Claims multiple allergies (e.g., penicillin).

COMMENTS:
--Severe car accident May 1984--head injuries

V. CRIMINOLOGICAL DATA:

JUVENILE HISTORY:
--Record dates from November 17, 1977 (age 14). Juvenile record includes Theft Over $200, Mischief, Robbery, Breaking and Entering, Unlawful Confinement, Possession of Stolen Property, and Robbery with Violence.
--Psychiatric Assessment--October 1977--showed high average intelligence. Report said he was prone to impulsive acting-out behavior, and showed signs of depression and anger.
ADULT HISTORY:

PRESENT OFFENSE: Assault, Possession of Stolen Property, and Mischief

LENGTH OF SENTENCE: 739 DAYS

NUMBER OF PAROLES AND PROBATIONS (INCLUDING MANDATORY SUPERVISION):
- Letter to Parole Board August 3, 1982—Written quite poignantly and convincingly.
  Excerpts: "I feel very strongly about working... I know I can and will make it, all I need is the chance... The reason I was in trouble in the past was I did not want to work or did not know how, but now I have changed. I want to work and I know how. I would also like to go to "AA" and meet some real nice people and get on with my life... I would like to send a letter to the people I offended stating my apologies. I know I will have to live with the memories of what I did and I'm really sorry for what happened. I have learned a hard lesson that will scar me for life... Sooner or later, I would like to help people like myself and steer them in the right direction."

CONVICTIONS:
- Institutional Report 1/24/85—"Has almost continuous involvement with the Criminal Justice System in recent years. His main problems are assaults as a result of emotionalism and abuse of alcohol."

- Adult Record begins May 8, 1981—Includes Possession of Stolen Property, Common Assault, Mischief, Failure to Appear, Driving with greater than .08 Blood Alcohol Level, Assault Causing Bodily Careless use of a Firearm, Breaking and Entering with Intent.

- Violent Record.

VI. SUBSTANCE ABUSE

DRUGS:
- PSR/84—Says he uses "all street drugs."
- Psych. Report November 8, 1982—He has severely abused alcohol and drugs since early teens (two 26-ouncers a day, or 40 or more beers a day, plus heroin, acid, speed; heroin 2 caps a day, speed 1 1/2 grams a day).

ALCOHOL:
- PSR/84—has an alcohol problem.

VII. INSTITUTIONAL DATA

INSTITUTIONAL CHARGES:
- October 15, 1984—"refusing orders, verbal and physical aggressiveness."
- December 1984—"unpredictable... extremely explosive... can be friendly, then sharp and negative."

COMMENTS:
- 1982 Reports—"assaulting another inmate, swearing at guard."
- Variable staff reports: "quiet... no problems... seems to have a chip on his shoulder at times... poor attitude... just wants to 'do his time'."

- Institutional Report 1/24/85—"Fine worker, but several instances in which he finds it difficult to hold his temper. His violent temper is what resulted in his incarceration in the first place. To last on the street he must learn to control his temper... In the last few weeks his attitude and behavior have deteriorated somewhat."

- put in West Gate B June 1984—"to date (1/24/85) he has not been a management problem."

VIII. MARRIAGE/COMMON LAW RELATIONSHIPS

NUMBER OF MARRIAGES AND LENGTH OF EACH:
- Mug Sheet 6/5/84—lists him as having a wife in Vancouver.
- PSR October 1984—lists him as single.

IX. PERSONALITY/BEHAVIORAL DESCRIPTIONS

- Psych. Report November 18, 1982—"He relates numerous instances of explosive rage and administering severe beatings/assaults of others and property (many incidents involving slashing people with bottles, beating with clubs, destroying a house with a baseball bat, etc.)... all violent acts have occurred during extreme alcohol/drug intoxication... no evidence of thought disorder... severe personality disorder."

- Psych. Report November 24, 1982—"No evidence of any serious mental illness at this time. Some anxiety about returning to the wings, in view of difficulties experienced as a protective custody inmate... however, he also demonstrates a high degree of manipulativeness, including some selective reporting of events and conversations... has presented a number of management problems... My impression is that he is a personality-disordered individual whose reputation and manipulative behavior give rise to real stress-creating situations."

- T.A. denied February 6, 1985—"Serious concerns as to whether he can live in a disciplined environment... his previous criminal activity, performance in the institution, and community assessments indicate he is an undue risk to the community."

- Comm. Assess. 6X—"local RCMP feel that his record speaks for itself and they do not want him in the Aldergrove area... would not support his early release.

- "There is a flaw in his character... I am first and most important and screw you" is his attitude... no give and take, just take... will not take responsibility for his actions... denies any involvement when he knows he's in the wrong."

X. MISCELLANEOUS ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- Comm. Assess. 6X—"was last on probation March 1984... lied about his whereabouts and employment and continued to build on his criminal record while on probation... Probation Officer concluded that probation means nothing to him."

- Institutional Report 6X—"Has begun to accept his limitations and to learn he can deal with problems in a positive way... release plan is weak, but he apparently now has willpower and desire to alter his lifestyle... commitment to change."

- PSR 6X—"described as being stubborn, emotional, and although well-motivated at present time, he lacks discipline."

- PSR 6X—"interviewed on three occasions... impressed as above average intelligence, but as emotional, immature, and while overtly cooperative and friendly, this was felt to be superficial... When questioned about his offense, he admitted to the assault, but maintained he was the ultimate victim in the incident as he was simply coming to someone's aid and out of that was arrested and faced with jail... Rationalization and denial of responsibility appear to be characteristic of him and is felt to be how he perceives his circumstances generally
and his criminal record—history of difficulty relating to authority, a poor response to most programs, and forms of supervision (community or institutional), and involvement in a variety of treatment forms with no significant effect. Serious personality problems symptomatic of which are alcohol and drug abuse and antisocial and frequent violent behavior that to date have defied intervention of any kind and are of a nature that they will probably continue to be resistant to resolution.

NOTE:
--His progress log contains a letter written to the Vancouver Chief of Police asking them to support his parole. The letter was obviously written by 85-HC-047 (same writing style and contents) but is signed by 046.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>04/12</td>
<td>P 09/0575 NONE 638700 MISCHIEF</td>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>04/12</td>
<td>ER 09/0575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>11/08</td>
<td>P 10/1177 629401 THEFT OVER $200</td>
<td>CWS 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 12 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>11/08</td>
<td>SE 10/1177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>03/11</td>
<td>P 26/0179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>03/11</td>
<td>SE 26/0179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>R 14/0781 629401 THEFT OVER $200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>R 14/0781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>R 04/1181 638700 MISCHIEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>R 04/1181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>R 02/0182 524500 ASSAULT/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40382
60382

30382 0001 0066 S TR 160382
0666 0013 S TR 160382
80582 0013 0066 S TR 160382
90582 0066 0001 S TR 190582
1107 524500 ASSAULT
00582 0001 0050 S TR 190582

30682 0050 0001 S ME 190582
30782 0001 0050 S TR 190582
50882

50882 0050 0013 S TR 190582
51182 0013 0050 S TR 190582
01182 0050 0001 S TR 190582
70283 0001 FREE SE 190582
FREE 0304 P SB 030382

40383
50783 FREE 0001 R SB 150783
30783 0001 FREE BA 150783
0304 0401 B TR 140383
20883 0401 0401 P TR 030382
10883 FREE 0001 R SB 10883
1107 630600 BREAK & ENTER
1107 631200 P. STOLEN PROPERTY
41083 0401 0304 P TR 030382

70184 0001 FREE RC 110883
70284 0304 FREE SE 030382

90584 FREE 0217 B SB 130584
1111 108300 POSSESS WEAPON
1111 317100 CAUSE DISTURBANCE
05984
06984 FREE 0001 S SB 050684
1107 524510 ASSLT-WEAPON/HARM
1101 742100 ATT COMMIT/ACCESSORY
1107 631200 P. STOLEN PROPERTY
1108 631200 P. STOLEN PROPERTY
0984 0217 FREE SE 180584
1084
09185

1110 523400 IMPAIRED DRIVING
1110 523600 DRIVING W/MORE .08
1110 524500 ASSAULT
1110 629402 THEFT UNDER $200
1110 631200 P. STOLEN PROPERTY
1111 630200 ROBBERY
1110 524500 ASSAULT
1111 524500 ASSAULT
1111 630200 ROBBERY
1111 524500 ASSAULT
1111 638700 MISCHIEF
1. You are a cyclist in a cross-country race. Just before crossing the finish line you overtake the person in second place. What place do you finish in?

2. In a year there are 12 months. 7 months have 31 days. How many months have 28 days?

3. I do not have any special powers, but I can predict the score of any football game before it begins. How can I do this?

4. Please add the following numbers in your head
   Start with 1000
   Add 40
   Add 100
   Add 30
   Add 1000
   Add 20
   Add 1000
   Add 10
   Write down your answer

5. I have 2 U.S. coins that total 55 cents. One of them is not a nickel. What are the two coins?

6. What are the next 3 letters in the following sequence?

7. Jimmy’s mother had 4 children. She named the first one Monday. She named the second Tuesday. She named the third Wednesday. What is the name of the fourth child?

8. What is full of holes but can still hold water?

9. Your dad tells you that he will pay you $6.00 an hour for the 6 seconds that you take to wash your hands before dinner. How much did you make for washing your hands?

10. What words are pronounced differently by merely capitalizing the first letter?
Appendix H

1. You will be using one office in the lab (A or B), the two ends of the conference table, and one of the cubicles.
2. Find your participant's name on the Sona Website (google FSU Sona Systems)
   a. Login: carbonelllab password: Toledo
3. Get key from cupboard and unlock the filing cabinet where the materials are
4. Take out the logbook and one packet
5. Fill out the next available entry in the logbook and write down the corresponding participant number on all of the materials for the participant.
6. Go to the subject waiting room (DON'T FORGET YOUR FSU ID)
7. Call the participant's name
   a. If no one is there go back to the lab.
   b. Go out again and check to see if the participant is there and go to the 4th floor waiting room to check.
   c. After 15 minutes if no one is there then put the participant in as a no show.
   d. MAKE SURE THAT THE CREDITS RECEIVED IS 0.
8. If participant is there... Introduce yourself: “Hi my name is _____________, and I am working in the Carbonell Lab. Thanks for coming today.”
9. Bring participant into the lab and take them to one of the offices/conference table/ or cubicle.
10. Give them the consent form that is in the packet and encourage them to read it.
   a. Say, “Here is the consent form that I need you to read and sign. This study will consist of three parts and should take no more than one and a half hours to complete. During this study you will be answering questions and filling out answers on paper. All of your answers will be kept confidential and nothing will have your name on it. Your participation is voluntary and you can stop at anytime. However, to receive full credit you must finish the study.
   b. How old are you? (If younger than 18 then no, they cannot participate)
   c. Do you have any questions?
11. Have them sign and date the consent form, ask them if they want a copy.
12. After they sign, YOU sign and date the consent form also.
13. After you sign the consent form hand them the TriPM (participant # should already be on it.
   a. Say, “Now we will begin the first part of the study. Please read the questions carefully. Bubble in the most appropriate answer for you. If you have any questions please raise your hand. When you have finished the questionnaire please raise your hand and I will give you the next part.
14. Fill out the credit slip with the participants name
15. When the participant raises their hand collect the TriPM
16. Give them the distractor task
   a. Say, “Now we will begin the second part of this study. There are a total of 10 questions. All of the items must be answered so if you feel you do not know an answer take your best guess. Once you are done please raise your hand and I will give you the final part.
17. When they raise their hand collect the distractor task
18. Give them the PCL-R Item Description and the PCL-R checklist
a. Say, “This is the final part of the study. The PCL-R is a 20-item checklist used to determine if a criminal offender is psychopathic. Please thoroughly read through each item description on the PCL-R Item Description. While you read you should look over the PCL-R checklist to see how each item is scored.

b. “When you have finished reading each item description please raise your hand.”

19. Once they have raised their hand ask them “Do you have any questions regarding the PCL-R Item Description?”

20. Give them the case file

a. Say, “This is a case file of an actual prison inmate which includes an interview with the inmate and their rap sheet (crimes they’ve committed). Your task is to read through this interview and score this inmate on the PCL-R.

b. “As you previously read; a score of 0 means that item is not applicable to the inmate, 1 is somewhat applicable, 2 is completely applicable.”

c. If at any point you need an example, look on the instructions page given to you with the PCL-R Item Description.”

d. “You can refer back to the PCL-R Item Description at any point while reviewing the case file.”

e. “Take your time reading through the case and score the inmate. Once you have finished scoring the inmate on the PCL-R Checklist please raise your hand.”

21. When the participant has finished collect all of the materials from the participant.

22. Give them the demographics sheet.

a. Say, “Finally please complete the following form.”

b. If they leave any answers blank say, “Did you leave something blank accidentally? Remember that everything you write is confidential and anonymous. You are free to leave it unanswered if you feel that you do not want to answer it.”

23. Give them the credit slip and the debriefing form.

24. Ask them if they have any questions

25. Thank them for their participation and tell them they are free to leave

26. Paper clip their responses back together and lock their responses back in the drawer.
Title of research: The impact of personality on everyday behavior.

You are invited to be in a research study on the impact of personality on everyday behavior. You were selected as a possible participant for this study. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by Kristin Klimley and Dr. Joyce Carbonell, Department of Psychology at Florida State University.

Background Information:
The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of personality on human behavior in everyday situations. Specifically, this study focuses on how individual’s personalities impact how they rate other people.

Procedures:
If you agree to be in this study, we ask you to do the following things: take the TriPM personality questionnaire, complete a memory task, and read through an individual case file and rate an individual on another personality questionnaire. In total the experiment should take 1 hour to complete.

Risks and benefits of being in the study:
There is minimal likelihood of risk from participating in this experiment.

Compensation:
You will receive experimental credit for participating in this study. The experiment credit may be used as extra credit if your professor has previously stated that this is an acceptable form on extra credit. Students enrolled in General Psychology classes are required to participate in experiments and therefore will not receive any extra credit for participating.

Confidentiality:
The records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University or the Department of Psychology. If you decide to participate you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.
Contacts and Questions:

The researchers conducting this study are Kristin Klimley and Dr. Joyce Carbonell. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact them: Kristin Klimley kek11d@my.fsu.edu or Dr. Joyce Carbonell carbonel@psy.fsu.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researchers, you are encouraged to contact the FSU IRB at 2010 Levy Street, Research Building B, Suite 276, Tallahassee, Fl 32306-2742, or 850-644-7900, or by email at humansubjects@magnet.fsu.edu

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

__________________________________     ________________
Signature         Date

__________________________________     ________________
Signature of Investigator        Date
Please fill out the following information.

1. Age ______

2. Gender (circle)  Male  Female

3. Race (circle all that apply)
   Hispanic    American-Indian    Asian    African-American    Pacific Islander
   Caucasian

4. Have you ever been trained on the Psychopathy Checklist Revised?
   Yes ______      No ______

If you answered yes to question 4 please answer the remaining questions.

5. Where did you receive your training on the PCL-R?

6. How many hours were you trained?

7. How many ratings have you done of the PCL-R?
This study examines the relationship between personality and individual’s ratings of psychopathy. This experiment is designed to measure whether an individual rater's personality characteristics influence the rater's PCL-R ratings. Specifically, this study examines the influence of personality characteristics that resemble psychopathy characteristics found on PCL-R Factor 1 such as: glibness, lack of remorse or guilt, cunning and manipulation etc. on how individuals rating other individuals on the PCL-R.

Previous research suggests that an individual who has personality characteristics such as: glibness, lack or empathy or remorse, etc. are more likely to give higher scores when rating individual cases on the PCL-R.

How was this tested?

The researchers used the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure as well as the participant’s PCL-R ratings to measure the influence of personality characteristics resembling psychopathy on participant’s rating of a PCL-R case. All participants started by completing the TriPM followed by a distractor task. Finally the participants examined an individual case file and rated that individual on the PCL-R.

Hypotheses and main questions:

The study hypothesized that individuals with higher scores on TriPM scale will also rate other individual’s higher on the PCL-R. Because the individual already possesses similar personality traits they are more recognizable in other people. We will also examine whether or not previous experience with the PCL-R or training on the PCL-R would influence the participants ratings on the PCL-R.

Please do not discuss this study with other potential participants until the study is over at the end of the semester. If participants know what we are testing before they participate it could adversely affect our results.

If you have any questions please contact:
The researchers: Kristin Klimley kek11d@my.fsu.edu and Dr. Joyce Carbonell carbonel@psy.fsu.edu

For all additional inquiries please visit the Psychology Department at Florida State University website psy.fsu.edu.