1

PM-1 3 1/2"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

HYPERMASCULINITY
and
THE CORRELATES OF MALE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR

by
ANDREW J. McWHINNIE, B.A.

A Thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

April, 1996

© copyright
1996, Andrew J. McWhinnie

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

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

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

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

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

ISBN 0-612-13807-0

Canada

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

U·M·I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0686
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

Philosophy	0422
Religion	0423
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Marketing	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial or Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746

General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Bioethics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472

Biogeochemistry	0425
Geochemistry	0996

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleocology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Palaozoology	0985
Polymology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and	
Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and	
High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0758
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	0537
General	0538
Aerospace	0539
Agricultural	0540
Automotive	0541
Biomedical	0542
Chemical	0543
Civil	0544
Electronics and Electrical	0348
Heat and Thermodynamics	0545
Hydraulic	0546
Industrial	0547
Marine	0794
Materials Science	0548
Mechanical	0743
Metallurgy	0551
Mining	0552
Nuclear	0549
Packaging	0763
Petroleum	0554
Sanitary and Municipal	0790
System Science	0428
Geotechnology	0796
Operations Research	0795
Plastics Technology	0994
Textile Technology	

General	0621
Behavioral	0304
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0901
Psychobiology	0345
Psychometrics	0627
Social	0451

Thesis Acceptance Form

**The undersigned recommend the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of this thesis.**

**"HYPERMASCULINITY AND THE CORRELATES OF SELF-REPORTED CRIMINAL
BEHAVIOUR"**

submitted by

ANDREW JAMES MCWHINNIE

**in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Masters of Arts**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Phil", written over a horizontal line.

Thesis Supervisor

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Phil", written over a horizontal line.

Chair, Department of Psychology

Carleton University

April 16, 1996

Abstract

This study evaluates the relationship between variables associated with a Psychology of Criminal Conduct (PCC), hypermasculinity and the correlates of self-reported criminal behaviour. It is hypothesised that young boys who experience a punitive socialization environment develop a "toxic" sense of shame and a defensive hypermasculine script. Hypermasculinity comprises a callous sexual attitude toward women, toughness as control, danger as exciting, and violence as manly. Responses to several family functioning scales, the Hypermasculinity Index, Hare's self-report PCL-R, the Socialization scale of the CPI, and other predictive scales are obtained from 70 male offenders. Offender responses are compared with those of 82 university males and 93 university females. As well, a subset of results were obtained from 147 subjects (university students and offenders) for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). A series of Univariate, and multivariate analyses were performed. Among university subjects, results indicated healthy support for the PCC variables. Support for these variables was also found in the results for the offender group as well. Very good support for the variables associated with hypermasculinity was also observed, indicating that these variables may have a role to play in a psychology of criminal conduct. Socialization measures and measures related to family functioning such as low family cohesion, high family conflict, and a laissez-faire family style were also related to self-reports of criminal behaviour. Differences between groups and gender are discussed briefly. Implications for future research are also discussed, with particular reference to male batterers, and treatment within correctional settings.

Acknowledgements

A thesis is never the work of one individual. This one, representing the collaborative effort of several people, is no different. To my partner and best friend, Lynne, who has supported me both emotionally and financially throughout the writing of this thesis, I extend a simple, but heart-felt thank you.

This thesis was, in part, about men and masculinities. Several men have collaborated in the production of this thesis. Chief among them was Don Andrews, who stands for me as proof that men are capable of gentleness and nurturance, for these were the ways he has "brought me along" in the study of the psychology he practices and teaches. He has consistently called me beyond my own limitations and, beyond all this, has also taught me the value of remaining positive in the face of challenge. For me, he has reaffirmed the worth and dignity of the profession of "teacher," and I count myself as lucky to have had him as one of mine.

Among the men who advanced this study were the inmates of Rideau Correctional and Treatment Centre, who volunteered their time to share sometimes intimate details of their personal lives. Within the context of their lives in prison, many expressed the desire to contribute something positive to society which, I believe, is a fundamental desire among human beings, realised on their part, I hope, through participation in studies such as this. Access to

these men was made possible through the Ontario Ministry of Corrections, Mr. Vic Villeneuve, Superintendent, Rideau Correctional and Treatment Centre (RCTC), and his staff, especially Dr. Hugh Marquis, Chief Psychologist, and Dr. Dave Baxter, Director of the Assessment Unit. Dr. Baxter's assistance with computer-scoring of several instruments, including the MMPI-2 was invaluable.

Thanks also to Dr. James Bonta, Chief of Correctional Research for the Ministerial Secretariat, Solicitor General Canada, and Dr. Brian Grant of the Research Division, Corrections Canada who, acting as External Examiner, offered comprehensive criticisms on short notice which were especially appreciated and instrumental to the final product.

Finally, my thanks to Diogenes, Minerva and Persophone.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	viii
Table of Appendices	xii
Tables in Appendices	xiv
Charts in Appendices	xv
Introduction	1
Definition of Criminal Behaviour	2
Major, Broad-based Research Question	3
Social Psychological Theories of Behaviour	4
The Psychology of Criminal Conduct - A Personal, Interpersonal and Community Reinforcement (PIC-R) Model	8
Male Socialization Practices	10
Punitive Socialization	17
Hypermasculinity and Shame	25
Formation of The Hypermasculine Script	26
The Ideology of Machismo	27

The Construct of Hypermasculinity	29
Empirical Support Hypermasculine Construct	34
Shame and The Hypermasculine Male	42
Punitive Socialization, Shame, Hypermasculinity and Criminal Behaviour Links	45
The Present Study	49
Method	52
Subjects	52
Procedure	52
Measures	53
Self-Reported Criminal History	53
Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding	54
Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding Decriminalised Version	58
Criminal Sentiments	59
Social Support for Crime	59
Socialization	62
Punitive Socialization	64
Family Functioning	64
Hypermasculine Personality Style	69

Level of Internalised Shame	71
Psychopathy Checklist Self Report	73
Clustering of Variables	74
Results	77
Data Screening	77
Missing Values	77
Outliers	77
Internal Consistencies	78
Descriptive Statistics	78
Intercorrelations Among Battery Scales	79
The Correlates of Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour: University Males: The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables	81
Other Variables of Theoretical Interest	92
The Correlates of Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour: Officially Defined Offenders: The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables	98
Other Variables of Theoretical Interest	101
The Correlates of Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour: University Females: The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables	107
Other Variables of Theoretical Interest	110
Multiple Regression Analysis	114

Regression Analysis - University males	116
Regression Analysis - Offenders	118
Regression Analysis - University Females	118
Regression Analysis - “Serious” Crime	121
Multivariate Analysis of Risk Factors	127
Differences Between University Males and Offenders	127
Differences Between University Males and University Females	135
Gender Differences for Specific Risk Factors	140
Correlates of Self-Reported Crime: The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Index	140
MMPI-University Males	143
MMPI - Officially Defined Offenders	146
MMPI - University Females	146
Discussion	151
Conclusions	167
 Future Research	170
 Male Batterers	171
 Correctional Settings	171
References	173

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1:	Reliability data for The Criminal Sentiments Scale	60
Table 2:	Social Support for Crime and Correlations with Criminal Criminal Sentiments, Persnality and Recidivism	63
Table 3:	Reliability Data For The Hypermasculinity Index	72
Table 4:	Sample Sizes (N's)	80
Table 5:	Scale Reliabilities - Internal Consistencies	82
Table 6:	Number of Subjects Endorsing Items on the Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour Scale	84
Table 7:	Unadjusted Means and Standard Deviations for Independent Measures	87
Table 8:	Intercorrelations Between Variables Associated With General Criminal Behaviour, Age, and Socially Desirable Responding	89
Table 9:	Intercorrelations Between Variables Associated With Criminal Behaviour, Other Variables of Theoretical Interest, Socially Desirable Responding and Age	90
Table 10:	Intercorrelations Between Other Variables of Theoretical Interest	91
Table 11:	The PCC Variables and Self-Reported Crime Among University Males	93
Table 12:	Other Variables of Theoretical Interest and Self-Reported Crime Among University Males	94
Table 13:	Colorado Family Functioning Scales	97

Table 14:	The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables and Self-Reported Crime Among Offenders	99
Table 15:	Other Variables of Theoretical Interest and Self-Reported Crime Among Offenders	102
Table 16:	Colorado Family Functioning Scales and Self-Reported Crime Among Offenders	106
Table 17:	The PCC Variables and Self-Reported Crime Among University Females	108
Table 18:	Other Variables of Theoretical Interest and Self-Reported Crime Among University Females	111
Table 19:	Colorado Family Functioning Scales and Self-Reported Crime Among University Females	113
Table 20:	University Males: Full Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest On Self-Reported Criminal behaviour, Accounting for Socially Desirable Responding	117
Table 21:	Offenders: Full Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest On Self-Reported Criminal behaviour, Accounting for Age, and Socially Desirable Responding	119
Table 22:	University Females: Full Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest On Self-Reported Criminal behaviour, Accounting for Socially Desirable Responding	120
Table 23:	University Males - Serious Crime: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest On Self-Reports of Involvement In Serious Crime	123

Table 24:	Offenders - Serious Crime: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest On Self-Reports of Involvement In Serious Crime	124
Table 25:	University Females - Serious Crime: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest On Self-Reports of Involvement In Serious Crime	126
Table 26:	Unadjusted and Adjusted Means and Standard Deviations for All Measures	128
Table 27:	Univariate F Tests of Significant Differences Between Groups - University Males and Offenders on Variables Associated With General Criminal Behaviour.	130
Table 28:	Univariate F Tests of Differences Between Groups-University Males and Offenders Controlling for Age and Socially Desirable Responding	132
Table 29:	Univariate F Tests of Significant Differences Between University Males and Females: PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest	136
Table 30:	Univariate F Tests of Differences Between Groups - University Men and University Women Controlling for Age and Socially Desirable Responding	138
Table 31:	Mean Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour Scores of University Males and Females: With and Without Controls for Other Variables	143
Table 32:	Pearson Product Moment Correlations (r) Between MMPI Standard Validity and Clinical Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime	144
Table 33:	Pearson Product Moment Correlations (r) Between MMPI	

	Supplementary Scales University Males	145
Table 34:	Pearson Product Moment Correlations (r) Between MMPI Standard Validity and Clinical Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime - Offenders:	147
Table 35:	Pearson Product Moment Correlations (r) Between MMPI 5 Supplementary Scales and Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime - Offenders	148
Table 36:	Pearson Product Moment Correlations (r) Between MMPI 6 Standard Validity and Clinical Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime - University Females	149
Table 37:	Pearson Product Moment Correlations (r) Between MMPI Supplementary Scales and Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime - University Females	150

Table of Appendices

	Page
Appendix A: Informed Consent - University	199
Appendix A-1: Informed Consent - Offenders	201
Appendix B: Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour Scale	203
Appendix B-1: Criminal Behaviour scale "Seriousness" Ratings	208
Appendix C: Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding	209
Appendix C-1: List of Items Deleted From The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding	213
Appendix D: Criminal Sentiments Scale	214
Appendix E: Social Support for Crime Scale	220
Appendix F: California Personality Index - Socialization Scale	222
Appendix G: Rewarding Punitive Socialization of Distress	226
Appendix H: Extended Hypermasculinity Index - Limited Choice Version	230
Appendix H-1: Validity Data for the Hypermasculinity Index and Te Extended HMI, Forced Choice and Limited Choice Versions	237
Appendix I: Level of Internalised Shame Scale	243
Appendix J: Psychopathy Checklist Self Report	247
Appendix K: Colorado Family Functioning Scale	251

Appendix L:	Intercorrelations Among Measures - Male Subjects Only	265
Appendix M:	Factor Analysis of "New" Measures	268
Appendix N:	Intercorrelations between PCC Variables, Other Variables of Interest, and MMPI Scales	284

Tables In the Appendices		Page
Table L-1:	Intercorrelations Between Variables Associated With General Criminal Behaviour, Age, and Socially Desirable Responding - Men Only	265
Table L-2:	Intercorrelations Between Variables Associated With Criminal Behaviour, Other Variables of Theoretical Interest, Socially Desirable Responding and Age - Men Only	266
Table L-3:	Intercorrelations Between Other Variables of Theoretical Interest	267
Table M-1:	Factor Loadings for The Rewarding-Punitive Socialization Distress Scale	270
Table M-2:	Correlations Between Scores of factor Items and Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour Scale - Rewarding Punitive Socialization	271
Table M-3:	Means and Factor Loadings for The Extended Hypermasculinity Index	274
Table M-4:	Means and Factor Loadings for The Internalised Shame Scale	280
Table M-5:	Internalised Shame Scale Item-Factor Total Scores Correlated With the Self-Reported Crime Scale	285
Table N-1:	Differences Between University Males and Offenders on MMPI Validity	290
Table N-2:	Differences Between University Males and Offenders on MMPI Supplementary and Clinical Scales	291

List of Charts in Appendices

		Page
Chart N-1	MMPI Standard Validity and Clinical Scales by Validity Type	286
Chart N-2	MMPI Supplementary Scales by Validity Type	287
Chart N-3	Standard Validity and Clinical Scales by Subject Type	288
Chart N-4	MMPI Supplementary and Content Scales by Subject Type	289

Hypermasculinity
and
The Correlates of Male Criminal Behaviour:

Introduction: At the beginning of this decade, Canadians spent \$7.7 billion to maintain the criminal justice system (Homer, 1993). The majority of this money was spent on police services, followed by correctional services, which in the 1991-92 budget year cost Canadians \$950 million. Each person in prison costs Canadians in excess of \$51,000 per year. These costs do not include the added burden to our national social "safety-net," realised in terms of 50,500 hospital nights incurred because of offender-victim contacts, which are also responsible for well over 400,000 days of employment loss (Homer, 1993). If we add to these "hidden costs of crime," increases in insurance premiums made by the insurance industry to cover an estimated \$2 billion per year in insurance claim payouts (Homer, 1993) as direct compensation for losses due to crime, then the cost of crime in Canada begins to soar astronomically. Criminal behaviour is an expensive social problem in terms of economic costs and, far more importantly, in terms of human losses.

This study represents an attempt to examine the social problem of crime at the level of individual behaviour. Specifically, this study investigates the known correlates of criminal behaviour, along with some as yet only theorized correlates. Moreover, just slightly more than 93 per cent of the federal and provincial prison population in Canada is made up of men (Statistics Canada, 1992), and because The Standing

Committee on Justice and The Solicitor General (Homer, 1993, p. 3) has identified Canadian crime as "in the main, a problem of . . . males," that is, "the majority of those charged with criminal code offenses are male," and given that research has identified "being male" is a predictor of criminal behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Rogers, 1981), it seems reasonable that research should focus on the individual behaviour of men.

Definition of Criminal Behaviour

The definition of criminal behaviour adopted for this paper is linked to, yet distinct from, legal, moral, and social views of what constitutes criminal behaviour. Criminal behaviour is defined herein as not only "problem" or "deviant" behaviour (Jessor & Jessor, 1977; Ulmann & Krasner, 1976), but adds a distinctly psychological dimension which defines such behaviour as essentially antisocial in nature (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). This additional psychological distinction of "antisocial," made by Andrews and Bonta (1994), squarely lodges a specific group of otherwise "problem behaviours" within a criminal justice context. At the same time, it separates non-deviant, yet otherwise socially problematic behaviour from criminal behaviour. This psychologically-based distinction yields the following definition adopted for this study:

Criminal behaviour refers to antisocial acts that place the actor at risk of becoming a focus of the attention of the criminal [or] juvenile justice professionals (Andrews & Bonta, 1994, p. 24).

This definition takes into account culturally specific variations of behaviour, and

includes universal definitions of criminal behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

Major, Broad-based Research Question Addressed

The question addressed in this paper asks why men are so over-represented in statistics reporting criminal activity (Simon & Sharma, 1979; Braithwaite, 1977; Smith & Visser, 1980; Conter, 1982; Warner, 1982; Ouston, 1984; McGarrell & Flanagan, 1985; Marash, 1986; Riley, 1986). This paper focuses on the antisocial, criminal behaviour of adults within the more general context of masculinity.

While criminal behaviour is not unique to men, there is a danger in this type of research of falling victim to the false supposition that, generally, women are not involved with criminal behaviour. From such a perspective, there is the even greater danger of supposing that if we could make men more like women we might reduce criminal behaviour. All behaviour involves the choices of individuals, whether they are members of a particular gender group or not. While researchers such as Smith and Visser (1980), produce review data indicating men are disproportionately linked to greater crime severity, the question to be asked is why do some men (offenders) make the choices they do, especially with regard to violence? Part of the answer to that question, this thesis argues, may derive from the perception of some men who believe their behavioural choices are constrained within a unique male script (Mosher & Tomkins, 1988), which Mosher has defined as a "hypermasculine" way of being male. Therefore, this study examines the correlates of male criminal behaviour and

hypermasculinity as it may relate thereto. The exploration of these issues is performed within the framework of a general theory of crime, based on the principles of social learning theory.

Social Psychological Theories Behaviour

Social learning theory represents one of the major paradigm shifts in the study of human behaviour. It is preceded by psychodynamic theories which emphasize internal structures, or "person-centred" variables in its explanation of human behaviour. More recently, Radical Behaviorism has emphasized that human behaviour can best be understood by focusing on environmental variables. Since then, though psychoanalysts have consistently refused the translation, the union of Freudian psychodynamic theory with radical behaviourist theory has arrived at a crossroads, and that crossroads is Social Learning Theory (Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Monte, 1987).

Social learning theory is important to an understanding of criminal behaviour because it allows us to conceptualise individual human behaviour as an interaction between both person-centred and environment-centred variables: to understand criminal behaviour, it is insufficient to only examine the internal environment of the individual, one must also understand the individual within the context of his or her environment. A brief look at the development of a social learning theory helpful to an understanding of criminal behaviour is, therefore, in order.

Building on Freud's early work on frustration and aggression, Yale researchers

Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears (1939) "modernized" the concepts of aggression and criminality by linking them with methods of an emerging behavioural perspective of human psychology. These early "seeds" of modern social learning theory developed over the next twenty-five years, a period which included the publication of Dollard & Miller's (1950) monograph, Personality and Psychotherapy in which they reformulated virtually all of the psychodynamic theories of Freud and recast his main ideas on psychotherapy in terms of behaviourism. In 1962, Berkowitz published Aggression: A Social Analysis, in which he introduced the principles of a now highly sophisticated social learning model, which included the idea of cognitive-emotional mediators for the study of aggression.

Albert Bandura (Bandura 1977b; Bandura & Walters, 1963) and colleagues have advanced the task of uniting behaviourism with complex mental events by developing a cognitive-behaviourism which takes into full account the human capacity to think and plan experience. There has been an attempt to study basic clinical phenomena, and to explain them, using the language of learning (Monte 1987). There are four main features to this paradigm.

The first involves observational learning, which includes attending, remembering, reproducing and, crucially, the reinforcement of overt and covert behaviour. The consequences of behaviour may also increase or decrease behaviour already learned (Bandura 1977b).

The second feature involves Bandura and colleagues' reformulation of the idea of reinforcement to include the idea of antecedent control, which includes "variations in the chances of an act occurring due to immediately preceding stimulus conditions," (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Based on conditions existing immediately prior to the present situation, a person may choose to, or choose not to display behaviour learned. Failure to display behaviour, however, does not necessarily mean that learning, which is clearly cognitive, has not taken place (Monte, 1987).

The third feature focuses on internal control of behaviour to explain complex learning, or what Bandura (1977b) coined as the "self-system," which he saw as a complex of processes all interdependent with the individual's social and physical environment. Fundamental to this feature is Bandura's (1977b) idea of "reciprocal determinism" meaning, in its most simplistic reduction, that environments have causes as do behaviours of individuals and that both have a determining effect on the other.

Finally, Bandura (1977b) tackled what Freud (1936) had earlier termed "the problem of anxiety," attempting a synthesis between Freud's ego-helplessness (Freud, 1920/1966) and behaviourist response consequences. Bandura did not see anxiety arousal and resulting defensive behaviours as sequentially related, but as co-effects. Aversive events, according to Bandura, trigger avoidance behaviours because they signal impending pain or injury, and anxiety arousal is also triggered, but simultaneous with the pain/injury expectation (Monte, 1987). Individual responses remain under the

control of person variables, and it is the person's own feelings and thoughts (cognitions) about the meaning of the anxiety arousal, and their expectation of personal capability in coping with the situation that are important. Threats signal impending pain or injury and activate defensive behaviours which are subsequently maintained because of their perceived success in warding off or reducing the threats. The practice of constant avoidance never permits the individual to experience that the real situation has changed, and that the threats as once experienced no longer exist. The failure of these threats to fully materialize acts as "proof" that the defensive behaviours are working. Therefore, according to Bandura's formulations, it is not anxiety reduction which is reinforcing, but the reduction of the feelings of helplessness in the face of threats, which in turn bolsters a person's feelings of competency and powerfulness.

Social learning theory has also incorporated Sutherland's (Sutherland, 1947; Sutherland & Cressey, 1970) differential association theory, which has its basis in Symbolic Interactionism (Mead, 1934). Symbolic Interactionism suggests that people behave according to their subjective, cognitive definitions of the situations they find themselves in. A behaviour will occur in a given situation if that behaviour is defined as appropriate. Helping to define antisocial behaviour as "OK" are antisocial associates. Drawing upon this idea, classic Differential Association theory traces a causal chain from antisocial associates to the acquisition of antisocial attitudes, to

antisocial behaviour. These ideas have been linked with social learning theory to suggest that, essentially, all behaviour is learned through association with others. For instance, Andrews (1980), and Burgess and Akers (1966) have presented empirical support for a direct connection between antisocial associates and the acquisition of antisocial behaviours (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Behaviour, then, is both learned and reasoned (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Together, differential association theory, symbolic interactionism, and Bandura's reworking of psychodynamic theory and radical behaviourism place behaviour squarely under the cognitive control of the individual in reciprocal interaction with the environment. Emphasis is placed on attitudes, values and beliefs supportive of certain behaviours which are learned through association with others, and these factors are among the most powerful correlates of criminal conduct found within a psychology of criminal conduct (Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

The Psychology of Criminal Conduct - A Personal, Interpersonal and Community Reinforcement (PIC-R) Model

The task of forging a general psychological theory of criminal conduct based on a social learning model was undertaken by Andrews (1982a), and Andrews and Bonta (1994). Their theory, called "The Personal, Interpersonal and Community Reinforcement" (PIC-R) model of criminal conduct, suggests that all human behaviour is determined by the density of rewards and costs for that behaviour, and that such rewards and costs are mediated by antecedent stimuli and an evaluation of consequent

stimuli, both deriving from sources which are personal, interpersonal, and within an individual's immediate environment and community. According to this model, in order to understand behaviour one must examine characteristics of the person, those with whom he has had contact immediately prior to, during, and immediately following the behavioural episode, and the environmental context of his behaviour – the "situation" immediately prior to the behaviours, during the incident, and as it unfolded immediately after the episode. The major sources of variation in behavioral judgements between offenders and non-offenders according to the PIC-R model, therefore, are found within the following: characteristics of the immediate environment (Glueck & Glueck, 1950); attitudes, values, beliefs and rationalizations (Sykes & Matza, 1957) held by the person with regard to antisocial behaviour; social support for antisocial behaviour, most often in the form of perceived support from others for that action, and a history of having engaged in antisocial behaviour. As well as these areas, the following two categories contribute most heavily to a particular person being in a particular situation: "self-management and problem-solving skills, and other relatively stable personality characteristics conducive to antisocial conduct" (Andrews & Bonta, 1994, p. 111).

Personality refers to characteristic patterns of thinking and feeling (Andrews & Bonta, 1994) and, like personally held attitudes values and beliefs, including those of an antisocial nature, these patterns are formed as a result of interactions "with others

in a process of intimate communication," (Andrews & Bonta, 1994, p.104; Sutherland, 1947), or in other words, a process of socialization (Glueck & Glueck, 1950; Mosher & Tomkins, 1988).

Male Socialization Practices:

Since the prima facie assumption of this study is that criminal behaviour is primarily a men's issue, any influence of socialization must be constrained to an examination of male socialization. Ironically, the theme which runs through much of the socialization literature is that masculinity is what femininity is not: masculinity itself is defined in terms of inverse femininity. While there is room for considerable debate about the masculinity-femininity construct (e.g. whether they are bipolar constructs along a social continuum, or the psychological manifestations of biological dimorphism) (Constantinople, 1973), that debate is beyond the scope of this thesis. What concerns this thesis is the question of evaluation: by what empirical means (i.e. external, objective) can masculinity or femininity be measured?

One of the most well-known measures of masculinity/femininity is the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). In a critical examination of this scale, however, Pedhazur and Tetenbaum (1979), using 171 male and 400 female subjects, found that the determination of masculine or feminine depended on the subjects' responses on only two of the forty items in the scale. Males rated themselves low on feminine, and high on masculine "traits," and females rated themselves low on masculine, high on

feminine "traits." Knowledge "of the respondents' self-ratings on the remaining 38 traits adds little to" the above (Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979, p. 109). Therefore, the idea of masculine and feminine may depend on a personally held system of attitudes, values and beliefs about men and women and, through learning, or socialization, on what people believe to be true about themselves, and is therefore resistant to empirical evaluation.

Hegel wrote that what is familiar (bekannt) was often not really known (erkannt), simply because it was so familiar (Brod, 1987). For instance, few would disagree that there are measurable differences between males and females (e.g. Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Eagly & Carli, 1981;), yet equally few have investigated why, compared to females, there are so many more males in conflict with the law (as measured by prison populations). During the infant years of modern psychology, for instance, the Freudian psychoanalytic perspective attributed male and female differences to the fact that boys were required to negotiate and resolve what Freud termed the Oedipal conflict (Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Monte, C. 1987;), and that this phase, unlike the concomitant Electra complex for girls, was more intense for boys (Sherrod, 1987; Freud, 1966). Classic Freudian theory was developed with a focus on the father. Critics of classic Freudian theory, such as feminist philosophers Chodrow (Chodrow, 1978), and Dinnerstein (Dinnerstein, 1976), re-evaluated the Oedipal/Electra conflicts with reference to the mother-child relationship, and

concluded that boys and girls resolve this crucial identification phase differently (for a review, see Sherrod, 1987). Notably, as a function of the Oedipal phase, boys must separate themselves from a primal identity with the ubiquitous, nurturant mother (until now, in most cultures, their primary point of interface with their whole world), and attempt to reformulate their identity within the context of a largely aloof, often absent, usually non-nurturant father (Segal, 1990; Jackson, 1990). On the other hand, girls are usually not required to undertake such a fundamental shift of ground for the development of their self-identities. As a result, Chodrow concludes, "the basic feminine sense of self is connected to the world, [whereas] the basic masculine sense of self is separate" (Chodrow, 1978, p.169).

Again, though compelling, these theorized differences remain resistant to direct observation and measurement, though some support for them has come from third-party survey research of self-reported parental observations and independent evaluation of parental attitudes. Saegert and Hart (1976), for example, have suggested that parents set higher achievement standards for sons, and provide different reinforcement for sons than for daughters. Block (1982) presents research suggesting that parents want their sons to be independent, self-reliant, ambitious and strong-willed, while they want their daughters to be unselfish, loving, kind and well-mannered.

Quantitative research focusing on differential socialization practices of adults

towards boys and girls is a little more conclusive. Margolin and Patterson (1975), present evidence suggestive of fathers acting in ways which may encourage boys to develop a stronger sense of agency than girls. In a study of 20 dual-parent families, Idle (1993) replicated past research (e.g. Reingold & Cook, 1975) suggesting children's toy preferences differ according to gender and context (presence of a parent or playing alone). Other (though now dated) research has suggested that teachers tend to give boys more attention and encouragement than girls, and several such studies suggest that teachers are particularly less encouraging in their responses to high-achieving girls (Block, 1978).

These studies tend to confirm that masculinity is not an innate attribute, but a product of an intricate web of social forces which, while in Hegelian terms are very familiar, remain substantially unknown as to their role in the construction of male identity. The familiarity of these social pressures is evident in the way masculinity and femininity has enjoyed a "lengthy history of common discourse" (Constantinople, 1973) within psychology, a discourse which is reflective of stereotypes commonly held in society generally. Masculinity on the Spence and Helmreich (1978) Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), for instance, is represented by high scores on items such as independent, active, competitive, persistent, self-confident, and feels superior. Early research on the nature of sex roles (e.g. Zelditch, 1955; Hartley, 1959; Turner, 1970; and Komarovsky, 1976) suggested that to be a "real man," men should cultivate

an independent style of achievement while also cultivating incompetency at anything "feminine," and, moreover, that these themes are orthogonal (for a review, see Thompson and Pleck, 1987). Hartley (1959) and Turner (1970) believed that the anti-femininity standard was the most dominant social norm of the era governing the male role (see also Meinecke, 1981).

More recently, Brannon (1976; Brannon & Juni, 1984) have postulated four clusters of norms which define the male role. The most pronounced of these is the proscriptive norm against anything feminine or, as Thompson and Pleck (1987) have described it, "no sissy stuff." The three other clusters describe "positive" prescriptions including the achievement of status, cultivation of self-confidence and independence, and the development of a penchant for aggressiveness.

Using items from Brannon (1978) and Brannon and Juni (1984), Thompson and Pleck (1987) investigated conceptions of the male role, obtaining data from a 20 per cent random sampling of college males from two liberal arts colleges in the United States. These colleges were the same ones used by Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman and Broverman (1968) to define the male stereotype. Using factor analytic techniques, Thompson and Pleck computed a three-factor solution accounting for 28 per cent of the variance: the first common factor, which they called the "Status Norm," underscored men's need to achieve status and other's respect; the second factor, dubbed the "Toughness Norm," emphasised men's expectations that they

should be mentally, emotionally and physically tough and self-reliant; the third factor identifies men's belief that they should avoid stereotypically feminine pursuits and occupations; this factor is called the "Anti-femininity Norm." The prevailing belief about masculinity, generated and regenerated through the socialization process seems, therefore, to be one which (in order of descending priority) reveres competitiveness (the achievement of status) and toughness, and which devalues things feminine.

The developmental literature tends to support the notion that behaviour in general, including sex-typed behaviour, is acquired as a result of socialization pressures placed on the child (Broude, 1990). One of the most salient arguments in this branch of psychology is that males are more aggressive than females across ages and cultures, and that this phenomenon can be explained by the greater social pressure placed on boys to be more aggressive (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974).

Broude (1990) has tested the socialization hypothesis in a meta-analysis of the developmental literature from 203 societies using adult profiles of aggression. As a measure of what she termed "hypermasculinity," she constructed a composite scale by combining scales from Slater and Slater (1965), and Bacon, Child and Barry (1963). Among the codeable early childhood and later childhood studies, she found highly significant results supporting pressure toward aggression in boys. She also found that, in societies where this pressure does not exist, or where there is pressure to inhibit aggression in children, low -aggression males were "overwhelmingly" produced.

Furthermore, variations in late aggression training in childhood accounted for .50 of the variance in scores on aggression profiles obtained in adulthood.

Broude (1990) also examined the issue of father-presence versus father absence as a variable in the socialization of aggression hypothesis. Her thesis is that the development of aggression (i.e. hypermasculinity) depends on who controls the resources in the family, and that if the father is absent, the male children, envious of the mother's position as prime resource controller, develop aggressive behaviour patterns. Father presence ameliorates the development of aggressive behaviour by dissuading it through punishment. Broude (1990) found an indirect relationship between the development of aggressive behaviour and father presence/absence. She found that what significantly predicted aggressive outcomes in boys (as measured by profiles of aggression in their adulthood) is the direction of socialization pressure from the prime socializer, and not merely whether fathers were present or absent. If fathers are present and socialization to aggression pressure is low, so are the aggressive outcomes. For instance, from her data Broude (1990) notes that of the 26 societies which train to inhibit aggression, 24 are father present. On the other hand, if the father is present and aggressive socialization pressure is high, aggressive outcomes are also high. Put another way, socializing relationships with one's prime caregiver may involve associations with an antisocial other who helps shape antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs supportive of increased aggression, and perhaps even crime (Andrews and

Bonta, 1994; Andrews, 1980; Burgess & Akers, 1966).

From the perspective of the individual, the personal impact of a socializing relationship involving training for aggression may be a punitive one. For instance, social factors associated with the family in terms of parental role modelling (Patterson, Dishion & Bank, 1984; Eron, et al. 1961), and levels of warmth, stress and general child rearing practice (Widom, 1989a; 1989b; 1989c; Carroll, 1979) are associated with violence and violent recidivism among males (for a review see DeJong, Virkkunen & Linnoila, 1992). In terms of its social impact, therefore, there are suggestions, that a particularly punitive form of male socialization practices is associated with criminal behaviour (Zaitchik & Mosher, 1993; Archer & Rhodes, 1989; Mosher & Sirkin, 1988; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984).

Punitive Socialization

Punitive socialization emerges in families which the Gluecks (Glueck & Glueck, 1950) described as comprising social environments demonstrating little understanding of children's needs, and who were unable or unwilling to provide adequate affection and stability for their children. Their "tentative causal formula" of criminal behaviour included individuals from such environments who, they emphasised, were characterised by "weak internal controls . . . resulting from poor parenting practices and parental modelling," (Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

Agnew (1993) reviews literature (e.g. Hirschi, 1977; 1969), which suggests

that chaotic, disorganized, and emotionally cold and punitive homes are not conducive to the development of commitment and attachment, and that adolescents low on measures of these factors are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour.

Mosher and Tomkins (1988) described punitive socialization developmentally as involving parents who use contempt and humiliation to inhibit emotions of fear and distress in boys, and where boys are encouraged to learn the ideals of courage and dominance.

Gold et al (1992) describe punitive socialization in terms of parental models using aggression to solve problems and a parenting style which encourages males to be tough and not weak (see also Riggs & O'Leary, 1989; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984).

Along these lines, non-experimental American data obtained primarily from the American National Family Violence Survey which surveyed 3,300 children and 6,000 couples, was reviewed by Straus (1991). He found that while physical punishment was the most frequently employed means of correcting misbehaviour, and that while it usually served to produce conformity in immediate situations, it tended to increase the probability of deviance, including delinquency in adolescence. It also increased the probability of violent crime both within and outside of the family in adulthood.

Literature focusing on the intergenerational transmission of family violence has focused on the experience of growing up in an abusive home and the enculturation of

patriarchal values. O'Leary and Curley (1986) found that abusive men were more likely to have witnessed violence between their parents, whereas independent studies (Bernard, & Bernard, 1983; Kalmuss, 1984; Telmich & Lindquist, 1984) suggest that a history of familial abuse is related to future involvement in abusive behaviour, and that witnessing abuse predicts men who espouse traditional views about women more so than non-abusive men.

In a study involving 380 men and women, Alexander, Moore & Alexander (1991), found a significant interaction between sex and a social history of abuse by the father when he was a child. Calculating separate interaction terms for men and women, they found that physical abuse by one's father was not only highly predictive of a man's commitment of and for being a victim of both physical and verbal abuse in his relationships with women, it was a primal factor in the prediction of male violence in male-female relationships. Witnessing parental violence was found to be non-predictive of female violence in relationships. Instead, women who reported witnessing marital violence between their parents tended to espouse more liberal attitudes toward women than women who did not witness parental violence (Alexander, Moore & Alexander, 1991).

These American-based data are supported by recent Canadian research such as Statistics Canada's National survey on Violence Against Women (Rodgers, 1994). Researchers from Statistics Canada surveyed 12,300 Canadian women over the age

of 18, asking them about their experience of violence in a marital relationship, current or previous. Among other things, they found that women living with men who had witnessed violence by their fathers were three times as likely to experience violence than those women living with men who had not witnessed violence by their fathers. Moreover, these women tended to experience repeated and more severe form of violence at the hands of their male partners. According to a recent analysis performed by the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence (Alan, 1991), children who grow up in violent homes may begin to act out learned violence behaviourally, an outcome consistent with a social learning perspective. For boys, this means imitating the behaviour of their fathers when involved in relationships with girls and women (Alan, 1991). As well, the literature (Rodgers, 1994; Kalmuss, 1984; Telmuck & Lindquist, 1984; Bernard, & Bernard, 1983) provides strong evidence to support conclusions (Alexander, Moore & Alexander, 1991) that such men are significantly more likely to hold more conservative attitudes toward women if they have witnessed violence between their parents, and that they are more likely to report being physically and verbally abusive toward their female partners.

These results are consistent with the findings of Rosenbaum and O'Leary (1981), and O'Leary and Curley (1986) which suggest that, compared to females, males are more likely to model the abusive behaviour of their parents, and of data presented by Comins (1984), suggesting those family environments characterised by

harsh physical punishment are associated with the perpetration of male violence. That is, for males, punitive socialization styles experienced in childhood, is predictive of future violent -- and therefore likely criminal -- behaviour.

However, it should be noted that there exists a problem with much of the transmission of violence literature. Many research projects failed to incorporate satisfactory controls for response biases such as an exaggeration of, or the denial of experience, commonly referred to as social desirability (Paulhus, 1984). For instance, Alexander, Moore and Alexander's (1991) data suggests that women with conservative attitudes are less likely to report verbal and physical abuse than women with more liberal attitudes, as measured by their own responses to the Attitude Toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). These controls, to be discussed in a forthcoming section, will be included in this study.

Punitive socialization, regardless of the unfavourable outcomes, does not mean that a child remains unsocialized. Such children, in fact, do learn a pattern of behaviours which guide their interactions with others. They are socialized within a particular social structure which, according to the literature reviewed thus far, is more or less supportive of certain, frequently violent, sometimes criminal behaviour, which is distinctly antisocial and masculine in its orientation.

The Socialization Scale of the California Personality Index (Megargee, 1972; Gough, 1965) measures socialization to conventional norms and beliefs. Research

using this scale shows that the socialization-criminality link is stronger than other suggested links such as class, race or age (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Such research has also demonstrated that as scores on measures of socialization decline, measures of delinquency increase (Howland, Kosson, Patterson & Newman, 1993; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985; Brodsky & Smitherman, 1983; Hindelang, 1972). This seems at odds with the proposal that among some men who engage in criminal behaviour, it is not so much that socialization has not taken place, but that a certain type of socialization has occurred, namely a punitive style of socialization. Referring to the psychodynamic literature, especially that which addresses certain "environmental barriers" to development of a healthy psyche, Andrews and Bonta (1994) note a frequently overlooked segment of Freudian psychology. That is, a specific pattern of child rearing practice (i.e. socialization) in which "moral training occurs without a background of warmth and affection," (p.72) may predispose some children to develop a strong orientation to rules, but may not leave them with a positive (i.e. pro-social) orientation to people. If so, people raised in such an environment could be expected to score low on a measure of socialization, but be ardent rule observers. While criminal behaviour ordinarily involves blatant rule violation, such behaviour would depend on what rules the person was strongly oriented to, and which rules he violated.

For instance, from lessons learned by watching his father, if a boy learns that

it is apparently appropriate for a man to punch a woman, and that sometimes women ought to be punched, he may in a relationship invoke this "rule" and may consequently be found guilty on a criminal charge of aggravated assault: he is, in effect, a socially low-scoring, rule adherent, criminal offender. Such a process of socialization wherein behaviour is learned through imitation of models and adoption of norms, supported by groups with whom an individual associates, is sometimes referred to as the Cultural Spillover Theory (McCord, 1991; Straus, 1991).

In her critique of the Cultural Spillover Theory, McCord (1991) offers an alternative, which she calls Construct Theory. This theory states that children learn what to do and what to believe in the process of learning language. They learn not just concepts, such as words for table and chair, computer, and the like, but also "what to count as painful or pleasant, desirable and undesirable, and what is worth avoiding or pursuing," (McCord, 1991, p. 173). Children in essence are engaged in a process of constructing classification systems, which will permeate all that they see, think, say and do. The learning of language, as mentioned, is integral to the process of constructing classification systems, and language attainment involves learning words, and then learning how to use those words to construct sentences. At the most fundamental level, sentence construction involves the stringing together of classes, or of what logicians call "predicates," and functional relations among them. In terms of punishment, McCord (1991) suggests that the most critical sentence string is the "if .

... then" connective. The neonate learns that "if" he cries, "then" he will be picked up. This connective is essential for learning about natural consequences the physical world of behaviour. The child learns that "if" he acts tough, "then" not only will other boys pay attention to him (one way or another), but more importantly, he will gain notoriety in the world of MEN. "If" he cries in the face of danger, "then" other boys and, most importantly, MEN, will ridicule him (Mosher, 1984).

Construct Theory holds that, because people construct different classification systems, individuals consider similar events to have different affective characteristics, such as pleasant or painful (McCord, 1991). Citing data from Aronson and Carlsmith's (1963) work with preschool children and the effects of controlling behaviour through threats of punishment, Construct Theory suggests that the more severe forms taught children to orient their behaviour around estimates of consequences to themselves. Likewise, rewarding behaviour tends to teach a child to value his own benefit over that of others. Rewards and punishments, according to McCord (1991), like neglect and rejection, teach egocentrism, and she writes that "Children brought up among adults who do not attend to their well-being are given no grounds for learning to consider the welfare of others" (McCord, 1991, p. 175). Reliance on punishment in particular may increase the attraction to forbidden acts, and both physical and non-physical forms teach children to focus on their own pain and pleasure in deciding how to act.

Whether a boy is unempathic, and learns to be unresponsive to his own inner

feelings of pain and fear because of Cultural Spillover theory or, according to Construct theory he values toughness and is impervious to pain, and is domineering, one variable seems to be common: punitive socialization practices, originating in the home environment, appear to have etiological primacy for the development of criminal behaviour patterns.

Hypermasculinity and Shame:

One of the outcomes of a punitive social environment is described by Mosher and colleagues (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984; Mosher & Tomkins, 1988; Mosher, 1993) of the University of Connecticut who have hypothesized the formation of a macho personality script. In part, this macho, or "hypermasculine" script was developed based on the work of Silvan Tomkins (see Tomkins, 1991), and involves the punitive socialization of affect.

In addition to the formation of a macho script, this study proposes a second and related outcome of a punitive social environment which incorporates an area of psychological research based on the effects of the experience of shame (Kaufman, 1974; O'Leary & Wright, 1986; Balcom, 1991; Retzinger, 1991; Lewis, 1992) which, unlike other emotions, is concerned with the self in relation to others, and appears to fit well conceptually with the personal and interpersonal mediated sources of rewards and costs suggested by Andrews (1982a), and Andrews and Bonta (1994): shame permeates all person-mediated sources of reward and costs for behaviour. As well,

studying the experience of shame will help address issues concerned with how an individual has learned to recognize himself as a result of sustained punitive socialization.

Formation of The Hypermasculine Script

Within cultures there are certain, accepted ways of being which Tomkins has termed "scripts" (Tomkins, 1965, 1987, 1991). As in the theatre, scripts comprise scenes, and scenes are temporal events or "happenings" with set beginnings and endings. Each scene includes at least one affect and its object. Scenes may include characters, places, props, actions and psychological functions and outcomes. This "dramaturgic model" (Tomkins, 1991), contains as well a whole series of connected scenes which form "the plot of life" (Tomkins, 1991).

Scenes are synonymous with what Andrews and Bonta (1994) have described as "the situation," in terms of understanding behaviour according to the PIC-R model. Tomkins (1991) contends that what society may decide defines a scene may be similar to, but will not be identical to what an individual defines as a scene, or situation. Therefore, while the two definitions are non-orthogonal, they remain distinct, which Tomkins (1991) says describes a tension between individual and society which necessary if both are to remain viable and yet able to change.

Scripts are the rules for ordering daily information into related scenes. Scripts usually exist beyond consciousness and are used to "order, predict, produce, improve,

avoid, interpret and understand through evaluation a collection of related scenes" (Tomkins, 1991; Hall, 1991).

The scripts of macho men are created both by socialization and enculturation (Mosher, 1991). Socialization has been discussed. Enculturation, according to Mosher, "particularly in informal male social systems, additionally teaches the boy the ideology of machismo . . . [through] identification, vicarious resonance, and celebration" (Mosher, 1991, p.211). There is "resonance" between the ideology of machismo, and the macho script.

The Ideology of Machismo:

As a result of punitive socialization experiences, a male child learns to inhibit the expression of feelings of pain and the emotions of fear. In place of these feelings and emotions is the macho personality script, the "pivotal rule" of which is "the inhibition of distress: big boys don't cry" (Epstein, 1991).

Macho personality emanates from an "ideology of machismo." Ideology is a system of beliefs forming a particular world view, in this case a belief system and a world view that "chauvinistically exalts male dominance by assuming masculinity, virility, and physicality to be the ideal essence of real men who are adversarial warriors competing for scarce resources (including women as chattel) in a dangerous world" (Mosher & Tomkins, 1988, p. 64). Another, more populist way of understanding machismo is to consider the bumper-sticker seen recently on an Ottawa-area car. It

read, "M.A.C.H.O., Mad, Attractive, Crazy, Hard, Oversized."

Ideology justifies forms of socialization, including beliefs about how children ought to be reared, and what the appropriate emotions for boys and girls are (Tomkins, 1965; Mosher, 1991). Punitive socialization punishes gender inappropriate affects, and increases the probability that a boy will accept a normative ideology (Tomkins, 1965). Normative ideologies conserve tradition and the status quo, and increase the likelihood that a boy will be socialized to accept an ideology of machismo (Tomkins, 1965; Mosher, 1991).

The ideology of machismo contains an image of men as warriors (Mosher, 1991), an image which justifies the power of the hypermasculine male. Those ascribing to such an ideology have come to understand male power flows from the nature of the "true" masculine. The ideology of machismo and the image of the warrior continues in contemporary times to influence "the socialization and enculturation of males, creating macho men and perpetuating hypermasculinity" (Mosher, 1991, p. 199).

No where is the perpetuation of the warrior myth as a model for masculinity clearer than in the literature of the so-called "Men's Movement," which seeks to salvage the trammelled image of masculinity in a post-feminist world. Three popular "men's" books -- Iron John, by Robert Bly (1990), Fire In The Belly, by Sam Keen (1991), and Men and the Water of Life, by Michael Meade (1993) -- all expound the

myth of the warrior as a prototype of masculinity. For instance, in the closing paragraph of his chapter on the "warrior psyche," Keen writes, "So long as the world is less than perfect the warrior can never wholly retire. It still takes gentleness and fierceness to make a whole man" (Keen, 1991, p. 48).

Citing the anthropological literature, (e.g. Geertz, 1973), Mosher (1991) makes the point that what is regarded as human nature is never independent from culture, and that claims to the naturalness of the masculine warrior ignores the symbiotic relation between human nature and culture: the point is that the attributes of gender are socially constructed, whereas biological sex is not.¹

The Construct of Hypermasculinity

The concept of hypermasculinity is not new. In the early 1970s (e.g. Finley, McDonal & Rosencranz, 1973) it was thought that men whose genetic endowment included a chromosomal combination of XYY were thought to be "hypermasculine" in that they possessed an extra male (i.e. Y) chromosome, taller and more muscular than normal males, and that they were more prone to criminal behaviour. Since then, research has largely disproved this theory. Herrnstein (1990) for example, found that the XYY genetic makeup was present in less than one percent of his offender samples.

The macho personality script involves an exaggeration of gender role

¹ The terms "gender" and "sex" are often used interchangeably, and are the source of some confusion in the literature. See Gentile (1993) and Deaux (1993) for a discussion.

behaviour: not just male, not just masculine, the macho man must be hypermasculine, (Zaitchik & Mosher, 1993), with clear dispositional choices in favour of physical toughness, daring, virility, and violence (Mosher, 1991). Mosher and Sirkin (1984) presented data in support of what they have termed the "macho personality constellation," which consists of three constructs: a view of danger as exciting, a view of violence as manly, and a callous sex attitude toward women. Hall (1991) has since expanded this "constellation" to include the view of toughness as control.

Socialization practices, particularly in early and middle childhood, which socialize the emotions of fear and distress in young boys are of fundamental importance in the creation of an exaggerated masculine lifestyle (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) which constitutes hypermasculinity. The young boy-child as a future macho male is socialized by his family in ways which, summarized, transform so-called "feminine" emotions into so-called "masculine" emotions (Mosher & Tomkins, 1988). To be borne manfully, personal distress for example must be transformed into anger: a man must never cry, but rather make his enemy cry out in surrender. Fear, the most serious enemy within, is the deadliest of all foes to the warrior, and it must be transformed into excitement. The expression of fear and the avoidance of fear are "inhibited through parental domination and contempt until habituation partially reduces them and activates excitement" (Mosher & Tomkins, 1988, p. 67). And shame is what the macho man must inflict upon his enemies, and within himself, shame must be

transformed into pride (Tomkins, 1987, pp. 175-176).

Distress, fear and shame are regarded as "inferior feminine" affects in the world of machismo, whereas anger, excitement and pride are regarded as "superior masculine" affects. This "stratification of affects" (Tomkins, 1987) in turn initiates a social bifurcation which is transformed into sexual differentiation: the successfully socialized superior, hypermasculine male expresses contempt for the "inferior feminine" affects (Zaitchik & Mosher, 1993). Boy children, as future hypermasculine males, enter manhood by proving themselves through male rites of passage. In part, these "rites" amount to a series of trials involving the mastery of "masculine" over "feminine" affects. Recalling the theme running through much of the socialization literature -- that masculinity is what femininity is not -- masculine superiority -- which takes the form of a fundamental misogyny -- permeates the childhood socialization of hypermasculine men.

During adolescence, enculturation continues with the magnification of the masculine virtues of heroism in such male activities as sports. In less pro-social endeavours, and among other, more criminally-oriented social associations (see Andrews and Bonta, 1994), enculturation may include the mastery of delinquent behaviours.

The hypermasculine male possesses a disposition to engage in exaggerated sex-typed performances (Hall, 1991; Mosher, 1991), which is realised by enacting

manhood as physicality, which he displays as a demonstration that not only is he masculine, but also hypermasculine, a man "who embodies the essence, the spirit, the soul of dangerous masculinity" (Mosher, 1991; Hall, 1991, p. 200).

Because of its emphasis on physicality, the hypermasculine personality is posited to be a young man's script. In unpublished data (Epstein, 1989) based on 76 hospitalised substance abusers, the mean age was 28 years (ranging between 18 to 45), and measures of hypermasculinity correlated inversely with age (see Mosher, 1991).

McCord (1991) has described the tenets of a Construct Theory, wherein punishment and some forms of reward executed within a punitive socialization environment, result in egocentrism and a focus on the self. Consistent with this view, Mosher's (1991) macho scripts are more self-validating than self fulfilling. Moreover, in terms of locus-of-control, the hypermasculine male seems to have forsaken the development of personal skills and mastery necessary in a public world -- what Mosher terms as "power-to" -- in favour of physical dominance within his private world -- or "power-over" (Mosher, 1991). In this respect, Mosher (1991) calls attention to what he calls "the paradox of traditional masculinity" (p.204). The ideology which seeks to place men over women also places men within a hierarchy of "male prestige" (Mosher, 1991, p.204). Such a prestige hierarchy advantages only the few men who rise to the top. As mentioned, however, "rising to the top," success, or "power-to," and competitiveness are all part of the male social and enculturation pattern. However, if

this route to a so-called legitimate manhood is denied, the macho man, according to Mosher (1991), may come to feel that salvaging his manhood is his last resort: he can still be a tough man. Mosher suggests that when destructive power substitutes for productive power (i.e. when power-over is substituted for power-to), "this pride in manhood creates a false consciousness" (Mosher, 1991, p.204). This "false consciousness" is embodied in the belief that one has power and is in absolute control of his destiny, when in fact, one does not have absolute power, and is, in fact, quite powerless and vulnerable.

Outside the discipline of psychology, the concept of hypermasculinity is broadly understood, particularly within popular culture, literature, and some of the feminist philosophies.

In modern English Literature, for instance, the concept of hypermasculinity is found in the scholarship of John Middleton Murray (1931). Writing about D.H. Lawrence's novel, Women In Love, Murray described Lawrence as a "squeaky-voiced, hysterical, impotent prophet of virility" (p. 72), and "construed Lawrence's attitude towards women as a function of his precarious, 'hyper-sensitive masculinity'" (Simpson, 1982, p.13). Murray writes:

To annihilate the female insatiably demanding physical satisfaction from the male who cannot give it her -- the female who has annihilated him -- this is Lawrence's desire. To make her subject again, to re-establish his own manhood -- this is the secret purpose of Women In Love. . . . He creates a sexual mystery beyond the phallic, wherein he

is the lord; and he makes the woman acknowledge the existence of this ultra-phallic realm, and his own lordship in it (Murray, p. 118).

American black social activist Bell Hooks (1984) notes that the traditional sources of power for men in the home -- the patriarch as worker providing for and protecting his family -- were transformed when labour came to benefit primarily the state rather than the family. Men no longer have complete power, authority and control over themselves or their family. They are, she suggests, controlled by the economic needs of capitalism. According to Hooks, most men today "are fed a daily fantasy diet of male supremacy and power. In actuality, they have very little power and they know it" (Hooks, 1984, p. 121). Instead, men are taught that, in return for their humiliation and domination in the public work place, they will have absolute power (and will be dominant) within the private world of the family. This, according to Hooks, is the root of domestic violence. The macho man has uncritically accepted this "fantasy" of power, this fantasy of "power-to," which is really nothing more than "power-over," and in itself is no more than a fantasy.

Empirical Support For The Hypermasculinity Construct:

Empirical support for the construct of hypermasculinity has come mainly from the work of Mosher and colleagues at the University of Connecticut at Storrs (for a comprehensive review see Mosher, 1991, and Zaitchik & Mosher, 1991). This group developed a 30-item Hypermasculinity Index (HMI), which includes three 10-item

subscales to measure the hypermasculinity constellation.² Cronbach's alpha for the 30-item, forced choice inventory is typically reported in the high 80s, and for the three 10-item subscales, within the mid 70s.

Mosher and Hall (Hall, 1991) added the construct of toughness to the original macho index to form a 40-item Expanded Hypermasculinity Index (EHMI). The EHMI comes in two forms, the forced choice (i.e. dyadic) format (EHMI-FC) and the "limited choice" format (EHMI-LC). The latter is comprised of items with a Likert scaling. Cronbach's alpha for the EHMI-FC is .90, whereas for the EHMI-LC it is .94 (Hall, 1991; Mosher, 1991).

Mosher (1991) lists six domains which provide support for the construct validity of the HMI and EHMI: personality correlates of macho men; ideology of macho among hypermasculine men; power and domination in macho men; callous sexuality of macho men; substance abuse in macho men, and toughness in macho men.

The personality correlates of macho men measured by the HMI were compared with needs assessed by Jackson's (1974) Personality Research Form. Among 135 college students (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) significant positive correlations were found with needs of impulsivity, exhibition, aggression, autonomy, and

Murnen and Byrne (1991) have developed a measure of Hyperfemininity (HFI) as an empirical counterpart to the HMI.

dominance. This pattern of correlations is interpreted by the authors as support for the macho emphasis of the "positive masculine" affects of excitement and anger. Significant negative correlations were found with needs for understanding, harm avoidance, cognitive structure, nurturance, order, and social desirability (-.18). This pattern of correlation is interpreted by the authors as support for the self-control of the "inferior feminine" affects (see Mosher, 1991).

A second study (Hall, 1991), involving 313 college men compared the EHMI to ratings on 100 adjectives drawn from the Williams and Best (1982) cross-cultural study of masculine and feminine stereotypes involving 30 cultures and 50 items each for male and female categorizations. As expected, macho was negatively correlated with feminine-trait adjectives in this sample, and significantly correlated positively with masculine-trait adjectives (e.g. reckless, tough, aggressive, adventuresome, courageous, rigid, pleasure-seeking). The most macho males produced scores negatively correlated with such adjectives as rational, steady, progressive, and precise. Interestingly, this sample of men did not rate "macho" as a prototype of the "ideal man," but rated macho along the lines of "warrior" or "hood" (Mosner, 1991).

Two studies examined the relationship between scores on the EHMI and measurements of an ideology of machismo. Hall (1991), with a sample of 313 college men, found significant positive correlations with both the forced-choice format and the limited-choice format and ideology. Several studies have found positive correlations

between macho scores and such measures as Jehovanist ideology (see Mosher and Sullivan, 1988; Hall, 1991), a Normative ideology (Epstein, 1991; Hall, 1991), with a measure of Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1988; Hall, 1991), militarism and support for war (examined during the American-Iraqi confrontation, "Operation Desert Storm") (Hall, 1991).

During the American-Iraqi conflict, Hall and Mosher (Hall, 1991) also designed a Posse measure after Altemeyer's measure of authoritarian aggression against select targets (i.e. communists; see Altemeyer, 1988). Mosher and Hall's Posse scale focused on Arabs, examining the assumption of their dangerousness to American interests. Significant positive correlations were found between the Posse measure and both the HMI and the EHMI ($r = .41$ and $.32$ respectively).

Significant positive correlations were also found (Hall, 1991) between scores on the EHMI and scores on the Modern-Traditional Sex-Role Ideology (TSRI; Kalin & Tilby, 1978).

Power and dominance in macho men was measured by Cornman (1987) among a sample of 110 college men using the HMI and Wiggins' (1979) adjective checklist for interpersonal behaviour. Scores of macho men correlated significantly with the full quadrant of dominant-to-hostile self-descriptions, with largest correlations found with arrogant, cold, and calculating behaviours. The psychological opposite of this quadrant is the friendly-submissive quadrant which, as expected, yielded

significant inverse correlations.

Epstein (1989), using Falbo and Peplau's (1980) Power Strategies in Intimate Relationships scale, found that macho males self-reported greater reliance on unilateral power strategies (e.g. persuading, persisting, demanding, threatening, angry expression, angry withdrawal) in relations with their friends. Machos used bilateral power strategies (e.g. reasoning, bargaining, and positive affect) with their male friends more often than with their female friends.

Lenderking (1988) related a measure of Interpersonal Styles of Dating and Sex, developed by Mosher from Kiesler's (1983) Interpersonal Circle Theory, which suggests a two-dimensional interpersonal space characterised by an axis of Control (Dominance-Submission) and an orthogonal axis of Affiliation (Friendly-Hostile). Macho men displayed a predominantly hostile interpersonal style along adjectives describing assurance, dominance, competitiveness, mistrusting, coldness, and hostility. These, in turn are associated ($r=.27$) with a proclivity to rape, and to sexually aggressive behaviour. Sexual satisfaction measures were related to segments close to the Control axis, exhibitionism, assurance, dominance and competitiveness.

Aggression against men and property is associated with the warrior image described earlier, and the hypermasculine constructs of violence as manly and danger as exciting (Mosher, 1991). Epstein (1989), using HMI scores obtained from 94 inpatients of alcohol and drug rehabilitation programs, suggests that scores of more

macho men are negatively ($r = -.26$) associated with the socialization scale (CPI-So) of the California Personality Index (Gough, 1969). Epstein (1989) also found that scores of macho men were positively associated with the Histrionic-Gregarious and Antisocial-Aggressive axes of the Million Multiaxial Inventory (Million, 1977), and with the Zuckerman's (1979) Sensation Seeking Scale (SSS).

Sexual aggression was demonstrated by Mosher and Anderson (1986), when they found a positive relationship between scores on the HMI and self-reports of aggressive sexual behaviour. Macho men reported using multiple tactics while dating to obtain sexual gratification, including using drugs such as alcohol, sexual force, angry rejection, threats, angry expressions and other verbal manipulations. In the same study, macho men subjected to guided imagery of themselves committing a realistic and brutal rape of a stranger, displayed less self-directed affective disgust, anger, fear, distress, shame, contempt and guilt. These researchers interpret these findings as demonstrative of a macho male's callous sexual attitude toward women. Several other studies (Lenderking, 1991; Sullivan & Mosher, 1990; Lenderking, 1988;) have supported the callous sexual expressions of macho men compared to non-machos.

In terms of substance abuse and its aftermath in macho men, Mosher and Sirkin (1984) reported the HMI was significantly and positively correlated with substance abuse in high school and currently; machos self-report more aggressive behaviour and dangerous driving after drinking. Zaitchik and Mosher, in a study of

rock musicians, found increased use of amphetamines, cocaine, and marijuana which, while elevated across the sample as compared to others, was particularly high among machos. Hall (1991) found EHMI scores were correlated with alcohol and marijuana use.

In unpublished data (Epstein, 1989), based on 76 hospitalised substance abusers, macho men reported that they started using alcohol at younger ages than non-machos, and that alcohol became a problem for them at earlier ages than non-machos (see Mosher, 1991).

Toughness was assessed among macho men by Hall (1991), who found, using a sample of 313 college men, that measures on the EHMI were correlated with Concealing emotions, and the Toughman subscales of Brannon's measure of masculinity (Brannon, 1985). Epstein (1988), using an extended version of Jourard's (1971) measure of self disclosure, found that college men disclosed more Bravado (recklessness, alcohol use) than either Neutral (preference for foods, politics, books) or Intimate (health concerns, self-criticism, disappointments) aspects of self. Macho men disclosed more to a male friend than a female friend.

Toughness with respect to self-disclosure was investigated by Mobayed (1990) who compared 32 high-macho and 32 low-macho men (assessed using the HMI) in terms of their interactions during 15 minute conversations with high- and low-macho strangers (hence high-macho dyads were compared with low-macho dyads). As

hypothesised, macho men were less likely than non-macho men to disclose personal information or affects which might have increased their vulnerability. Macho men elicited statements from their partners which avoided affect.

Mobayed (1990) found that macho men displayed more overtly aggressive affects during conversational interactions. They also tended to make statements about themselves at a higher level of superficiality than low-machos. This observation led to an unexpected discovery of potential significance for correctional settings. It was expected that expressions of Bravado would be increased by high-machos. In fact, both disclosures revealing vulnerability and Bravado expression were maintained at a neutral level by high machos. Mobayed speculates that this may be due to the high machos fearing either an escalation of Vulnerability self-disclosures, or an escalation of Bravado, both of which may test his masculinity either through an expression of vulnerability, or through violence. Moreover, it is thought that, in the presence of a hypermasculine man, it is more acceptable for many affects to be numbed, intellectualised, or masked by hostility. A hypermasculine approach to a hypermasculine man will potentially shut down meaningful communication, and relegate any exchange to the level of the superficial and/or the hostile.

In short, the hypermasculine male is remarkably close to the description of male delinquents offered over four decades ago by the Gluecks (Glueck & Glueck, 1950): the delinquent was described as physically mesomorphic (tough looking); he

was temperamentally restless, energetic, impulsive, aggressive and destructive; attitudinally, he was described as hostile, defiant, non-submissive to authority, and cognitively he was concrete rather than symbolic, and less methodical in terms of problem solving.

Shame and The Hypermasculine Male:

In the process of developing a macho personality, if a boy fails to achieve the hypermasculine ideals of courage and stoicism through the inhibition of his fear and the silencing of his cries of distress (anxiety), he experiences shame and self-contempt (Zaitchik & Mosher, 1993). According to Izard (1991), many boys are scolded and shamed for acting like "scaredy cats." In adulthood and in adolescence, showing fear is seen as an expression of cowardice, and being branded a coward is humiliating (shameful).

Most writers today distinguish shame from guilt. Shame concerns the functioning of relationships (Retzinger, 1991). Guilt "limits the expansion of power . . . Shame covers up weakness; guilt limits strength. Shame protects an integral image of the self; guilt protects the integrity of an object" (Wurmser, 1995, p 67) Shame says you cannot hurt me (in my weakness), whereas guilt says I should not hurt you (in my strength). Retzinger (1991) describes shame as the most social of all emotions, second to none in its importance to human relationships, and necessary for a well functioning-society. Shame, she suggests, is the human mechanism used to monitor

the self in social context. It is a guardian of the inner perimeter of privacy and intimacy (Schneider, 1977; Wurmser, 1995).

In terms of criminal behaviour and justice, a discussion of shame is incomplete without considering Australian sociologist John Braithwaite's (1989) theory of reintegrative shaming. With reference to criminal behaviour, his theory is one of reintegration rather than segregation, in which the first attempt is to reintegrate the individual within community. He sees the individual as an active decision maker, and the criminal actor is perceived as involved in a process of decision making "against a background of societal forces mediated by shaming" (Braithwaite, 1989, p. 9). This approach links both the idea of criminal behaviour and the concept of shame to the community, rather than limiting it to the individual. Shame is therefore intrinsically linked to socialization as discussed above, and therefore to the community. Cast this way, the focus is shifted from the individual criminal actor alone - though he is still held accountable for his own actions - to a shared responsibility between the criminal actor in the context of his community, and his community in the context of the criminal actor. Two "realities" are brought to the table of reconciliation, which is the ultimate strength of Braithwaite's theory, and its inherent weakness. His theory of reintegrative shaming depends on the existence of a cohesive community sharing mutual, communal interests on a daily basis. Individuals with no such sense of communal cohesiveness fall outside this theory.

Indeed, the creation of shame is much more pernicious among those who have a limited experience of cohesiveness, who have, instead, frequent experiences of parental humiliation, disparagement, and transfer of blame (Kaufman, 1974). For instance, according to a theory of hypermasculinity, the infant boy begins his life having to submit to parents who socialize his "feminine" affects punitively, through displays of anger and contempt and a rigid intolerance for their son's expressions of fear and distress, and even his consequent shame. This punitive socialization style instill in the infant the very sort of fear, shame and distress he is prohibited from expressing (Mosher, 1991).

O'Leary & Wright (1986) discuss shame in terms of a typology of narcissism. Narcissism, they suggest, is mediated by the extent to which grandiosity is consciously experienced. Specifically, where grandiosity is conscious and central, there is a distinct shame avoidance quality. Males, they suggest, are over-represented in this category. Both narcissism and shame reactions are evident in men who have been socialized in terms of the hypermasculine script. Balcolm (1991) notes that internalised shame and being shame-bound can make some men prone to violence within marriages, especially when coupled with male socialization patterns. The introduction of shame into the formulation of why men batter informs the expansion of intervention strategies (Balcom, 1991).

Punitive Socialization, Shame, Hypermasculinity and Criminal Behaviour Links

The question posed at the outset of this paper asks why some men (offenders) make the choices they do, especially with regard to violence. Part of the answer may derive from the perception of some men who have been systematically taught to believe that their behavioural choices are constrained within a unique male script (Mosher & Tomkins, 1988). Sykes and Matza (1957), for instance, have suggested that, while there is likely no culture wherein it is always acceptable to lie, cheat, steal and to inflict harm on others as a matter of course, there are those, such as criminal offenders, who engage in a system of verbalizations which, in given situations, not only find such behaviour as acceptable, but as the only solution or course of action left open to them. George Kelly (1967), in his "psychology of the optimal man," puts this same idea in a somewhat more poetic form, along with the hint of a solution:

if events, either past or expected, appear to manipulate a man it is only because, so far, he has figured out only one way to cope with them. He will continue to dance to the tune he thinks he hears them play until he contrives some other way of listening for the succession of notes (p. 27).

Such is the reaction of the hypermasculine male to potential (if only imagined) experiences of shame. Shame experiences of adulthood, or the adult recollection of a shame-producing event from childhood can serve as "triggers" to macho behaviour. Whereas shame itself is not criminogenic, some macho responses in the face of potential shame, real or imagined, may be.

Hypermasculinity as the defence against painful shame experiences is a model consistent with a social learning perspective of behaviour. Recall that Bandura (1977b), in his attempts to address Freud's (1936) "problem of anxiety," did not see anxiety arousal and resulting defensive behaviours as sequentially related events, but as co-effects. This study places shame arousal and a resulting hypermasculine defence also as possible co-effects of a punitive socialization environment. Aversive events (punitive socialization), according to Bandura, trigger avoidance behaviours (hypermasculine personality system), because they (the socialization experiences) signal impending pain or injury (shame and humiliation). Thus, within the context of a punitive event, while shame is generated, so a hypermasculine response is simultaneously "triggered" through a process which transforms certain affects (such as fear and pain) into acceptable hypermasculine affects (anger, hatred). Individually nuanced responses remain under the control of person variables, and it is the person's own feelings and thoughts (cognitions) about the meaning of the experience, and their expectation of personal capability in coping with the situation that are important. Threats signal impending pain or injury and activate defensive behaviours which are subsequently maintained because of their perceived success in warding off or reducing the threats. The practice of constant indulgence in the hypermasculine behaviours as defences against the pain of shame never permits the individual to experience that the real situation has changed, and that the threats as once experienced no longer exist.

The failure of these threats to fully materialize acts as proof that the defensive behaviours, that is, the hypermasculine responses, are working. Therefore, adapting Bandura's formulations on anxiety to the experience of shame, it is proposed herein that it is not shame reduction which is reinforcing but, as Bandura might put it, it is the reduction of the feelings of helplessness in the face of threats, which in turn bolsters a person's feelings of competency and powerfulness.

Mosher (1991) proposes that a macho script theory shows promise as a general theory of crime in conjunction with a theory of crime based on social class. Although this was a tentative proposal at the time (Mosher, 1991), he nevertheless proposed that since "poverty creates an unfavourable ratio of negative to positive affects in the lives of underclass men" (p. 225), and that since these negative affects are at the heart of a hypermasculine script which includes the constructs of danger, violence and callous sexual attitudes, hypermasculine scripted males are predisposed to criminal behaviour: machoism, hypermasculinity, and crime are seen primarily as a problem of "underclass" males. But crime is not committed according to a class system, real or imposed. Classes of peoples do not commit crimes – rich or poor, advantaged or disadvantaged, crime is the behaviour of an individual, which is the right and proper focus of a psychology of personality, of a psychology of criminal conduct.

As Andrews and Bonta (1994) note, no single variable has been accorded more importance in the field of criminology than social class. However, they further

note that several major reviews of the research literature have largely discredited social class as a major predictor of criminal behaviour (see Tittle & Meier, 1991; Tittle & Meier, 1990; Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1987; Thornberry & Farnworth, 1982; Tittle, Villemez & Smith, 1978; and for an opposing view see Braithwaite, 1979; 1980; 1981). Social class is not a good predictor of criminal behaviour, despite Mosher's musings. His work in developing a psychology of hypermasculinity, however, is.

Mosher (1991) has taken pains to meticulously construct an exhaustive psychology of the macho male personality, and has presented considerable data from various psychological measures of delinquency and antisocial behaviour with obvious links to the macho personality construct. For instance, men who have elevated scores on a hypermasculine measure (Hall, 1991; Mosher & Tomkins, 1988; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) share the following: they believe more rape myths to be true; they acknowledge greater use of drugs, alcohol and delinquent behaviours; there is a positive relationship between high macho scores and impulsivity, exhibitionism, and aggression, including greater sexual aggression towards women; they are less likely to believe that forced sex in marriage constitutes rape and are more predisposed to view such behaviour as part of the male prerogative. In two independent studies (Epstein, 1991; Gold, et al. 1992), men scoring high on measures of macho responded with greater anger and less empathy to distressed infants, and they were more likely to

define the babies as "bad," and to hold them less. In both studies, the authors relate these attitudes to potential for child abuse.

Within Mosher's psychology of the hypermasculine male exist the variables consistently demonstrated as high-level predictors of criminal behaviour as described by a psychology of criminal conduct (PCC). Andrews and Bonta (1994, pp. 230-233) have defined "the big four" predictors of criminal behaviour. These are: antisocial attitudes, antisocial associates, behavioural history and personality variables. This thesis is concerned with connecting Mosher's theory of hypermasculinity to this latter element within a psychology of criminal conduct, and in this way to offer an explanation as to why Canada's prison population is so overwhelmingly male.

The Present Study:

This study compared an officially defined offender sample with university males. As well, additional data were collected from a university female sample for a less important, general comparison of gender differences, especially on measures of hypermasculinity. Subjects were asked to provide self-reports of their involvement in a variety of criminal behaviours. As well, they were asked to respond to a battery of self-report, paper-and-pencil measures assessing the major sources of variation in behavioral judgements between offenders and non-offenders according to the PIC-R model of Andrews (1982a), and Andrews and Bonta (1994). These are found within the attitudes, values, and beliefs held by the person with regard to antisocial behaviour.

These are conceptualised, in part, as criminal sentiments, social support for antisocial behaviour, and a history of having engaged in antisocial behaviours which are among the most potent predictors of criminal behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Therefore, the measures in this study were designed to tap these very constructs, and therefore should be capable of distinguishing differences in criminal sentiments, social support for crime, and self-reported criminal history within groups of offenders and non-offenders, and between the self-reported criminal history of males and females.

Self-management and problem-solving skills are also among the best predictors of criminal behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 1994), and for the purposes of this study these are conceptualised as problems arising from a shame-based personality, problems which are then dealt with through the development of a hypermasculine personality style. Therefore offenders and non-offenders were compared on measures of hypermasculinity, and internalised shame which should distinguish the two groups.

In addition to these research questions, this study will be used as a preliminary validation of the hypermasculine construct, punitive socialization and internalised shame using offender samples. A considerable majority of the studies to date using these measures have employed college student pool samples, which threaten the generalizability of results to other, non-college groups (i.e. external validity is weak). This study should clarify that weakness.

As well as examining the potential correlates of self-reported crime, this study

will formulate a prediction model. Such a model containing variables such as criminal sentiments, social support for crime, and criminal associates has proved to be of significant value (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Adding items such as personal distress, alienation, normlessness and awareness of limited opportunity (McAvoy, 1993; for a review see Andrews & Bonta, 1994) have not been able to add significant incremental increases in variance accounted for in terms of criminal behaviour. As predictor variables, therefore, they are of limited value. Using official status as a criminal offender, along with self-reported criminal behaviour as the dependent measures, this study will introduce measures of hypermasculine personality style, punitive socialization, and level of Internalised Shame as independent measures, and will examine the extent to which they contribute to the prediction of behavioural measures, incremental to the known measures of sentiments, associates and social support. Adding incremental significance to variance explained in the outcome measure is fundamental to the understanding of "the problem of crime" in our society. Without that criterion, however, there remains the potential clinical value of these measures in terms of their potential relationship with such measures as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and its subscales, or Hare's (1991) Psychopathy Checklist.

Method

Subjects

Data were collected from 245 subjects. These included a total of 70 Offenders housed in the Assessment Unit of the Province of Ontario's Rideau Correctional and Treatment Centre, located at Burrit's Rapids, Ontario. They ranged in age from 18 to 54, with a mean age of 31.27, $sd = 7.9$. As well, 82 men, mean age 21.15, $sd = 3.5$, and 93 women, mean age 20.00, $sd = 2.30$, from the undergraduate pool at Carleton University also volunteered for this study as part of their introductory psychology course requirements. They were awarded a grade point credit for their participation.

Procedure

All subjects were issued one of two consent forms, depending on whether they were a university student or an offender (see **Appendices A**, and **A-1**), which the researcher read aloud while subjects read silently along. All subjects were briefed on their rights as participants, including their right to refuse to answer any question in the study, or to withdraw at any time without penalty, and were given the opportunity answer questions concerning their participation. All subjects then completed the form by signing it. For security reasons relating to privacy and confidentiality of inmate records, offenders' forms were retained by the institution on each offender's file.

The research battery was then handed out. Each package was arranged in counterbalanced order using a balanced Latin Squares technique (Tabachnick &

Fidell, 1989, p.48). This procedure ensured that the order of questionnaires was balanced.

The Eastern Region Ethics Committee of Ontario Provincial Corrections voiced some concerns over wording in one of the questionnaires (see the Extended Hypermasculinity Index discussed in detail below). This committee was concerned that some of the items may have proved "emotionally upsetting to some readers," and recommended one of two options: the first option was to drop the offending items, an option not followed by the researcher. Failing that, they directed that each subject be "cautioned at the beginning that they may come across material that may be personally upsetting." In the course of obtaining consent, the researcher issued this caution, verbatim. As, if items were not dropped, the ethics committee required that each subject in the offender sample be debriefed individually, and that they be told "which values may not be endorsed" by all people (e.g. those describing demeaning behaviour toward women). This procedure was followed individually for offenders, and in groups for university volunteers, with attention given to those items which were demeaning not only to women, but gays and lesbians as well.

Measures

Following is a brief description of each construct and its measure.

Self-Reported Criminal History

The outcome variable for this analysis is the Self-Reported Criminal History

Scale total score. Self-report criminal history does not rely on official records, however, research has indicated high concordance between those records and crime self-reports (Hindelang & Weis, 1981). Moreover, Hindelang (1972) has demonstrated a socialization-criminality link using self-report delinquency. Hagan and Simpson (1987), using self-report data of criminal behaviour (i.e. criminal history), have demonstrated individual differences in taste for risk-taking and dangerousness. Others, such as Hirschi (1969) have reported similar findings, and likewise for Linden and Fillmore (1981) using Canadian data.

Appendix B contains a self-report measure of criminal behaviour developed by Andrews, Kiessling, Russel and Grant (1979). The Criminal Behaviour Scale is a 33-item, 5-point Likert-style self-report questionnaire. It asks the respondent if they have ever been involved in criminal behaviour, and if so, how frequently in the last year. For the purposes of this study, this scale has been divided into levels of crime seriousness. That segregation appears in **Appendix B-1**.

Balanced Inventory of Social Responding:

The measure used to estimate socially desirable responding in this study was an amended form of Paulhus's (1984) Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Form- 6 (BIDR-6). The amended for is referred to as the "decriminalised" version (BIDR-DC), a copy of which is contained in **Appendix C**. A description of the process of "decriminalization," follows.

Response bias, defined as the tendency to either minimize or exaggerate psychological problems and weaknesses, is important in any evaluation, but within the forensic sciences, it is critical. Many offenders harbour the belief that any data collected from them will be inevitably used against them. Their worries are not unfounded, especially given the use to which psychological reports will be put, and because of the potential ramifications of the interpretations made on the basis of these reports and subsequent clinical data (Haywood, Grossman & Hardy, 1993). Moreover, it is a natural human tendency to want to appear "normal," to belong, especially in the face of rejection and condemnation.

Those who engage in socially desirable responding (SDR) over time and across situations are said to have a response style (Paulhus, 1991). There are a variety of instruments which have been designed to assess SDR, yet many of them do not correlate well with one another and they frequently tap different constructs.

For instance, SDR can be divided into two clusters often referred to as Alpha (Block, 1965) and Gamma (Wiggins, 1964). Alpha refers to the general adjustment factor of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Associated SDR measures include measures such as the MMPI K scale (measuring Exaggeration/Faking). As Paulhus (1991) notes, Alpha is sometimes referred to as the "autistic bias" (e.g. Damarin & Messick, 1965), or a solipsistic distortion of self which alters self-perception such that is consistent with self-attitudes, and "self-deceptive

positivity." (Paulhus, 1984). Paulhus (1986) maintains that the healthy person is prone to self-deceptive positivity, and measures of such are therefore associated with Alpha. Simply put, Alpha distorts how I see myself, so that I may see myself favourably.

Gamma, which has been referred to as "propagandistic bias," is an instrumental manipulation of how other people see me or, as Paulhus (1984, 1986) terms it, it is a distortion aimed at "impression management."

The existence of a twin modelling of SDR has been demonstrated through factor analysis (Paulhus, 1984, 1986), and through experimental trial (Paulhus, 1984). Construct validity of a two-factor model employing both the Self-Deception Questionnaire and the Other-Deception Questionnaire (SDQ and ODQ; Sackeim & Gur, 1978) has been demonstrated through both correlational and experimental studies (for a review see Paulhus, 1991).

Paulhus (1991) distinguishes between two "traditions" in social desirable responding research, both deriving from separate but mildly related models. The first derives from a tradition of distinguishing between self-deception and impression management (Paulhus, 1984; Damarin & Messick, 1965; Sackeim & Gur, 1978). The second derives from a tradition of distinguishing between claiming positive attributes and denying negative ones (Roth, Snyder & Pace, 1986; Millham, 1974). From these two traditions emerge four constructs: self-deception; impression management, claiming positive attributes (enhancement), and finally, denial of negative attributes

(denial).

Paulhus (1991) presents supportive evidence for a merger between these four constructs, finding that both content (self-deception and impression management) and tactic (enhancement versus denial) were important determinants of responses to his Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR). Moreover, he found that denial items (denying negative attributes) were more closely associated with the other-oriented impression management items.

Enhancement items were closely associated with self-esteem, low social anxiety, and empathic distress. Paulhus (1984) suggests that when the content of the enhancement items responded to by socially desirable responders is examined, they reflect an inflated sense of control and confidence in one's thinking powers. He likens this style of responding with a sort of "cognitive narcissism," which is most closely associated with an instrumental self-deception, and is more than simple, indiscriminant claiming of positive attributes. Accordingly, (Paulhus, 1989) suggests that enhancement items (claiming positive attributes) were more closely associated with psychological adjustment (see also Roth, Snyder & Pace, 1986).

Paulhus (1984) has developed a scale based on a two-factor modelling of SDR which he calls the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR-6). Since the BIDR-6 approaches SDR by wedding twin concepts of desirable responding - self-deceptive enhancement, and impression management - it is the scale of choice for this

study given the subjective nature of the questionnaires used in this study (Kroner & Weekes, 1994).

Balanced Inventory of desirable Responding - Decriminalized Version:

The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding contains items which seem to describe criminal behaviour. Respondents answering these items are, in effect, self-reporting criminal behaviour. Since self-reported crime is the crime outcome measure used in this study, these BIDR-6 items represent a potential confound.

Two PhD candidates familiar with descriptions of self-reported crime were recruited from Carleton University's graduate program. These two raters, both held "blind" to the task at hand, were handed a "generic" list of items (which in fact were all the BIDR-6 items), and were asked to identify those items "Having to do with antisocial attitudes, beliefs and/or criminal behaviours." This author performed the same task so that three lists of items were generated. Only those items to which all three raters agreed were descriptive of or had to do with criminal behaviour were eliminated from the set of items comprising the current BIDR-6. No items were deleted from the Self-Deceptive Enhancement subscale. There were six items each deleted from the Impression Management subscale, and the Denial subscale.

The desirable responding scale used in this study, therefore, is not Paulhus's **BIDR-6** scale, but the current researcher's "decriminalized" version of that scale as mentioned above, dubbed the "**BIDR-DC**." For a list of the items deleted from the

BIDR-6, please refer to **Appendix C-1**.

Criminal Sentiments:

With the exception of its scale measuring attitudes to the criminal justice system (called "Law, Courts, and Police," which can also be broken into three scales measuring pro-social beliefs - and is the most distal measure in terms of its relation to actual criminal behaviour), the Criminal Sentiments (see **Appendix D**) scale is a measure of pro-criminal attitudes, values and beliefs. This scale is a 53-item measure consisting of three subscales which assess the following attitudes: attitudes toward police courts and the law, tolerance for law violations, and identification with offenders. A detailed discussion of this scale is provided by Andrews, Wormith, and Kiessling (1985). **Table 1** contains alpha scores, test-retest correlations, and correlations with Level of Supervision Inventory (adapted from Andrews, 1985). Morrison (1982), reporting on Tolerance for Law Violations, found that this measure accounted for more of the variance in self-reported criminal activity than other measures of criminal sentiment, and that a score above the mean (mean = 23.37, Andrews, 1985), was a clear indicator of risk (McAvoy, 1993).

Social Support For Crime:

A psychology of criminal conduct seeks to account for the way in which social arrangements influence variations in individual criminal behaviour. Certainly the

Table 1**Reliability Data: The Criminal Sentiments Scale**

	Alpha	Test Re-test	r with LSI Risk
Attitudes toward Law, Courts, Police	.67	.62	-.30
Tolerance For Law Viol.	.72	.41	.20
Identific. with Offenders	.53	.17	.22

literature reviewed thus far suggests that intimate personal arrangements -- such as those found within the milieu of the family -- shape attitudes values and beliefs, including those supportive of crime. Outside the family, however, other such relationships, some "intimate," and others less formal or intense also influence behaviour. In fact, according to Andrews and Bonta (1994, p. 109), the best predictors of criminal conduct among practically any sample, besides antisocial personality factors and cognitions or a history of antisocial behaviour are antisocial associates. A survey of risk factors identified through both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies identifies a list narrowed to four major predictors of criminal conduct, among them, social support for crime (Andrews, 1989; Andrews, Lescheid & Hoge, 1992; Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Andrews and his colleagues based their work on earlier research on social support (Pillavin, Hardyck, and Vadum, 1968; Linden and Hackler, 1973). The Social Support for Crime scale (**Appendix E**) asks respondents to report their awareness of criminal activities in their community, and is concerned with both the activities of close associates and of others less familiar to the respondent. It provides a measure of the respondent's awareness of and proximity to opportunities to become involved with criminal activities.

Social support ranks second behind attitudes values and beliefs supportive of crime, and is conceptualised as association with criminal others ($\text{Alpha} = .80$) and isolation from non-criminal others ($\text{Alpha} = .81$). Social support for crime is

correlated with other predictors as shown in Table 2 (Adapted from Andrews, 1985).

Socialization

Gough's measure of socialization is a paper-and-pencil, self-report subscale of The California Personality Index (CPI-So - Appendix F). It is composed of items which tap sensitivity to conventional rules and procedures. Low scores are known to be associated with impulsivity and a generalized disrespect for rules and conventions (Andrews & Bonta, 1994, p. 17). The CPI-So scale consistently and regularly differentiates (i.e. in 86% of studies reviewed) between offenders and non-offenders, according to Andrews & Bonta (1994). This scale is also known to correlate with familial variables and with measures of self-management skills. In an unpublished meta-analysis of predictive criterion validity, Simourd, Bonta, Andrews and Hoge (1991) found that the CPI-So and Hare Psychopathy Checklist (PCL; Hare, 1980) although indistinguishable from one another, clearly distinguished offenders and non-offenders well above social class and the MMPI Psychopathic Deviant (Pd) scales. The mean predictive validity of the CPI-So and PCL were between .34 and .39.

Harrison Gough (Gough & Bradley, 1992), the designer of the CPI and its 1987 revision, studied the CPI in a sample of 272 delinquent or criminal men versus 1,088 control, and 400 delinquents or criminal women versus 2,266 controls, which gave delinquent base rates for men of 20% and for women, 15%. They found that best

Table 2**Social Support For Crime and Correlations with Criminal Sentiments,
Personality, and Recidivism**

	r with Social Support
Criminal Sentiments	.48
Criminal Personality	.33
Criminal Recidivism	.44

Adapted from Andrews (1985)

discriminator was the So scale, which had a point-biserial correlation of .54 for men, and .58 for women.

Punitive Socialization:

Two measures will be used to assess the type and style of socialization each person experienced growing up. The first of these was developed by Mosher and Epstein (Epstein, 1989), and is called the Rewarding-Punitive Socialization of Distress Scale (Appendix G). Scores on this scale are correlated significantly with measures of hypermasculinity (HMI), ascribing to a normative ideology $F(4,88) = 7.75$ $p < .01$, and significantly predicted less empathy with and more negative evaluations of distressed children, which has been associated with child abuse (Epstein, 1989). Further psychometric evaluation of this instrument is not available.

Family Functioning:

The experience of a punitive socializing environment, and socialization generally, is normally obtained within the home environment or, on more sociological terms, within the family of origin. It is necessary, therefore to corroborate the extent of punitive socialization experience with a retrospective report of a subject's home environment. The Colorado Self-Report Measure of Family Functioning (Appendix K) was developed by Bloom (1985), and is a 75-item, four-choice ("very true for my family," to "very untrue for my family") self-report scale measuring fifteen differing aspects of family functioning. These fifteen aspects are based along three general

dimensions -- relationships, personal growth or value, and system maintenance (Grotevant & Carlson, 1989). The scale is based on four other well known self-report measures: Moos's Family Environment Scale (Moos, Insel & Humphrey, 1974); van der Veen's Family Concept Test (van der Veen, 1965); Olson's Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale (Olson, Bell & Portner, 1978), and Skinner's Family Assessment Measure (Skinner, Steinhauer & Santa-Barbara, 1983). A list of these fifteen "aspects," according to the scale, are as follows:

1. Cohesion	2. Expressiveness
3. Conflict	4. Intellectual-Cultural Orientation
5. Active-Recreational Orientation	6. Religious Emphasis
7. Organization	8. Family Sociability
9. External Locus of Control	10. Family Idealization
11. Disengagement Style	12. Democratic Family
13. Laissez-Faire Family Style	14. Authoritarian Family
15. Enmeshment	

Moos (1974) has suggested that family functioning can be thought of in terms of three major dimensions. The first is a "relationship dimension," describing the

extent to which members feel they belong to and are proud of their family, the extent to which there is open expression

A second dimension can be thought of in terms of "personal growth" or value, indexed by the level of emphasis within the family placed on developmental processes. Inconsistent and equivocal data on this dimension have been routine, and therefore it was not included in Bloom's (1985) scale.

The third dimension can be thought of in terms of "system maintenance." Information along this dimension provides insight into the structure or organization of the family members vis-à-vis one another (Grotevant & Carlson, 1989).

Bloom (1985) expanded the dimension of "family relationships" as an area of assessment by adding three other constructs. The first of these is the construct of "family sociability," which he suggests is the degree to which members seek and desire gratification from social interaction with one another. He also added the construct of "family idealization," which he describes as the extent to which the family is prized by its members. The third and last of Bloom's additions on this dimension is described as "disengagement," or the extent to which family members fail to be drawn to one another, or are independent.

The dimension of system maintenance is described as structure and organization plus degree of control within the family. Control, according to Moos (1974) meant "the extent to which the family is organized in a hierarchical manner, the

rigidity of family rules and procedures and the extent to which family members order each other around" (Moos, 1974, p. 13).

A second lifestyle measure can be described as the extent to which rules governing family behaviour fail to exist or fail to be enforced. Families characterised this way are referred to as having a laissez-faire family style. replaced Moos's (1974) conception of control with three relatively independent components describing family style. The first of these he described as having a democratic family style, or the extent, to which family decision-making involves all members of the family. A second lifestyle measure can be described as the extent to which rules governing family behaviour fail to exist or fail to be enforced. Families characterised this way are referred to as having a laissez-faire family style. Authoritarian family style describes the third of Bloom's additions. Assessment of authoritarian family style involves measuring the extent to which parents are the locus of rule making in the family and are the arbiters of punishment in the event of rule breaking.

As well, locus of control, that is, the extent to which family fate is seen to be a function of circumstances beyond family control, and enmeshment, or the extent to which family members are seen as insisting on interdependence to the exclusion of individual action have also been identified as variables describing family system maintenance.

Within the relationship dimension, Bloom (1985) found that idealization was

highly correlated with family cohesion and expressiveness, and with the following qualities: little conflict; high active recreational orientation; high sociability; a familial perception of an internal locus of control; a sense of engagement with one another; having a democratic family style, and an absence of a laissez-faire family style.

Within the relationship dimension, cohesion was found to be a central concept. Cohesion is powerfully correlated in a positive direction with measures of expressiveness, sociability and family idealization. Cohesion was correlated negatively with measures of conflict and disengagement. Bloom noted that throughout the scale, "cohesiveness appears to be an integrating concept . . ." (Bloom, 1985, p.237).

Among system maintenance variables, external locus of control appears to be the key concept. Positive correlations with laissez-faire, authoritarian life styles, and enmeshment have been reported. Negative correlations have been observed between external locus of control and families characterised by a democratic organizational style. Bloom concludes that "those families that see external forces playing the major role in determining their happiness tend to be relatively unorganized, undemocratic, authoritarian, and laissez-faire, and tend to stifle independent action" (Bloom, 1985 p. 237).

Psychometric data for this scale is satisfactory. Measure of reliability using Cronbach's alpha method ranged from .40 to .88 (mean .71). No test-retest results are reported (Grotevant & Carlson, 1989).

Construct validity of the scale was assessed using factor analysis, which yielded 13 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, and closely matching the theoretical constructs (Bloom, 1985). Significant differences were found on 12 of the 15 scales in samples of adolescents whose parents were intact versus divorced, thus indicating the scales criterion related validity (Grotevant & Carlson, 1989; Bloom, 1985).

While standardization and norming has been performed only on small samples of adolescents, the instrument is also useful in studies with young adults. Grotevant & Carlson (1989) indicate that while more validity data are required for the scale to be clinically useful, "careful theoretical and psychometric development" (p. 291) make it a promising tool for use in assessing the influence of family of origin on present functioning.

Hypermasculine Personality Style:

Mosher and Sirkin (1984) developed the Hypermasculine Inventory (HMI) to measure what they posited as the macho personality constellation. This constellation, they suggested, consisted of a view of violence as manly, of danger as exciting, and of a callous sexual attitude toward women. "Violence as manly" was intended to identify a macho man's attitude that aggression, whether physical or verbal, is an acceptable means of domination over others. "Danger as exciting" reflects an attitude that survival in dangerous situations is a display of the macho male's dominance of the physical environment. A "callous sexual attitude toward women" indicated the macho

male's belief that sexual intercourse can be equated with the sexual domination of women; the sex act, accordingly, is an aggressive, depersonalized experience for the macho man (Zaitchik & Mosher, 1993).

Initial validation of the HMI was performed using 135 college men. External validity was assessed through comparisons with other, already well validated measures of drug use, alcohol use, high school delinquency, and the Jackson (1974) Personality Research Form. Psychometric data on the HMI from these and other studies is contained in **Appendix H-1**.

Hall (1991) added the construct of toughness to the original HMI, resulting in a 10-item "Toughness As Self Control" subscale, thus expanding Mosher and Sirkin's (1984) original 30-item HMI into the 40-item Expanded Hypermasculinity Inventory (EHMI). The EHMI was validated using 313 college men on a number of external measures. An added feature of the EHMI is that it comes in two formats. The original forced-choice scales are retained (with the addition of the fourth "Toughness" scale) for the EHMI-FC form. A second, limited choice form was created by pairing each item and its alternative in the 40-item inventory with a Likert scale ranging from 0 indicating "Not at all true of (for) me, up to 6 meaning Extremely true of (for) me" (Hall, 1991).

For both forms of the EHMI the Cronbach's Alpha is slightly higher than the original HMI with the exception of the "Toughness As Self-Control" subscale. Alphas

for all three versions are contained in **Table 3**.

The EHMI (FC and LC) demonstrated the same relationship as the original HMI with measures of drug use, sexual aggression, and antisocial behaviour. Both the Forced Choice and Limited Choice formats demonstrate good internal consistency, as well as construct and discriminant validity.

However, they fall to the same criticism as the original in that by using only college students as the validity sample, generalizations beyond that social group are questionable.

The present study will use the EHMI-LC format (**Appendix H**). The forced choice format of this scale, and that of the HMI, requires the subject to select a response from two alternatives. These two alternatives present the subject with a fairly obvious choice vis-a-vis what the socially desirable response is. The limited choice scale allows respondents to respond to each alternative.

Level of Internalised Shame

Among the measures of shame used in research, the **Internalised Shame Scale** (**Appendix I**) represents the best developed measure for clinical use (Allen, 1992; Harper & Hoops, 1988). The 30-item scale was developed to measure enduring, chronic shame which has become part of the internalised identity. The ISS includes an embedded self-esteem scale (items 4, 9, 14, 18, 21, and 28) which are not scored as part of the shame scale. These items are included to minimize response set (Allen

Table 3**Reliability Data For Hypermasculinity Index**

	Cronbach's Alpha	Source
30-Item HMI (total Scale)	.89	Mosher & Sirkin, (1984)
- Callous Sex Attitudes	.79	
- Danger As Exciting	.71	
- Violence As Manly	.79	
40-Item Expanded HMI (EHMI)		Hall (1992)
Limited Choice Format (total)	.94	
-Callous Sex Attitudes	.87	
-Danger As Exciting	.81	
-Violence As Manly	.88	
-Toughness As Control	.74	
Forced Choice Format (total)	.90	
-Callous Sex Attitudes	.81	
-Danger As Exciting	.80	
-Violence As Manly	.83	
-Toughness As Control	.67	

Note: The above data are drawn on college males.

1992). Shame has been conceptualised as different from self-esteem because it is an affect rather than a cognitive appraisal of one's self.

Alphas range from .95 for the ISS and .90 for the self-esteem measures, and test-retest reliability coefficients range from .71 to .84.

Psychopathy Checklist Self-Report (SRP-II):

The Psychopathy Checklist (PCL) and the slightly revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R) (**Appendix J**) represent an alternative conceptualization to the formulation of antisocial personality disorder defined by the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III-R). The work of Hare and colleagues is based on the earlier conceptions of psychopathy developed by Hervey Cleckley (1941). Ratings are generally based on a combination of semistructured interviews and an examination of institutional and criminal records. High interrater reliabilities for the PCL and the PCL-R have been demonstrated by Hare and colleagues (Hare, et al., 1990; Wong, 1988; Alterman, Cacciola & Rutherford, 1988). Factor analysis of data from six samples of male prisoners (N = 1,119) in Canada, the United States and England have demonstrated that the PCL and PCL-R comprise two stable factors, which were replicated with congruity in all six samples. Factor 1 was defined as core personality traits, including superficiality; habitual lying and manipulateness; callous lack of affect, guilt, remorse, and empathy. Factor 2 was defined by a chronically unstable and antisocial lifestyle

(Harpur, Hakstian & Hare, 1988).

Though caution is the order of the day, especially among inmates who often have been subjected to multitudes of psychological tests in their criminal careers and are likely to be test-wise and skilled at impression management, a self-report measure of psychopathy can provide useful information (Hare, 1991). Hare (1991) reports that the second version of the self-report form of the Psychopathy Checklist (SRP-II) has been validated using a sample of 100 inmates, yielding a Pearson product moment correlation of .54 with the PCL-R. Correlations of .50 and .44 with Factors 1 and 2, respectively, were also reported.

Hare reports that the SRP-II proves useful in research with both criminal non-criminal populations, though caution must be exercised in making clinical decisions based on its results.

Clustering of Variables:

The measures used in this study are divided into four sets of variables: variables measuring socially desirable responding (this "set" contains the subscales of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding; variables associated with a general theory of crime; other variables of theoretical interest, and variables derived from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Index. These sets are constructed as follows: a set comprising Age and variables measuring socially desirable responding (i.e. subscales of the **Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding**); a set consisting only of those

variables known through the weight of empirical evidence to be associated with general criminal behaviour (i.e. variables within a general **Psychology of Criminal Conduct**, or "**P.C.**" variables); a third set comprised of those variables which are also of theoretical interest, but as yet cannot lay claim to the benefit of an empirically sound demonstration of their statistical linkage with actual criminal behaviour, evidence of predictive validity in the same realm, and if those qualities can be demonstrated, have been further tested in replication studies.

The fourth and final set involves the adult version of the **Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Index**, second revision (**MMPI-II**).

These sets are further delineated below:

1. Socially Desirable Responding:

Age
Impression Management
Self-Deceptive Enhancement
Denial

2. The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (PCC) Variables

Criminal Sentiments

Attitudes Toward Law, Courts, Police
Tolerance for Law Violations
Identification with Criminal Others

Social Support for Crime

California Personality Index - Gough's Socialization Scale

3. Other Variables of Theoretical Interest:

Rewarding Punitive Socialization

Extended Hypermasculinity Index

Danger as Exciting

Violence as Manly

Callous Sexual Attitude Toward Women

Toughness as Control

Internalised Shame Scale

Psychopathy Checklist Self-Report (SRP-II)

Factor 1 (SF1)

Factor 2 (SF2)

Total Score (STOT 59)

Colorado Family Functioning Scale

4. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Index - 2

Standard Validity Scales

Clinical Scales

Supplementary and Content Scales

Three groups of respondents (University Males, University Females, and officially defined Offenders) will respond to measures in each of these sets.

Results

Data Screening

Missing Values

All data were initially screened for missing values. There were 245 subjects in three groups who participated in the study (see Table 4 for a breakdown). Of those, four subjects (one university male, and three offenders) were dropped from the analysis because data was missing in over one-quarter of the measures included in the research battery they were asked to complete. After these deletions, 241 subjects remained in the study. Excluding those four cases just mentioned, when missing values were encountered in the rest of the analysis, items were deleted listwise.

A subset of 147 subjects from the whole sample of 245 subjects completed the revised adult version of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Index (MMPI-2). Three cases were subsequently dropped from this part of the study due to incomplete data as defined by the MMPI-2 handbook. Additional criteria were applied to the analysis of the remaining 144 cases in the MMPI-2 data base, which further reduced the subset size. That criteria will be presented when the MMPI-2 data analysis is discussed.

Outliers:

Those cases whose scores were (+-)3.00 standard deviations above the mean

for any given scale were identified as outliers. As well, one subject whose **Age** (54 years) was greater than the mean age for his group (offenders) by more than +3.00 standard deviations was dropped from the study. Employing the above criteria, outliers were found among scores for the Extended Hypermasculinity Index (total score; two university males, and one from the female group), and the CPI-Socialization scale (one university male -3.00 sd). These cases were dropped from the study. After data screening, a total of 241 subjects were included in the study (**Table 4**).

Internal Consistency

The Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour scale, and all scales demonstrated adequate internal consistency as measured by Cronbach's Alpha's. Factor analyses of all "new" measures are reported in the appendices after the tabling of the scales themselves (see **Appendix 1**). As another measure of internal consistency, "coefficients of internal consistency" were determined through split-half analysis (see Anastasi, 1988, pp. 120-122). Unlike a Spearman-Brown analysis, the "Guttman" split-half analysis does not assume that both halves of the scale are equally reliable, or that they have the same variance. This analysis, too, yielded acceptable reliability statistics which, together with the alpha statistics, are reported in **Table 5**.

Descriptive Statistics

Subjects' scores for self-reported crime ranged between 33 and 137, with an observed mean score of 54.37, and a standard deviation of 16.09.

2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

A total of 235 individuals of 241 eligible subjects (97.5% of the sample) reported involvement in some form of criminal activity. Only five subjects (one university male and four university females, together forming 2.5% of the sample) reported having had no involvement ever in any form of criminal behaviour. The remainder of the sample indicated at least some involvement in some form of criminal activity. Response patterns to each item in the scale are reported in Table 6. Descriptive statistics for all other measures are reported in Table 7.

Inter-Correlations Among Battery Scales

Inter-correlations among risk factors and self-reported criminal behavior, variables measuring social desirable responding, and age are reported in Tables 8 - 10. Self-reported criminal behaviour is significantly correlated with the three subscales of the **Adjusted Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding**: Impression management ($r = -.50$); Self-Deceptive Enhancement ($r = -.14$), and Denial ($r = -.44$). Of the 17 risk-factors assessed in this study, only **Factor 1** of the **Self-Report Psychopathy Checklist** was not correlated with criminal behaviour self-reports. While age, overall, was not correlated with criminal behaviour self-reports, it was significantly correlated with those self-reports among offenders and university females. Intercorrelations among measures for data collected only from male subjects (i.e. University Males and Offender Groups Collapsed) are reported separately in

Table 4**Sample Sizes**

Group	Total N	Missing Data	Final Total	MMPI-II N
Student Sample				
Males	82	1	81	32
Females	93	0	93	45
Offenders	70	3*	67	67
Total	245	4	241	144

Note: * Includes one subject dropped due to age (61 YEARS) greater than +3.0 sd above the mean age in years (32)for his group.

Appendix L (see tables **L1 - L3**). Among male subjects, all measures were correlated with self-reported criminal behaviour, with two exceptions: Rewarding/Punitive Socialization to Distress, and Factor 1 scores from the psychopathy self-report scale were not significantly (i.e. $p < .05$) correlated with self-reported crime among male subjects. Among those scores which were correlated with self-reported crime are the Psychology of Criminal Conduct variables (i.e. having criminal attitudes, values and beliefs supportive of crime, social support for crime, and an inverse relationship with socialization to conventional norms and beliefs), Shame, Hypermasculinity and Family variables (i.e. low cohesion, high conflict, and a laissez-faire family style).

Simple and partial correlations between self-reported criminal behaviour, social desirable responding (BIDR-DC subscales), and age were computed separately for each of the sample groups, and are reported below.

The Correlates of Self-Reported Crime: University males

The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables: Simple and partial correlations between measures of self-reported criminal behaviour, social desirable responding, age, and those variables associated with general criminal behaviour ("PCC Variables") are reported in **Table 11**.

With the exception of the subscale measuring "Self-Deceptive Enhancement," ($r = -.16$) social desirability scores were significantly correlated with criminal

Table 5**Scale Reliabilities - Internal Consistencies**

SCALE	Cronbach's Alpha	Guttman Split- Half
<u>A. The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables</u>		
Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour Scale	.86	.95
Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Total)	.74	.77
Impression Management	.83	.70
Self-Deceptive Enhancement	.69	.82
Denial	.84	.83
Criminal Sentiments Scale (Total)*		
Laws, Courts Police	.87	.88
Identific With Criminal Others	.56	.72
Tolerance for Law Violations	.74	.65
Social Support for Crime	.85	.79
California Personality Index		
Socialization Scale*	.62	.70
<u>B. Other Scales of Theoretical Interest</u>		
Rewarding Punitive Socialization	.77	.80
Extended Hypermasculinity Scale	.92	.92
Danger as Exciting	.86	.87
Violence as Manly	.78	.77
Callous Sex Attitude	.78	.77
Toughness as control	.68	.64
Internalised Shame scale	.95	.92

Table 5 Continued

SCALE	Cronbach's Alpha	Guttman Split- Half
Psychopathy Checklist Self-Report		
Factor 1 (SF1 = 9 items)	.54	.58
Factor 2 (SF2 = 13 items)	.84	.85
Total Score (STOT59)	.87	.86
Colorado Family Functioning Scale	.86	†

Notes: * Reliability statistics for these scales includes ONLY University Subjects, items for Offenders are not available.

† Guttman Split-Half Reliabilities for individual subscales (n=13) with 5 items per scale were not computed.

Table 6**Number of Subjects Endorsing Items on the Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour Scale**

Item	Never	Not Last Year	<u>In The Last Year</u>		
			Once	Twice	Three (+)
1 Bribed or attempted to bribe a police officer or any other type of official	225	6	4	-	5
2 Used force to get money or valuables from another person	206	17	6	2	9
3 Sold beer, wine or liquor without a licence	199	16	10	5	19
4 Visited prostitutes or solicited	216	9	6	-	8
5 Carried a razor, switchblade, or gun.	190	22	6	3	19
6 Attacked someone with the idea of taking his/her life	223	5	1	1	-
7 Taken part in a gang fight	201	30	5	2	2
8 Taken things of large value (worth more than \$200)	177	33	11	2	17
9 Broken in and entered a home, store or dwelling	167	50	7	3	13
10 Had marijuana or hashish in my possession	117	34	22	15	52
11 Taken a car for a ride without the owner's knowledge	160	55	9	5	11
12. Attempted to force or forced someone to have sexual intercourse with me	229	7	3	-	1

Table 6 Continued

Item	Never	Not Last Year	<u>In The Last Year</u>		
			Once	Twice	Three (+)
13. Started a fist fight during an argument or struck or "beat up" someone who had not hit me first or who had not threatened me.	172	41	12	4	11
14. Purposefully damaged property	123	77	19	7	13
15. Driven a car without a driver's licence or permit.	103	79	10	11	37
16. Falsified information while filling out an application ore report, or] falsified official documents	164	39	21	8	7
17. Sold marijuana or hashish.	180	34	3	1	21
18. Started a fire or helped set fire to a building.	229	10	1	-	-
19. Participated in illegal gambling	177	32	10	6	15
20. Taken things of medium value.	97	76	17	-	4
21. Made false cab or ambulance calls, fire alarms, food orders, etc	177	52	7	-	4
22. Driven a car in a very fast, reckless manner	84	55	31	18	52
23. Went on to someone's property when I knew I was not supposed to	123	71	18	8	20
24. Threatened to hurt or or injure someone.	133	56	23	10	18
25. Taken Little things (worth less than \$5) that didn't belong to me	104	82	16	12	26
26. Had in my possession things I knew were stolen.	94	65	26	15	40

Table 6 Continued

Item	Never	Not Last Year	<u>In The Last Year</u>		Three (+)
			Once	Twice	
27 Have cheated on exams and/or assignments	95	97	20	12	16
28 Driven a car while impaired by alcohol or drugs	116	47	22	16	39
29 Caused a disturbance in a public place	119	60	28	12	19
30 Had illegal drugs other than marijuana or hashish in my possession.	150	34	10	7	37
31 Sold illegal drugs other than marijuana or hashish	193	22	2	-	21
32 Have stolen a car for purposes other than joyriding.	205	21	3	1	8
33 Got some money or something from others by deception	150	48	13	7	20

Table 7**Unadjusted Means and Standard Deviations for Independent Measures**

	Univ Males	Offenders	Univ Females
	<u>M</u> (SD)	<u>M</u> (SD)	<u>M</u> (SD)
Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour	54.37 (16.09)	69.80 (29.32)	44.96 (9.52)
Age	21.15 (3.56)	31.27 (7.86)	20.00 (2.27)
<u>Desirable Responding</u>			
Impression Management	48.07 (12.70)	46.57 (14.28)	47.55 (10.20)
Self-Deceptive Enhance.	83.79 (10.99)	82.49 (12.43)	79.11 (12.54)
Denial	50.44 (13.87)	52.34 (11.94)	53.79 (9.67)
<u>The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables</u>			
<u>Criminal Sentiments</u>			
Law, Courts, Police	86.33 (10.88)	91.67 (15.18)	89.49 (10.90)
Tolerance for Law Viol.	27.30 (5.36)	25.16 (6.42)	24.28 (4.44)
Ident. With Crim. Others	15.53 (3.23)	15.10 (3.28)	14.36 (2.79)
<u>Social Support for Crime</u>	22.58 (5.83)	25.03 (7.99)	20.46 (5.22)
<u>CPI-Socialization Scale</u>	43.31 (11.79)	33.91 (11.07)	46.13 (12.34)
<u>Other Variables of Theoretical Interest</u>			
<u>Rewarding/Punitive Soc.</u>	4.93 (3.59)	3.90 (3.90)	3.51 (3.15)
<u>Extended Hypermasculinity Index</u>			
Danger as Exciting	53.93 (18.44)	49.57 (21.32)	41.58 (16.81)
Violence as Manly	54.44 (17.31)	48.18 (23.71)	44.66 (16.24)
Callous Sexual Atmt.	44.07 (15.45)	45.07 (16.90)	34.62 (10.80)

Table 7 Continued

	Univ. Males	Offenders	Univ. Females
	<u>M</u> (S.D.)	<u>M</u> (S.D.)	<u>M</u> (S.D.)
Toughness as Control	62.83 (12.13)	57.79 (12.78)	55.62 (11.26)
<u>Shame</u>	57.49 (17.26)	58.49 (18.43)	58.70 (18.06)
<u>Self-Reported Psychopathy</u>			
SF 1 Factor 1	33.28 (5.92)	32.71 (7.74)	29.63 (6.78)
SF 2 Factor 2	48.20 (13.00)	47.56 (15.85)	41.10 (12.96)
STOT 59 Total	224.68 (32.72)	215.03 (42.45)	200.80 (31.00)
<u>Colorado Family Functioning Scale</u>			
Cohesion	10.27 (3.49)	10.24 (3.19)	9.63 (3.24)
Conflict	13.11 (3.70)	11.79 (3.5)	12.82 (3.70)
Laissez-faire Family Style	14.43 (2.58)	14.78 (3.31)	14.71 (3.4)

Table 8 Intercorrelations between variables associated with general criminal behaviour, age, and socially desirable responding

	VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH GENERAL CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR									
	CRIMBEH [†]	AGE	Desireable Responding				Criminal Sentiments			
			Impman	SelfDec	Denial	LCP	TLV	IO	SSC	CPI-SO
1. CRIMBEH	---									
2. AGE	.12	---								
BIDR-6										
4. IMPMAN	-.50***	.02	---							
5. SELFDEC	-.14*	.05	.31***	---						
6. DENIAL	-.44***	.09	.65***	.36***	---					
CRIMINAL SENTIMENTS										
7. LCP	-.22***	.11	.15*	.12	.18**	---				
8. TLV	.37***	-.06	-.26***	-.19**	-.35***	.02	---			
9. IO	.33***	-.07	-.20**	-.12	-.22***	.04	.46***	---		
SOCIAL SUPPORT FOR CRIME										
CPI-SO	.43***	.12	-.25***	-.08	-.23***	.24***	.26***	.31***	---	
	-.38***	-.34***	.22***	.08	.20**	-.28***	-.26***	.18**	-.27***	---

Notes: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. [†] Scale abbreviations: CRIMBEH = Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour; BIDR-6 = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Form 6; IMPMAN = Impression Management; SELFDEC = Self Deceptive Enhancement; LCP = Law, Courts Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators; IO = Identification with Criminal Others; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

Table 9 Inter-correlations: variables associated with general criminal behaviour, other variables of theoretical interest, desirable responding, and age.

	OTHER VARIABLES OF THEORETICAL INTEREST											
	REWPUN	Extended Hypermasculinity					Self-Report Psychopathy			Family Functioning		
		DAN	VIOL	CASEX	TOUGH	SHAME	SF1	SF2	STOTS9	COH	CON	LAIS
1 CRIMBEH	.17**	.54***	.45***	.37***	.28***	.17**	.05	.28***	.28***	.21**	-.31***	-.23***
2 AGE	.05	-.14*	-.23***	.02	-.22***	-.02	.05	.09	.02	.17**	-.11	.07
BIDR-6												
4 IMPMAN	-.07	-.23***	-.22**	-.15*	-.08	-.14*	.001	-.21***	-.15*	-.16*	.22***	.19**
5 SELFDEC	-.14*	.003	.04	-.004	.06	-.41***	.25***	.005	.09	-.27***	.36***	.28***
6 DENIAL	-.18**	-.26***	-.30***	-.22***	-.18*	-.32***	-.03	-.23***	-.25***	-.24***	.25***	.22***
CRIMINAL SENTIMENTS												
7 LCP	-.23***	-.34***	-.24***	-.16*	-.14*	-.20**	.11	-.03	-.03	-.19**	.14*	.23***
8 TLV	.36***	.46***	.38***	.30***	.25***	.22***	-.06	.26***	.26***	.16*	-.16*	-.26***
9 IO	.14*	.35***	.26***	.17**	.12	.08	-.06	.26***	.25***	.08	-.02	-.11
SOC SUPP CRIME	.14*	.28***	.18**	.18**	.16**	.15**	-.03	.28***	.31**	.18**	-.21***	-.06
CPI-SO	-.19**	-.20**	-.15*	-.20**	-.14*	-.23***	.01	-.26***	-.24***	-.32***	.34***	.07

Notes. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ REWPUN = Rewarding Punitive Socialization, DAN = Danger as Exciting, VIOL = Violence as Manly, TOUGH = Toughness as Control, SF1 = Psychopathy Factor 1, SF2 = Psychopathy Factor 2, STOTS9 = Psychopathy Self-Report Total Score, COH = Family Cohesiveness, CON = Family Conflict, LAIS = Laisses-Faire Family Style CRIMBEH = Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour, BIDR-6 = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Form 6, IMPMAN = Impression Management, SELFDEC = Self Deceptive Enhancement, LCP = Law, Courts Police, TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators, IO = Identification with Criminal Others, CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

Table 10
Inter-correlations between other variables of theoretical interest.

	OTHER VARIABLES OF THEORETICAL INTEREST									
	REWPUN	Extended Hypermasculinity			Self-Report Psychopathy			Family Functioning		
	DAN	VIO	CASEX	TOUGH	SHAME	SF1	SF2	STOT59	COH	CON LAIS
HYPERMASCULINITY										
DANGER	22***	---								
VIO	22***	61***	---							
CASEX	41***	48***	51***	---						
TOUGH	33***	53***	61***	55***	---					
SHAME	26***	14*	06	17**	17**	---				
SELF-REPORT PSYCHOPATHY										
SF1	01	08	08	15**	07	-24***	---			
SF2	16**	32***	25***	19**	17***	10	16***	---		
STOT59	18**	30***	30***	22***	21***	.07	31***	89***	---	
FAMILY FUNCTIONING										
COHESION	29***	12	-005	-01	04	.21***	-06	08	10	---
CONFLICT	-34***	-16**	18**	-20**	-13*	-.28***	04	-07	-08	-.52***
LAISSEZ-FAIRE	-18**	-.31***	-21**	-24***	-20**	-.27***	005	-07	-005	-.25***

Notes. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ REWPUN = Rewarding Punitive Socialization; DAN = Danger as Exciting; VIOL = Violence as Manly; TOUCH = Toughness as Control; SF1 = Psychopathy Factor 1; SF2 = Psychopathy Factor 2; STOT59 = Psychopathy Self-Report Total Score; COH = Family Cohesiveness; CON = Family Conflict; LAIS = Laissez-Faire Family Style.

behaviour self-reports of university males. **Age** was not ($r = -.16$). Among university males, attitudes toward the criminal justice system (Law, Courts, Police), were not correlated with criminal-behaviour ($r = .05$).

All the Psychology of Criminal Conduct variables which were correlated with criminal behaviour self-reports retained their correlations when the effects of social desirability were partialled from the equation. Likewise, partialling **Age** from the correlations had little effect on the statistical significance of scores for university males.

Other Variables of Theoretical Interest

Simple and partial correlations between self-reported criminal behaviour, social desirable responding, age, and other variables of theoretical interest, are reported in **Table 12**. University males' scores for **Rewarding/Punitive Socialization** were significantly correlated with their self-reported criminal behaviour scores ($r = .33$). When a partial correlation partialling denial (one of the three subscales measuring socially desirable responding) was performed, however, this correlation reduced to non-significance ($r = .22$). The same partial correlations removing Impression Management and Self-Deception, however, maintained a significant relationships with criminal behaviour self-reports. Scores for university males on measures of hypermasculinity were all

Table 11

The PCC Variables and Self-Reported Crime among University Males

UNIVERSITY MALES	CORRELATION With Self-Reported Criminal behaviour	PARTIAL CORRELATIONS			
		Social Desirability			AGE
		Denial	Impression Management	Self- Deception	
<u>SOCIAL DESIRABILITY</u>					
Denial	- .5506***	-	-	-	- .5582***
Impression Managt	- .6803***	-	-	-	- .6807***
Self-Deception	- .1642	-	-	-	- .1669
AGE	- .1584	.0281	.0745	.0006	-
<u>PCC VARIABLES</u>					
<u>CRIMINAL SENTIMENTS</u>					
Law, Courts, Police	.0503	.0393	-.0391	.0434	.0351
Tolerance for Law Violations	.4754***	.3049**	.2456*	.4574***	.4653***
Identification With Criminal Others	.4035***	.3359**	.2717*	.3864***	.3796***
SOCIAL SUPPORT FOR CRIME	.6874***	.6081***	.5692***	.6812***	.6802***
CALIFORNIA PERSONALITY INDEX					
<u>SOCIALIZATION</u>	- .5755***	-.3800***	-.4309***	-.3655**	-.6869***

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 12

Other Variables of Theoretical Interest and Self-Reported Crime among University Males

UNIVERSITY MALES	CORRELATION With Self Reported Criminal behaviour	PARTIAL CORRELATIONS			AGE
		Denial	Social Desirability Impression Management	Self- Deception	
REWARDING PUNITIVE SOCIALIZATION	3262**	2171	2653*	3094*	3271**
HYPERMASCULINITY					
Danger as Exciting	5179***	4898***	3786***	6381***	5027***
Violence as Manly	4943***	3765**	2789*	5304***	4721***
Callous Sexual Attitudes	3706**	2607*	2599*	3182**	3350***
Toughness	3062**	2899*	3240**	3410**	2789**
SHAME	2840**	0757	1510	2352*	2607*
SELF-REPORTED PSYCHOPATHY (SRP-II)					
Factor 1	1220	1801	2651*	2179	1391
Factor 2	7238***	6121***	5539***	7149***	7149***
Total	6583***	5382***	4960***	6881***	6479***

*p< .05 **p< .01 ***p< .001

correlated significantly with self-reports of criminal behaviour. When partial correlations between criminal behaviour self-reports and hypermasculinity were computed, partialling socially desirable responding, all four subscales maintained significant relationship with self-reported criminal behaviour

Shame scores for university males were also significantly correlated with criminal behaviour self-reports. Partial correlations between **Shame** and criminal behaviour retained significant relationships when Self-Deception was removed ($r = .24$). This relationship failed, however, when partials removing either Denial or Impression Management were computed.

Self-Reported Psychopathy total scores (**STOT59**) for university males were correlated significantly with criminal behaviour self-reports ($r = .66$), and this relationship was maintained when partial correlations were computed removing any of the three social desirability subscales. In terms of Psychopathy's factor structure, however, only Factor 2 (tapping a behavioral pattern characterised as having a "chronically unstable and antisocial lifestyle") (Harpur, Hakstian and Hare, 1988) was significantly correlated with criminal behaviour ($r = .72$). When the partial correlations were computed partialling social desirability variables, the relationship was maintained. Factor 1 (tapping core personality traits such as a selfish, callous and remorseless use of others), on the other hand, was not significantly correlated with

criminal behaviour self reports for this sample of university males, except, curiously, when the effects of Impression Management were introduced.

There were fourteen separate subscales computed for the **Colorado Family Functioning Scale**. Correlations and partial correlations between self-reported criminal behaviour and each of these subscales are reported in **Table 13**. Among University males, self-reported criminal behaviour scores were correlated positively with the subscale measuring Family Organization (an organized versus an unorganized family style) ($r = .22$). Negative correlations, on the other hand, were noted for subscales measuring Family Conflict ($r = -.26$), Family Disengagement ($r = -.25$), and laissez-faire Family Style ($r = -.29$). Low scores on these scales indicate high construct content. For instance, low Family Conflict scores indicate high levels of family conflict, and such a score would, therefore, be negatively correlated with criminal behaviour scores. Likewise for the other negatively correlated scales. An item from the subscale measuring laissez-faire Family Style, for example, reads as follows: **Members of our family could get away with almost anything.** Recall that response choices range from **1 = Very True for my family**, to **4 = Very Untrue for my family**. Therefore, low scores on this scale equate a highly laissez-faire family style, and would correlate negatively with criminal behaviour scale scores.

Among university males in this sample, the above mentioned **Family**

Table 13

Colorado Family Functioning Subscales and Self-Reported Crime among University Males

UNIVERSITY MALES	CORRELATION WITH Self Reported Criminal behaviour	PARTIALS			AGE
		SOCIAL DESIREABILITY			
		Denial	Impression Management	Self- Deception	
FAMILY FUNCTIONING SCALES:					
Cohesion	.0917	-.0351	.0997	.0114	.2723*
Expressiveness	.0420	-.1114	.0480	-.0513	.2143
Conflict	-.2595*	-.1607	-.1696	-.2064	-.1077
Intellectual- Cultural	.1935	.0593	.1923	.1402	.1573
Religious	.1964	.1208	.0421	.1945	.0912
Organization	.2214*	.2261	.0781	.1817	-.0533
Family Sociability	.1266	.0232	.0983	.0274	.2274*
External Locus of Control	.0652	.1406	.0357	.1526	-.2027
Family Idealization	.0546	-.0663	-.0065	-.0242	.1859
Disengagement	-.2463*	-.2033	-.1602	-.1885	-.0845
Family Style					
Democratic	.0817	-.0244	.1188	-.0265	.2620*
Laissez-Faire	-.2913**	-.2193	-.1435	-.2541*	.1336
Authoritarian	.0813	.1295	-.0441	.1351	-.2263†
Enmeshed	.0523	.1066	.0738	.1070	.0977

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 † Authoritarian Style controlling for Age approach significance at p <.056.

Functioning Scales were the only ones which correlated with criminal behaviour self-reports. None of these correlations retained significance when partials were computed removing social desirable responding.

The Correlates of Self-Reported Crime: Officially Defined Offenders

The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (PCC) Variables

Simple and partial correlations between measures of self-reported criminal behaviour, social desirable responding, age, and the PCC variables among Offenders are reported in **Table 14**. Similar to university males, Offender scores for social desirable responding - Denial, Impression management, Self-Deceptive Enhancement - were significantly correlated with self-reported criminal activity.

Age in the offender group was also significantly correlated with criminal behaviour self-reports. When partial correlations were computed between age and criminal behaviour self-reports, controlling for socially desirable responding, this relationship was maintained.

As expected, there was a negative and significant correlation between the **Criminal Sentiments Scale** measure of pro-social attitudes toward the judicial system Law, Courts, Police ($r = -.41$). When partial correlations between Law, Courts, Police and criminal behaviour self-reports were computed, controlling for both social desirable responding and age, significance was retained. A similar, significant and

Table 14

The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables and Self-Reported Crime among Offenders

OFFENDERS	CORRELATION WITH Self Reported Criminal behaviour	PARTIALS			
		SOCIAL DESIRABILITY			AGE
		Denial	Impression Management	Self- Deception	
<u>SOCIAL DESIRABILITY</u>					
Denial	-.5745***	-	-	-	-.5116**
Impression Manag't.	-.5551***	-	-	-	-.5506***
Self-Deception	-.2696*	-	-	-	-.2603*
AGE	-.4243***	.2352	.0892	.0149	-
<u>PCC VARIABLES</u>					
<u>CRIMINAL SENTIMENTS</u>					
Law, Courts, Police	-.4072***	-.3012*	-.3930**	-.4060**	-.3830*
Tolerance for Law Violations	.3144**	.2060	.3243*	.2676*	.2647*
Identification With Criminal Others	.2659*	.1475	.3082*	.2471	.2334*
Social Support For Crime	.1490	.2149	.1482	.1165	.2190*
<u>CALIFORNIA PERSONALITY INDEX:</u>					
<u>SOCIALIZATION</u>	.0453	.0156	.1677	.0107	.0284

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

positive correlation between criminal behaviour and Criminal Sentiments Tolerance for Law Violations ($r = .31$) was observed. Again, significance was maintained when partials controlling for social desirable responding and Age were computed.

This was not the case for Criminal Sentiments. Identification with Criminal Others. While there was a mild and significant correlation between criminal behaviour self-reports and this subscale ($r = .27$), when Denial and Self-Deceptive Enhancement scores were partialled from the equation, the relationship failed. On the other hand, the correlation is INCREASED (from $r = .27$ to $r = .31$) when Impression Management is controlled, and that relationship held when Age was partialled from the equation.

Another unexpected result was the non-significant relationship between offenders' criminal behaviour self-reports and scores on the Social Support for Crime Scale. However, when a partial correlation between criminal behaviour self-reports and Social Support controlling for Age was computed, the relationship increased to ($r = .22, p < .05$).

Among offenders in this study, scores on the California Personality Index Socialization scale (CPI-SO) were not correlated significantly with self-reported criminal behaviour. Recalling that the CPI-SO measures socialization to pro-social norms, a negative correlation was expected. A near zero ($r = .05$), non-significant

relationship within this sample is not usual.

Other Variables of Theoretical Interest

Simple and partial correlations between self-reported criminal behaviour and social desirable responding, age and other variables of theoretical interest were reported in **Table 15**. Among this sample of offenders, **Rewarding/Punitive Socialization** scores were not related to criminal behaviour self-reports ($r = .005$). This result was not expected among offenders, and perhaps indicates that this scale is an unsatisfactory barometer of family life environment when used with an offender sample, although this sample of offenders cannot in any way be considered representative of that population. Nevertheless, many men in this sample verbally reported that they could not remember their family of origin, or that they had lived with several families as a child and as a teen, or that they lived their childhood within an institution. This scale was developed (Epstein, 1991) as an attempt to tap the antecedents of a macho personality central to this thesis. The "pivotal rule" of a macho personality as described by Epstein (1991), was "the inhibition of distress: big boys don't cry." Many of the items in this scale, therefore, ask questions about what happened or should happen when a child cries in the family setting. One man from the offender group, for instance, noted on his response sheet, "As a child I never cried." While scores on this scale were uncorrelated with criminal behaviour self-reports, they were not expected to be; they were expected to correlate with

Table 15

Other Variables of Theoretical Interest and Self-Reported Crime Among Offenders

OFFENDERS	CORRELATION WITH Self Reported Criminal behaviour	PARTIALS			
		SOCIAL DESIRABILITY			AGE
		Denial	Impression Management	Self- Deception	
REWARDING PUNITIVE SOCIALIZATION	.0047	-.0773	-.0018	-.0203	.0792
<u>HYPERMASCULINITY</u>					
Danger as Exciting	.6624***	.5061***	.5989***	.6381***	.5863***
Violence as Manly	.5408***	.4388***	.5303***	.5304***	.4406***
Callous Sexual Attitudes	.3114*	.2714*	.2813*	.3182**	.2046
Toughness	.3397**	.2373	.3293**	.3410**	.1674
SHAME	.2877*	.0060	.1810	.1724	.2543*
<u>SELF-REPORTED PSYCHOPATHY (SRP-II)</u>					
Factor 1	-.0446	.1801	-.1369	-.0584	-.1871
Factor 2	-.1331	-.1480	-.074	-.0822	-.0076
Total	.0360	-.0578	.0306	-.0241	.0276

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

hypermasculinity measures, which they were. As expected, they were positively and quite strongly correlated with scores from the subscales of the **Extended Hypermasculinity Index**. These are the scores that the **Rewarding Punitive Socialization** scale is expected to predict.

Another measure of family life experience that is correlated with criminal behaviour for offenders is the **Colorado Family Functioning Scale**, the results of which are reported in Table 16 , and will be discussed shortly.

For offenders, total scores on all four of the subscales comprising the **Extended Hypermasculinity Index (EHMI)** were significantly and positively correlated with self-reported criminal behaviour. Partial correlations which controlled for social desirable responding maintained significant and positive relationships between **EHMI** scores and criminal behaviour. This was true with the exception of a non-significant partial correlation between scores on the Toughness subscale and criminal behaviour scores, controlling for Denial.

Age was also a factor in **EHMI** offender scores. Although the Danger subscale and Violence subscale each retained a significant relationship with criminal behavior self-reports, Callous Sex Attitude and Toughness scores did not. In unpublished data, Epstein (1989), noting its emphasis on physicality suggested that hypermasculinity may be more related to younger rather than older men. In a sample of substance abusers,

for instance, measures of hypermasculinity correlated inversely with age (see Mosher, 1991). To test this idea, partial correlations based on a median age split were performed for the present offender sample (median = 31 yrs.) No substantial differences were observed. Neither the Toughness nor the Callous Sex Attitude subscales for the offender group, either above or below the median age, reached significance.

Correlations between offender scores on the Internalised Shame Scale (ISS) and self-reported criminal behaviours were positive and significant ($r = .29$). Partials controlling for social desirability, however, failed to reach significance. The partial correlation controlling for Age ($r = .25$) indicates that age was not a factor in the correlation between ISS scores and criminal behaviour for the offender group.

In this sample of offenders, psychopathy, as measured by the Self-Report Psychopathy Checklist (SRP-II), bore no significant relationship with self-reported criminal behaviour, either in terms of total score correlations ($r = -.04$), or in correlations with Factor 1 scores ($r = -.05$), or Factor 2 scores ($r = -.13$).

As mentioned earlier, family functioning scores may provide a clearer insight into offenders' family life experiences. The Colorado Family Functioning Scale yielded a pattern of correlations closely paralleling those for the university male sample. These results are reported in Table 16. Recall that negative correlations

Table 16

Colorado Family Functioning Subscales and Self-Reported Crime Among Offenders

OFFENDERS	CORRELATION WITH Self Reported Criminal behaviour	PARTIALS			AGE
		SOCIAL DESIRABILITY			
		Denial	Impression Management	Self- Deception	
FAMILY FUNCTIONING SCALES:					
Cohesion	.2779*	.1693	.1448	.2719*	.1693
Expressiveness	.1361	.0565	.2423	.1619	.1208
Conflict	-.3415**	-.1772	-.3065*	-.3414**	.1251
Intellectual- Cultural	.1123	-.0437	.0626	.0802	.1156
Religious	.0267	-.0638	.1401	.0944	-.0007
Organization	.1693	.0972	.0706	.1926	.1151
Family Sociability	-.0310	-.1415	-.1581	.0058	.3265**
External Locus of Control	-.0643	-.0670	-.1575	-.1458	-.0763
Family Idealization	.0591	.0044	.0330	.0777	.1918
Disengagement	-.2296	-.2660	-.3296*	-.2767*	-.0340
Family Style					
Democratic	.1686	.0140	.1468	.1702	.3163**
Laissez-Faire	-.4009**	-.3635**	-.4263**	-.4432**	.1156
Authoritarian	.1057	.0845	.0809	.0854	-.0638
Enmeshed	.0534	.0182	.0341	.0657	.0256

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

indicate high construct content, and positive correlations a lack thereof. Accordingly, within the offender sample, Family Cohesion was positively and significantly correlated with self-reported criminal behaviour, indicating low levels of family cohesion positively linked to criminal behaviour. This relationship, however was diminished to levels below significance when social desirability was partialled from the equation. **Age**, on the other hand, had no effect on these correlations.

As with the university male sample, Family Conflict correlated negatively and significantly with self reported criminal behaviour ($r = -.34$). This suggests that, within this sample of offenders, a high level of family conflict is associated with criminal behaviour self-reports. This relationship held when partials, removing socially desirable responding, were computed, except in the case of Denial; the partial controlling for its effects failed to reach significance. The offender sample also resembled the university male sample in its negative and significant correlation between laissez-faire Family Style and criminal behaviour ($r = -.40$). This relationship was maintained, and in the cases of Impression Management ($r = -.43$) and Self-Deceptive Enhancement ($r = -.44$), it was increased.

As in the case for the university male sample (excepting Disengagement), none of the other subscales of the **Colorado Family Functioning Scale** correlated with self-reported crime.

Correlates of Self-Reported Crime: University Females

The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (PCC) Variables

As mentioned earlier, a study seeking to isolate the determinates of male criminal behaviour necessitates a comparison of male risk variables with those for females. Following, therefore, are the simple and partial correlations between measures of self-reported criminal behaviour for university females, social desirable responding, age, and those variables associated with general criminal behaviour ("PCC Variables"). These statistics are also reported in Table 17.

Social desirability - Denial, Impression Management, Self-Deceptive Enhancement - was negatively and significantly correlated with criminal behaviour self-reports. Age was correlated with socially desirable responding variables (Denial, Impression Management, Self-deceptive Enhancement), almost to the same extent that these latter were correlated with criminal behaviour. Accordingly, Age, when social desirability is left unaccounted for, correlated non-significantly with self-reported crime. Partial correlations between Age and self-reported crime, controlling for social desirability were all negative and significant. Criminal Sentiments subscales were all positively and significantly associated with criminal behaviour. Attitudes toward the criminal justice system as measured by the Law, Courts and Police subscale (a measure of pro-social attitudes) was negatively and significantly correlated with self-

Table 17

The PCC Variables and Self-Reported Crime Among University Females

UNIVERSITY FEMALES	CORRELATION WITH Self Reported Criminal behaviour	PARTIALS			
		SOCIAL DESIRABILITY			AGE
		Denial	Impression Management	Self- Deception	
<u>SOCIAL DESIRABILITY</u>					
Denial	-.4168***	-	-	-	-.3652**
Impression Manag't.	-.5663***	-	-	-	-.5262**
Self-Deception	-.2794**	-	-	-	-.2796**
AGE	.0841	-.310*		-.4191***	-
<u>PCC VARIABLES</u>					
<u>CRIMINAL SENTIMENTS</u>					
Law, Courts, Police	-.3442**	-.3220**	-.3261**	-.2951***	-.3438**
Tolerance for Law Violations	.4984***	.4643***	.3897***	.4663***	.5094***
Identification With Criminal Others	.4672**	.4521***	.3329**	.4402**	.4615**
Social Support For Crime	.5320***	.5065**	.4529**	.5319**	.5579**
<u>CALIFORNIA PERSONALITY INDEX:</u>					
<u>SOCIALIZATION</u>	-.4730***	-.4493***	-.4869***	-.4566***	-.4832**
*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001					
PCC Variables = Measures Associated with general Criminal Behaviour.					

reported crime ($r = -.34$). Partial correlations controlling for Age and socially desirable responding had no appreciable effect on this observation.

Tolerance for Law Violations correlated positively ($r = .50$) and significantly with self-reported crime and, as above, partials controlling for social desirable responding and Age had no appreciable effect on this observation. Such was the case with scores on the Identification with Criminal Others subscale ($r = .46$).

Criminal Sentiments Scale subscales yielded expected observations: high scores on Tolerance for Law Violations were positively ($r = .50$) and significantly associated with self-reported criminal behavior. This relationship held in direction and significance when social desirability and Age were partialled from the equation. Likewise for Identification with Criminal Others: scores on this scale correlated positively ($r = .46$) and significantly with self-reported crime, and this relationship also held when social desirability and Age were partialled.

The California Personality Index - Socialization Scale (CPI-SQ), another measure of pro-social attitudes examines subjects' socialization to conventional norms. It is inversely and significantly correlated with self-reported crime, ($r = -.47$), among university women. The relationship held for the partial correlations controlling for social desirability and Age.

Other Variables of Theoretical Interest

The correlations of self-reported crime and other variables of theoretical interest among university women are reported in **Table 18**. Women's scores for self-reported crime correlated positively ($r = .36$) and significantly with **Rewarding/Punitive Socialization** scores. This relationship held for the partial correlations when the effects of **Age** and social desirability were removed from the equation.

Scores on the **Extended Hypermasculinity Index** for university female respondents were positive and significant except in the case of one subscale. The subscale measuring Danger as Exciting was correlated positively ($r = .42$) and significantly with self-reported crime, even when the effects of social desirability and **Age** were controlled. The Violence as Manly subscale correlated positively ($r = .40$) and significantly with criminal behaviour self-reports, and this relationship, too, held when the effects of social desirability and **Age** were held constant.

The Toughness as Control subscale also correlated positively ($r = .29$) and significantly with self-reported crime, a relationship which held when the effects of social desirability were controlled. When the partial correlation between self-reported crime and Toughness were controlled the relationship strengthened in magnitude ($r = .34$) and significance.

Table 18

Other Variables of Theoretical Interest and Self-Reported Crime among University Females

UNIVERSITY FEMALES	CORRELATION WITH Self Reported Criminal behaviour	PARTIALS			
		SOCIAL DESIREABILITY			AGE
		Denial	Impression Management	Self- Deception	
REWARDING PUNITIVE SOCIALIZATION	.3668**	.3169**	.3323**	.3290**	.3741***
HYPERMASCULINITY					
Danger as Exciting	.4169***	.4369***	.4266***	.4710***	.4231***
Violence as Manly	.3947***	.3398***	.3621***	.4204***	.4196***
Callous Sexual Attitudes	.1531	.1331	.1781	.1253	.2020
Toughness	.2697**	.2545*	.2787*	.2845*	.3446***
SHAME	.0766	.0105	.1022	.0181	.1160
SELF-REPORTED PSYCHOPATHY (SRP-11)					
Factor 1	-.2653*	-.2614*	-.1657	-.2249*	-.3030**
Factor 2	.3116**	.3391**	.2966**	.3762***	.2999*
Total	.2559*	.2793*	.2946**	.3501**	.2453*

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Internalized Shame scores among this sample of university females were not correlated with self-reported crime.

Self-Reported Psychopathy (SRP-II) scores were correlated with self-reported crime. Factor 1 scores (Core Personality Traits such as selfish, callous and remorseless use of others) correlated negatively ($r = -.27$) and significantly with self-reported crime. This relationship failed only when Impression Management was controlled, and increased in magnitude ($r = -.30$) and significance. Factor 2 scores were more positively ($r = .31$) and strongly correlated with self-reported crime, and this relationship held when social desirability and **Age** were controlled. Total scores for Self-Reported Psychopathy were also positively ($r = .26$) and significantly -- if weakly ($p < .05$) -- correlated with self-reported crime, and this relationship held for the partial correlations controlling for social desirability and **Age**.

Similar to the university male and the offender sample, university female scores for family cohesion and conflict were related to self-reported crime. Unlike the two male samples, however, university female scores for laissez-faire family style were not related to criminal behaviour. Correlations for the **Colorado Family Functioning Scale** are reported in **Table 19**. Cohesion scores, recalling that high negatives indicate

Table 19

Colorado Family Functioning Subscales and Self-Reported Crime Among University Females

UNIVERSITY FEMALE	CORRELATION WITH	SEMI- PARTIALS			AGE
	Self Reported Criminal behaviour	Denial	SOCIAL DESIREABILITY Impression Management	Self- Deception	
FAMILY FUNCTIONING SCALES:					
Cohesion	.2797**	.2259*	.2954**	.2449*	.2699**
Expressiveness	.1470	.0282	.1596	.0515	.3077**
Conflict	-.3802**	-.3050	-.2892	-.3050**	-.2238*
Intellectual- Cultural	.0299	-.0435	-.0143	-.0778	.0343
Religious	.0241	.0089	-.0143	.0226	.0156
Organization	.1820	.0291	.0497	.0777	.0933
Family Sociability	.0707	.0442	.0877	.0100	.1639
External Locus of Control	-.1866	-.1077	-.1850	-.0836	-.2549*
Family Idealization	.1856	.1041	.1872	.1203	.2723**
Disengagement	-.1801	-.1184	-.1346	-.0959	.0686
Family Style					
Democratic	.1967	.0850	.1740	.1058	.3176**
Laissez-Faire	-.0723	.1021	.1214	.0784	-.0151
Authoritarian	-.1986	-.1571	-.1897	-.1578	.2737**
Enmeshed	.0680	.1319	.0840	.1182	-.2462*

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

high construct content, were positively ($r = .28$) and significantly correlated with self-reported crime.

This relationship held for the partial correlations controlling for social desirability and Age. Conflict scores were negatively ($r = -.35$) and significantly correlated with crime self-reports. This relationship held when self-deceptive enhancement was partialled, but failed in the partials controlling for Denial and Impression Management.

Multiple Regression Analysis

A second purpose of this study was to delineate the “best” predictors of male criminal behaviour. To do this, hierarchical, stepwise regression analysis was performed, with university males and offender self-reports of criminal behaviour as the criterion variable. Regression was hierarchical, or “blockwise,” and “stepwise,” according to variable “sets” of variables. Variable “sets” included those variable associated with social desirability, variables associated with a general theory of crime, and other variables of theoretical interest.

Blockwise: Variables associated with socially desirable responding formed the first “block.” These variables were “forced” into the regression equation first so as to capture as much variance in the criterion variable as possible due to attempts by subjects to respond in predetermined ways. That is, in ways designed to manage impressions, to deny attributes, or in a self-deceptive way.

The second “block” of variables entered those five variables associated with

general criminal behaviour. These included a group of variables collected under the rubric, "Criminal Sentiments," and which measure pro-social attitudes to Law, Courts, Police. They also measure Tolerance for Law Violations and Identification with Criminal Others. Also in this set are variables measuring Social Support for Crime, along with Gough's Socialization scale from the California Personality Index. These variables were entered in the second block, and "forced" ahead of the third block because, in terms of their ability to predict criminal behaviour, they have greatest weight of empirical evidence in their favour. The third "block" of variables entered into the regression included the remaining eleven variables, many untried in their ability to predict behaviour among an offender sample. Their challenge is to add "incrementally understanding" to the prediction equation. This means that these variables must account for a significant proportion of the variance left after that already captured by social desirability and variables empirically associated with general crime.

Stepwise: Variables within each block are entered in steps according to preset probability criteria. "Probability of F to Enter" (PIN) was set at .05; "Probability of F to Remove" (POUT) was set at .10. The variable having the largest absolute correlation with the criterion variable is considered for entry first. If it fails to meet entry requirements (PIN), the procedure terminates. If it succeeds, this variable is then evaluated to see if it should be removed according the present removal criterion

(POUT). After these considerations, "Step 1" is completed, and the remaining variables are evaluated for entry. After each step, variables in the equation are examined for removal. The procedure terminates when no more variables meet entry (PIN) or removal (POUT) criteria. The procedure is repeated for each block (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989; Norusis, 1994).

Regression Analysis - University Males

Results of the first of these regressions for university males are reported in **Table 20**. Note that within the set of variables measuring social desirability, Self-Deceptive Enhancement was not significantly correlated with self-reported criminal behaviour. It was, therefore, dropped from this portion of the analysis. The remaining social desirability variables - Denial and Impression Management - captured fully half (50%) of the variance in self-reported criminal behaviour. The second block of variables entered were those associated with a general theory of crime. Of the five variables in that block, both Social Support for Crime and Gough's socialization measure accounted for another 21% (R^2 Change) of the variance in criminal behaviour self-reports supplied by university males. The other variables exceeded criteria limits. Of the thirteen variables remaining in the third block, only Factor 2 of the Self-Reported Psychopathy Checklist satisfied entrance and removal criterion, and accounted for a further 3% of variance in crime self-reports. This factor estimates Hare's (1988) Psychopathy Checklist factor 2, a factor describing so-called

Table 20

University Males

Full Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest on Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour, Accounting for Desirable Responding

Step	Variables	R ²	R ² Change	Beta In	F	p
Block 1						
1	Denial			-.53		
2	Impression Manag't.	.48		-.55	33.75	.000
Block 2						
3	Social Support Crime	.65	.17	.46	44.9	.000
4	Gough's Socialization	.69	.04	-.24	40.0	.000
Block 3						
5	Psychopathy Factor 2	.73	.04	.28	38.3	.000

behavioural traits (chronically unstable and antisocial lifestyle).

Regression Analysis - Offenders: The same regression procedure (hierarchical and stepwise) that was used for university males was used for the offenders (but not for university males), it was included in the first block, along with those variables associated with social desirability. In this way, any variance attributable to **Age** was captured before any of the predictor variables (Block2 and Block 3) were tested. The results of the regression are reported in **Table 21**.

Among offenders, Impression Management, Age and Denial together accounted for 40% of the variance in self-reported criminal behaviour. None of the variables associated with a general theory of crime reached criterion limits. The subscale, Danger as Exciting, from the **Extended Hypermasculinity Index (EHMI)**, captured an additional 7% of the variance in self-reported crime. None of the other theoretical variables qualified for entry.

Regression Analysis - University Females: A hierarchical, stepwise regression was also performed for university women. **Age** was not correlated with self-reported crime in this group, and was therefore not controlled. The results of this analysis are reported in **Table 22**.

Denial and Impression Management (**BIDR-DC**) accounted for 25% of the variance among university women. Among PCC variables, Gough's socialization index from

Table 21

Offenders

Full Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest on Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour, Accounting for Age and Desirable Responding

Step	Variables	R ²	R ² Change	Beta In	F	p
Block 1						
1	Impression Manag't			-.46		
2	Age			-.37		
3	Denial	.40		-.28	10.19	.000
Block 2						
Limits Exceeded						
Block 3						
4	Danger Exciting	.47	.07	.34	10.08	.000

Table 22**University Females**

Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest on Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour

Step	Variables	R²	R² Change	Beta In	F	p
Block 1						
1	Denial			-.35		
2	Impression Manag't	.25		-.42	12.78	.000
Block 2						
3	Gough's Socialization	.43	.18	-.44	19.51	.000
4	Social Support Crime	.46	.03	.20	16.32	.000
Block 3						
5	Danger Exciting	.51	.05	.25	15.62	.000

the **California Personality Index** accounted for an additional 18% of the variance, while **Social Support for Crime** accounted for yet another 3%, bringing the total variance accounted for to 46% after PCC variables have been included.

Among the other variables of theoretical interest, only the subscale, Danger as Exciting from the **Extended Hypermasculinity Index** added incremental variance (5%), bringing the total amount of variance accounted for to 51% when all variables were considered. The family functioning variables were not retained in the solution for the university women's group of subjects.

Regression Analysis of "Serious" Crime: Another way of looking at risk is to examine crime severity or seriousness. In the case of self-reported crime, items were categorized as "Serious," "Moderate" and "Low" crime (please refer to **B-1**). A "serious" crime item, for instance, would be "**Attacked someone with the idea of taking his/her life,**" or "**Started or helped set fire to a building.**" An example of a "Moderate" crime item would be, "**Had marijuana or hashish in my possession,**" while a "Low" crime item would be "**Sold beer, wine, or liquor without a licence.**" Using the crime category "serious" as the criterion variable, regressions were re-run in the same "blockwise" and "stepwise" fashion previously described for university males, offenders and, for comparison, university females. The first of these analyses (university males) are reported in **Table 23**. Age was not correlated with "Serious"

Table 23

University Males - Serious Crime**Full Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest on Self-Reports of Involvement in Serious Criminal Behaviour**

Step	Variables	R ²	R ² Change	Beta In	F	p
Block 1						
1	Impression Mangement			-.34		
2	Denial	.21	-	-.47	9.36	.000
Block 2						
3	CPI-Socialization	.27	.06	-.26	8.7	.000
Block 3						
3	Self-Reported Psychopathy (Total)	.38	.11	.40	11.16	.000

crime for university males and was, therefore, not part of the equation for this group. Social desirability (Impression Management and Denial) captured 21% of the variance in the "Severe" crime category. Among variable associated with general criminal behaviour, only Gough's Socialization Index from the California Personality Index figured in the equation. This scale measures socialization to conventional norms, and captured an additional 6% of the variance.

Within the third block, the only variable passing muster was the Self-Reported Psychopathy total score, which accounted for additional 11% of the variance. The complete solution, therefore, accounted for 38% of the variance in the "Severe" crime category.

Results for the "Serious" crime category for Offenders are reported in **Table 24**. Age is correlated with "Serious" crime self-reports for Offenders, and was therefore entered in the first block along with social desirability (Impression Management and Denial) in order to capture variance attributable to it and the others before the rest of the equation is run. Together, those variables captured 23% of the variance.

For offenders, second block variables - those associated with general criminal behaviour - failed to account for any additional variance over and above Age and social desirability before probability criteria were exceeded (i.e. PIN .05).

Table 24

Offenders - Serious Crime

Full Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest on Self-Reports of Involvement in Serious Criminal Behaviour

Step	Variables	R ²	R ² Change	Beta In	F	p
Block 1						
1	Impression Mangement			-.35		
2	Age			-.27		
3	Denial	.23	-	-.25	4.79	.005
Block 2						
4	PIN = .05 LIMITS REACHED					
Block 3						
5	Violence as Manly	.30	.07	.31	5.08	.002

Among theoretical variables - those comprising the third block - the **Extended Hypermasculinity Scale** subscale, "Violence as Manly" captured an additional 7% of the variance after **Age** and social desirability. Overall, a total of 30% of the variance in the self-reported "Serious" crime category was accounted for in the offender sample.

Results for the University female group are reported in **Table 25**. Again, as with university males, Age was not correlated with self-reported "Serious" crime, and was therefore not included in this analysis. Social desirability (Impression management and Denial) accounted for 17% of the variance in self-reported "Serious" crime. Distinct from the male data (i.e., university males and offenders), variables associated with general criminal behaviour among university women enjoyed healthy representation in this analysis. **Social Support for Crime**, captured an additional 7% of the variance after social desirability, and **Criminal Sentiments scale**, "Tolerance for Law Violations" accounted for a further 4%. In total 28% of the variance in the "Serious" crime category. Among the third block, **Rewarding/Punitive Socialization**, measuring a punitive environment within the family origin, captured a further 4% of the variance, bringing to 32% the total variance accounted for in the "Serious" crime category for university women.

Table 25**University Females - Serious Crime****Full Model: Stepwise Multiple Regression of PCC Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest on Self-Reports of Involvement in Serious Criminal Behaviour**

Step	Variables	R²	R² Change	Beta In	F	p
Block 1						
1	Impression Mangement			-.37		
2	Denial	.17	-	-.20	8.03	.001
Block 2						
3	Social Support for Crime	.24	.07	.30	8.6	.000
4	Tolerance For Law Violations	.28	.04	.22	7.9	.000
Block 3						
3	Rewarding Punitive Socialization	.32	.04	.22	7.4	.000

Multivariate Analysis of Risk Factors: The purpose of this study is to examine the correlates of male criminal behaviour. While data have been collected from three subject groups including a sample composed of university women, the following one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) considered only differences between the two groups of men - university males and officially defined male offenders. Differences are reported without and then with controls for age and socially desirable responding. A similar examination of group differences between male and female respondents will be reported following this primary analysis.

Differences Between University Males and Offenders

Unadjusted and previously reported means, together with adjusted means (i.e. the effects of age and socially desirable responding have been removed) for all dependent variables reported in Table 26. Overall, MANOVA revealed that the linear combination of DV's differed significantly between university males and offenders $F(21,100) = 7.10, p < .001$.

Results of the Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA's), along with variance explained for each variable by differences between groups (η^2 - η^2) are reported in Table 27. A second set of results is reported in Table 28. These results also show differences between university males and offenders after controlling for age and socially desirable responding using a Roy-Bargmann hierarchical stepdown

Table 26

Unadjusted and Adjusted† Means and Standard Deviations for All Measures

	University Males	Offenders	University Females
	<u>M</u> (S.D.)	<u>M</u> (S.D.)	<u>M</u> (S.D.)
Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour	54.37 (16.09)	69.8 (29.32)	44.96 (9.52)
Adjusted	48.70	72.77	45.88
Age	21.15 (3.56)	31.27 (7.86)	20.0 (2.27)
<u>Desireable Responding</u>			
Impression Management	48.07 (12.70)	46.57 (14.28)	47.55 (10.20)
Self-Deceptive Enhanc.	83.79 (10.99)	82.49 (12.43)	79.11 (12.54)
Denial	50.44 (13.87)	52.34 (11.94)	53.79 (9.67)
<u>Variables Associated With General Criminal Behaviour</u>			
Law, Courts, Police	86.33 (10.88)	91.67 (15.18)	89.49 (10.9)
Adjusted	85.98	91.52	89.84
Tolerance for Law Viol.	27.3 (5.36)	25.16 (6.42)	24.28 (4.44)
Adjusted	26.79	25.59	24.47
Ident With Crim Others	15.53 (3.23)	15.1 (3.28)	14.36 (2.79)
Adjusted	15.02	15.62	14.28
Social Support for Crime	22.58 (5.83)	25.03 (7.99)	20.46 (5.22)
Adjusted	22.47	26.25	20.88
CPI-Socialization Scale	43.31 (11.79)	33.91 (11.07)	46.13 (12.34)
Adjusted	42.42	34.13	45.42
<u>Other Variables of Theoretical Interest</u>			
Rewarding/Punitive Soc	4.93 (3.59)	3.90 (3.90)	3.51 (3.15)
Adjusted	5.52	3.70	3.34

Table 26 Continued

	University Males M (S.D.)	Offenders M (S.D.)	University Females M (S.D.)
Danger as Exciting Adjusted	53.93 (18.44) 48.40	49.57 (21.32) 55.60	41.58 (16.81) 41.55
Violence as Manly Adjusted	54.44 (17.31) 47.72	48.18 (23.71) 55.35	44.66 (16.24) 44.69
Callous Sexual Attit. Adjusted	44.07 (15.45) 41.58	45.07 (16.90) 48.01	34.62 (10.80) 34.42
Toughness as Control Adjusted	62.83 (12.13) 58.87	57.79 (12.78) 57.63	55.62 (11.26) 55.66
Shame Adjusted	57.49 (17.26) 58.58	58.49 (18.43) 57.63	58.7 (18.06) 56.26
<u>Self-Reported Psychopathy</u>			
SF 1 Factor 1 Adjusted	33.28 (5.92) 32.64	32.71 (7.74) 32.97	29.63 (6.78) 30.45
SF 2 Factor 2 Adjusted	48.2 (13.00) 48.33	47.56 (15.85) 48.08	41.1 (12.96) 41.61
STOT 59 Total	224.68 (32.72) 222.97	215.03 (42.45) 215.57	200.8 (31.00) 202.81
<u>Colorado Family Functioning Scale</u>			
Cohesion Adjusted	10.27 (3.49) 11.07	10.24 (3.19) 9.54	9.63 (3.24) 9.46
Conflict Adjusted	13.11 (3.70) 13.02	11.79 (3.50) 11.77	12.82 (3.70) 13.10
Laissez-Faire Family Style Adjusted	14.43 (2.58) 14.70	14.78 (3.31) 14.50	14.71 (3.40) 14.64

+ Means are adjusted for the effects of **Age** and response set as measured by the **Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR-6)**.

Table 27

Univariate F Tests of Significant Differences Between Groups - University Males and Offenders on Variables Associated With General Criminal Behaviour

	F(1,140)	p <	η^2 *
Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour	18.66	.001	.13
Age	104.47	.0000	.42
<u>Desireable Responding</u>			
Impression Management	.02	.90	.0002
Self-Deceptive Enhancement	.005	.94	.0000
Denial	.05	.82	.0004
<u>Measures Associated with General Criminal Behaviour</u>			
Law, Courts and Police	1.70	.20	.01
Tolerance for Law Violations	.56	.45	.005
Identification with Criminal Others	.01	.90	.0001
Social Support for Crime	7.00	.01	.06
California Personality Index - Socialization	7.16	.01	.06
<u>Other Variables of Theoretical Interest</u>			
Rewarding/Punitive Socialization	2.10	.15	.02

Table 27 Continued

	F(1,140)	p ~	η^2 *
<u>Hypermasculinity:</u>			
Danger as Exciting	1.0	.32	.008
Violence as Manly	.39	.53	.003
Callous Sexual Attit. To Women	2.77	.09	.02
Toughness as Control	.23	.63	.002
Shame	.56	.46	.005
<u>Psychopathy Self-Report</u>			
SF 1 Factor 1	.01	.91	.0001
SF 2 Factor 2	.10	.75	.001
STOT59 Total Score	.02	.90	.0001
<u>Colorado Family Functioning Scale</u>			
Cohesion	1.5	.22	.01
Conflict	4.42	.04	.04
Laissez-Faire Family Style	.02	.90	.0001

* η^2 (eta squared): variance explained in the variable of interest by differences between groups.

Table 28

Univariate F Tests of Significant Differences Between Groups - University Males and Offenders Controlling for Age and Socially Desirable Responding

	F(1,140)	p <	η^2
Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour	48.53	.001	.10
Age	104.47	.0000	.42
<u>Desireable Responding</u>			
Impression Management	1.10	.29	.001
Self-Deceptive Enhancement	.82	.37	.006
Denial	.30	.56	.002
<u>Measures Associated with General Criminal Behaviour</u>			
Law, Courts and Police	1.41	.24	.03
Tolerance for Law Violat 87	.35	.54	.04
Identification with Criminal Others	.63	.43	.005
Social Support for Crime	4.13	.04	.03
California Personality Index - Socialization	8.34	.01	.14
<u>Other Variables of Theoretical Interest</u>			
Rewarding/Punitive Socialization	4.14	.03	.02

Table 28 Continued

	F(1,140)	p	η^2 *
Hypermasculinity			
Danger as Exciting	2.80	.09	.01
Violence as Manly	3.23	.07	.02
Callous Sexual Attit. To Women	2.77	.09	.005
Toughness as Control	.97	.32	.004
Shame	.05	.75	.01
Psychopathy Self-Report			
SF 1 Factor	1.01	.91	.0001
SF 2 Factor	2.13	.72	.001
STOT59 Total Score	.75	.39	.002
Colorado Family Functioning Scale			
Cohesion	2.86	.09	.001
Conflict	3.26	.07	.03
Laissez-Faire Family Style	1.0	.74	.002

* η^2 (eta squared). variance explained in the variable of interest by differences between groups

analysis. From these latter results, clearly age (means: offenders = 31 years; university men = 21 years) accounts for the greatest proportion of difference between the two groups ($\eta^2 = .43$).

Self-reported criminal behaviour accounts for the next greatest difference between offenders and university males ($F[1,140] = 48.53, p < .001$), with offenders reporting greater involvement and greater variance in their self-reports. There were no observed differences in the overall pattern of results for socially desirable responding between offenders and university males. Among those variables associated with a Psychology of Criminal Conduct, higher Social Support for Crime, and lower socialization to conventional norms (Gough's Socialization Index) distinguished offenders from university males.

After controls for age and socially desirable responding were introduced, university males reported significantly greater experiences with a punitive form of socialization than offenders, a result that is opposite from what was expected. However, in terms of hypermasculinity, differences approached significance ($p < .07/.09$) in the expected direction, with offenders reporting higher scores for danger and violence items. Similar results were observed for differences between family cohesion and conflict, with offenders reporting reduced family cohesion and higher instances of conflict within their families of origin than their university counterparts.

Differences Between University Males and University Females

Overall, MANOVA revealed that the linear combination of DV's differed significantly between university males and university females $F(21,135) = 3.79$, $p < .001$. Unadjusted results of the Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA's) are reported in Table 29, whereas similar results controlled for the effects of age and socially desirable responding are reported in Table 30. There were some minor differences in the overall pattern of response set between these two groups: women's responses were apparently more influenced by denial, whereas men's responses were influenced by self-deceptive enhancement.

With the exception of attitudes toward the criminal justice system, socialization to prosocial norms, variables included within a Psychology of Criminal Conduct successfully differentiated between university women and university men. University men reported a higher tolerance for law violations, increased levels of social support for crime, and greater identification with criminal others than their women colleagues.

Compared to their male colleagues, university women reported a more punitive socialization experience within their family of origin (but not in terms of cohesion, conflict or general family style). The two groups, however, reported no differences in terms of internalised shame. As expected, subscales of the Extended Hypermasculinity Index distinguished between the university men and university women, in the expected direction (i.e. men reporting higher subscription to

Table 29

Univariate F Tests of Significant Differences Between Groups - University Males and University Females: P.C.C. Variables and Other Variables of Theoretical Interest.

	F(1,172)	p	η^2
Self Reported Criminal Behaviour	27.63	.001	.16
Age	6.20	.014	.04
<u>Desireable Responding</u>			
Impression Management	.08	.78	.0005
Self-Deceptive Enhancement	6.70	.01	.04
Denial	7.69	.01	.05
<u>Variables Associated With General Criminal Behaviour</u>			
Law, Courts, Police	2.84	.09	.02
Tolerance for Law Violations	18.96	.001	.11
Identification With Criminal Others	10.68	.001	.07
Social Support for Crime	10.56	.001	.07
California Personality Index - Socialization	3.0	.09	.02
<u>Other Variables of Theoretical Interest</u>			
Rewarding/Punitive Socialization	8.77	.004	.06

Table 29 (Cont'd)

	F(1,172)	p	η^2 *
<u>Hypermasculinity</u>			
Danger as Exciting	23.55	.001	.14
Violence as Manly	19.10	.001	.11
Callous Sexual Attit. to Women	28.52	.001	.16
Toughness as Control	21.32	.001	.13
Shame	.15	.69	.001
<u>Psychopathy: Self-Report (SRP-II)</u>			
SF 1 Factor 1	10.45	.002	.07
SF 2 Factor 2	12.88	.001	.08
STOT 59 Total Score	23.43	.001	.14
<u>Colorado Family Functioning Scale</u>			
Cohesion	1.59	.21	.01
Conflict	.11	.74	.0007
Laissez-Faire Family Style	.04	.84	.003

* η^2 (eta squared) = variance explained in the variable of interest by differences between groups

Table 30

Univariate F Tests of Significant Differences Between Groups - University Men and University Women Controlling for Effects of Age and Socially Desirable Responding

	F(1,140)	p <	η^2*
Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour	18.61	.001	.12
Age	6.20	.01	.14
<u>Desirable Responding</u>			
Impression Management	.02	.9	.0002
Self-Deceptive Enhancement	.005	.94	.0000
Denial	.05	.82	.0004
<u>Measures Associated with General Criminal Behaviour</u>			
Law, Courts and Police	2.86	.09	.01
Tolerance for Law Violations	18.68	.001	.09
Identification with Criminal Others	12.33	.001	.04
Social Support for Crime	6.45	.01	.03
California Personality Index - Socialization	.95	.33	.01
<u>Other Variables of Theoretical Interest</u>			
Rewarding/Punitive Socialization	7.52	.01	.05

Table 30 Continued

	F(1,140)	p	η^2 *
<u>Hypermasculinity</u>			
Danger as Exciting	21.18	.001	.12
Violence as Manly	11.02	.001	.08
Callous Sexual Attit To Women	21.88	.001	.12
Toughness as Control	14.10	.001	.09
Shame	11.74	.001	.08
<u>Psychopathy Self-Report</u>			
SF 1 Factor 1	5.21	.02	.08
SF 2 Factor 2	9.57	.002	.07
STOT59 Total Score	14.01	.001	.13
<u>Colorado Family Functioning Scale</u>			
Cohesion	7.38	.008	.08
Conflict	10.05	.001	.10
Laissez-Faire Family Style	11.21	.001	.10

* η^2 (eta squared): variance explained in the variable of interest by differences between groups

of self-reported psychopathathy.

Gender Differences for Specific Risk Factors: Gender differences were analysed using Multivariate Analysis of Covariation (MANCOVA) to determine which variables most effectively accounted for the difference between university men and women. The effects of each variable on mean self-reported crime for both groups were systematically controlled until differences (as measured by Eta^2) were minimized. Variables which “best” minimized differences between self-reported crime scores were then entered as a set as covariates in MANCOVA. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 31. Together, the PCC variable “Tolerance for Law Violations,” and all the Hypermasculinity variables “best” accounted for differences between university males and females; controlling for the effects of these variables eliminated statistically significant differences between university males and females in terms of their self-reported crime scores.

**Correlates of Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour and
The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory - II (MMPI-2)**

While **MMPI-2** data was completed as a matter of routine for the offender sample, not all university subjects completed a full **MMPI-2** package. Of the 241 subjects involved in this study, complete data (that is, including the **MMPI-2** data) is available for 144 subjects (32 university males, 45 university females, and 67 offenders). The discrepancy in sample size is due to a misunderstanding by the author

Table 31

Mean Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour Scale of University Males and Females Without and With Controls for Other Variables

Variable	Mean Self-Reported Crime Univ. Males	Mean Self-Reported Crime Univ. Females	p	Eta ²
Unadjusted	54.44	44.91	.001	.12
Adjusted For				
Age	54.66	44.69	.001	.12
Desirable Responding				
Impression Manag't	54.39	44.97	.001	.16
Self-Deceptive Enh	55.00	44.35	.001	.14
Denial	53.20	46.15	.001	.08
PCC Variables				
Law, Courts, Police	54.19	45.16	.001	.11
Tolerance Law Viol.	52.47	46.88	.01	.05
Ident. Criminal Others	53.34	46.08	.001	.08
Social Support Crime	52.90	46.45	.001	.09
CPI Socialization	53.57	45.78	.001	.10
Other Variables of Interest				
Punitive Socialization	53.51	45.52	.001	.09
Danger as Exciting	52.22	47.13	.01	.04
Violence as Manly	52.64	46.72	.01	.06
Callous Sex Attit.	52.95	46.41	.01	.06
Toughness as Control	53.37	46.18	.001	.07
Shame	54.51	44.90	.001	.12
Psychopathy F1	55.64	44.95	.001	.12
Psychopathy F2	52.70	46.63	.001	.07
Psychopathy Total	52.71	47.13	.01	.05

Table 31 Continued

Variable	Mean Self- Reported Crime Univ. Males	Mean Self- Reported Crime Univ. Females	p <	Eta ²
Family Cohesion	54.21	45.08	.001	.11
Family Conflict	54.55	44.81	.001	.13
Laissez-Faire	54.37	44.99	.001	.12
Adjusted to Control for The "Best" Measures of Difference† As a Set				
Tolerance Law Viol.				
Danger as Exciting				
Violence as Manly				
Callous Sexual Attitude				
Toughness as Control	51.01	48.39	.15	.01

† Controlling for these variables (including them in MANCOVA as covariates) eliminates statistically significant differences between the two groups.

that MMPI data was to be collected. Data collection commenced before this misunderstanding was realized.

Data containing "clinically" useful information beyond the "predictive" focus of this thesis, including point-charts, charts showing results by validity types and tables showing Differences between groups (Eta-square values) are tabled in **Appendix M**.

MMPI: University males

Correlations between the MMPI Standard Validity and Clinical scale are reported in **Table 32**. Among university males, none of the **Standard Validity** scales, or any of the ten **Clinical** scales were statistically significantly correlated with self-reported crime among university males. However, among the **Content** scales (**Table 33**), both Low Self Esteem and Social Discomfort were negatively and significantly correlated with self-reported crime.

The negative correlation between self-reported crime and Low Self-Esteem suggests that those who are self-confident, expect to succeed, are decisive and not passive, who are not sensitive to self-criticism or rejection, and who do not report many fears or worries (Graham, 1990, pp. 136-137), self-report significantly higher levels of involvement in criminal behaviour.

Similarly, the negative correlation between self-reported crime and Social Discomfort suggests that those who are socially extroverted and sociable, who like parties and find it easy to initiate conversations (Graham, 1990, p. 137), self-report

Table 32

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (*r*) between MMPI Standard Validity and Clinical Scales and Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime

	Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour	AGE	Deceivable Responding			General Criminal Behaviour Variables				
			IMP	SDE	DEN	LCP	TLV	IO	SSC	CPI-SO
University Males N = 31										
AGE	-.15	-	.35	-.05	-.01	.11	-.07	.01	.02	-.26
L	.18	.02	-.04	.08	.08	-.09	-.11	-.14	.21	-.04
F	.09	-.03	-.23	-.19	-.02	.01	.04	.09	.04	-.03
K	.26	-.22	-.06	.05	.09	-.18	-.16	.05	.32	.06
HS	.11	.12	-.09	-.34	.03	-.54**	-.33*	-.07	.10	-.34
D	.02	-.18	.03	-.12	.11	-.20	-.13	.30	.14	-.006
HY	.27	-.19	-.40*	-.36*	-.04	-.33	-.07	.22	.30	-.28
PD	-.04	.002	.05	-.16	-.08	-.23	-.09	-.13	-.08	-.32
MF	.14	.04	-.16	-.15	.09	.27	.41**	.37*	.16	-.07
PA	.03	-.15	-.09	-.33	.13	-.20	-.04	-.13	-.02	-.21
PT	-.10	-.22	.10	-.06	.20	-.22	-.26	.07	-.001	.002
SC	-.02	-.23	-.02	-.21	.07	-.37*	-.27	.06	.01	-.07
MA	-.29	-.29	-.23	-.10	-.17	-.19	-.13	.11	.23	-.20
SI	-.32	-.03	.26	.04	.15	.01	-.10	-.11	-.39*	.27

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. IMP = Impression Management; SDE = Self-Deceptive Enhancement; DEN = Denial; LCP = Law, Courts, Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators; IO = Identification With Criminal Others; SSC = Social Support for Crime; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

Table 33

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r): MMPI Supplementary Scales and Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime

	Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour		Desireable Responding			General Criminal Behaviour Variables				
		AGE	IMP	SDE	DEN	LCP	TLV	IO	SSC	CPI-SO
University Males N = 31										
MACR	.04	-.05	-.08	-.13	-.18	.06	-.07	.08	.06	-.30
DO	.23	-.13	-.41*	-.41*	-.10	-.12	-.01	.23	.33	-.22
RE	.10	-.13	-.15	.15	.13	.02	.21	-.09	.07	.32
ANG	-.12	-.003	.02	-.08	-.09	-.17	-.21	.06	-.02	-.27
CYN	-.23	.06	.03	.006	.10	.01	-.16	-.06	-.21	.03
ASP	-.16	.19	.03	-.11	-.03	-.16	-.31	.03	-.06	-.03
TRT	-.25	.009	.19	.09	-.13	-.13	-.15	-.14	-.33	.07
ANX	-.05	-.07	.01	.07	-.10	.01	.05	.09	-.05	-.17
FRS	.05	-.03	.03	.18	-.11	-.03	.09	.03	.05	-.11
OBS	-.17	.09	.20	.05	.02	.03	.007	-.0004	-.18	-.07
DEP	-.29	-.02	.003	.004	-.12	-.13	-.15	.03	-.28	.08
HEA	-.21	.15	-.006	.04	-.18	-.15	-.14	.02	-.25	-.23
BIZ	-.06	.18	-.05	-.02	-.16	.06	.07	-.05	-.16	-.16
LSE	-.37*	-.01	.25	.07	.01	-.08	-.114	-.007	-.31	.17
SOD	-.38*	-.18	.13	.17	.01	.06	-.02	-.11	-.41*	.34
FAM	-.13	-.26	-.10	.009	.11	-.08	-.03	.12	-.16	.12
APS	.07	-.12	-.05	.14	-.002	.28	.27	.38*	.17	-.09
AAS	-.03	-.06	-.21	-.05	-.35*	-.08	-.07	.07	.01	-.05

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. IMP = Impression Management; SDE = Self-Deceptive Enhancement; DEN = Denial; LCP = Law, Courts, Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators; IO = Identification With Criminal Others; SSC = Social Support for Crime; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

significantly higher levels of crime. Correlations with other variables of interest are in **Appendix M**.

MMPI - Officially Defined Offenders:

Correlations for Offenders between self-reported crime and the standard validity scales (**Table 34**) reached statistical significance only in terms of the “F-Faking or Exaggeration” scale. Individuals with elevated F-scores typically function adequately in most aspects of their life situations” (Graham, 1990, p. 27),

None of the Supplementary or Content scales were significantly correlated with Offender’s self-reports of crime. These correlations are reported in **Table 35**.

MMPI - University Females:

Among the Clinical scales (**Table 36**), none, other than the “Masculinity-Femininity” (MF) scale, was significantly (and positively) correlated with self-reported crime. High female scores on the MF scale are correlated with high self-reported crime scores, a pattern indicative of individuals who “tend to be stereotypically more masculine than feminine outgoing, uninhibited, and self-confident [and] . . . are rather logical and calculated in their behaviour and may be rather unemotional,” (Graham, 1990. P. 67). Among university women, none of the Supplementary or Content scales were significantly correlated with self-reported crime.

Table 34

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) MMPi Standard Validity and Clinical Scales and Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime

	Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour	AGE	Desireable Responding			General Criminal Behaviour Variables				
			IMP	SDE	DEN	LCP	TLV	IO	SSC	CPI-SO
Offenders: N = 64										
AGE	-.49***	-	-.54***	-.26*	-.57***	.06	-.08	-.18	.0009	-.11
L	-.02	.006	-.09	-.34**	.31**	.13	.07	.12	.21	.49***
F	.27*	-.13	-.15	.07	.03	-.03	.03	-.06	-.38**	-.60***
K	.01	-.01	.04	-.19	-.17	-.19	.04	.12	.09	.67***
HS	.25*	-.05	-.21	-.20	-.005	-.14	.03	.01	-.18	-.14
D	.18	-.11	-.11	-.08	-.005	-.14	.15	-.01	-.33**	-.07
HY	.07	.02	-.18	-.03	-.02	-.07	.03	.04	-.21	-.01
PD	.10	.08	.01	-.02	.17	-.09	.13	-.02	-.36**	-.37**
MF	.02	-.001	.02	-.14	.12	-.09	.13	-.12	-.04	.03
PA	.18	-.14	-.11	.03	.04	-.06	.03	-.03	-.30*	-.28**
PT	.14	-.10	-.09	-.04	.08	-.05	.09	-.02	-.44***	-.31**
SC	.23	-.11	-.14	-.03	.05	-.14	.07	-.02	-.42***	-.40***
MA	.12	-.02	-.19	.02	.03	-.05	-.05	.005	.06	-.80***
SI	.09	-.04	.003	.15	.22	.10	.10	-.12	-.46***	-.29*

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001. IMP = Impression Management; SDE = Self-Deceptive Enhancement; DEN = Denial; LCP = Law, Courts, Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators; IO = Identification With Criminal Others; SSC = Social Support for Crime; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

Table 35

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) MMPI Supplementary Scales and Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime

	Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour	AGE	Defensible Responding			General Criminal Behaviour Variables				
			IMP	SDE	DEN	LCP	TLV	IO	SSC	CPI-SO
Offenders N = 64										
MACR	-.12	.20	-.06	.09	.13	.06	-.05	.05	-.01	-.70***
DO	-.05	-.08	.19	.07	-.009	-.03	-.06	-.01	.16	.66***
RE	.08	-.20	.13	-.12	-.18	-.16	.02	-.07	.13	.61***
ANG	-.009	.13	-.10	.19	.20	.09	-.008	-.22	-.22	-.67***
CYN	.03	-.03	-.07	.15	.11	.03	.05	-.05	.11	-.52***
ASP	.07	.11	-.10	.15	.07	.04	.009	-.11	.03	-.66***
TRT	.05	.01	-.07	.09	.18	.19	-.12	-.21	-.41***	-.60***
ANX	.16	-.07	-.20	.03	.04	.07	-.06	-.09	-.26	-.44***
FRS	.06	-.09	.08	-.04	.25	.04	.006	-.02	-.19	.06
OBS	.11	-.05	-.11	.10	.25	.15	.02	-.12	-.28	-.59***
DEP	.11	-.08	-.10	.05	.16	.09	-.02	-.17	-.30*	-.61***
HEA	.13	-.03	-.15	-.03	.06	.01	.01	-.02	-.19	-.41***
BIZ	.15	-.03	-.11	.07	.10	-.006	-.01	-.006	-.15	-.48***
LSE	.14	.08	-.12	.06	.14	.14	-.07	-.17	.33**	-.49***
SOD	.02	.02	-.03	.07	.17	.08	-.06	.11	-.42***	-.13
FAM	.14	.01	-.15	.03	.05	-.09	.27	-.003	-.30	-.58***
APS	-.07	.12	-.03	.07	.23	.13	-.02	.05	-.06	-.47***
AAS	.05	-.03	-.14	.02	.05	-.09	-.08	-.02	-.24	-.66***

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001. IMP = Impression Management; SDE = Self-Deceptive Enhancement; DEN = Denial; LCP = Law, Courts, Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators; IO = Identification With Criminal Others; SSC = Social Support for Crime; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

Table 36

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) MMPI Standard Validity and Clinical Scales and Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime

	Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour		Desireable Responding			General Criminal Behaviour Variables				
	AGE		IMP	SDE	DEN	LCP	TLV	IO	SSC	CPI-SO
University Females N = 45										
AGE	.13	-	-.03	-.10	.04	.03	.07	-.05	-.07	-.24
L	-.15	.24	-.14	-.24	-.12	-.08	-.09	-.14	.02	.08
F	-.06	.02	-.01	-.02	-.25	-.04	-.14	-.10	-.06	-.07
K	-.21	.15	.09	-.13	.05	.01	.007	.001	-.08	.03
HS	-.24	-.07	.23	-.01	.16	.03	-.32*	-.04	.02	.10
D	.11	-.18	.03	-.19	.001	.14	-.07	.15	.13	.14
HY	-.11	-.004	.36*	-.03	.21	.05	-.19	-.002	-.03	-.04
PD	-.18	-.21	.31*	.11	.14	.06	-.18	.09	-.02	-.0007
MF	-.10	.31*	.09	.24	-.09	-.17	-.12	-.14	.03	-.32*
PA	.02	-.09	.27	.08	.05	.01	.005	.07	-.06	.15
PT	-.13	.25	.13	.18	-.03	-.02	-.14	.04	-.08	.02
SC	-.16	-.08	.15	.05	-.08	.04	-.16	.005	-.16	-.03
MA	-.10	.07	.35*	.22	.38**	-.08	-.24	-.30*	-.26	.04
SI	.21	.14	-.28*	-.03	-.36*	.11	.18	.12	.30*	-.29*

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. IMP = Impression Management; SDE = Self-Deceptive Enhancement; DEN = Denial; LCP = Law, Courts, Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators; IO = Identification With Criminal Others; SSC = Social Support for Crime; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

Table 37

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) MMPI Supplementary Scales and Variables Associated With a General Psychology of Crime

	Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour		Desireable Responding			General Criminal Behaviour Variables				
		AGE	IMP	SDE	DEN	LCP	TLV	IO	SSC	CPI-SO
University Females N = 45										
MACR	-.29	-.10	.34*	.41**	.31*	-.36*	-.25	-.21	-.19	.18
DO	-.24	.09	.15	-.98	.18	-.12	-.02	-.22	-.03	.09
RE	.11	.25	-.14	-.37**	-.18	.11	.25	.07	.13	-.11
ANG	.02	-.07	.23	.27	.04	-.02	-.10	-.14	-.16	.03
CYN	-.10	-.24	-.05	.17	-.02	-.10	-.18	-.10	.04	.04
ASP	.12	-.12	-.01	.15	-.005	.02	-.05	-.09	-.24	-.40**
TRT	.12	-.16	-.04	.08	.03	.10	-.11	.05	.04	-.16
ANX	.01	-.32*	.16	-.06	.11	.002	-.04	.07	.12	-.13
FRS	.04	-.005	-.01	-.22	-.16	.10	.14	.06	-.03	.004
OBS	.17	-.07	-.28	-.08	-.29	.05	.09	.13	-.02	.04
DEP	.04	-.12	.09	.12	-.006	.03	-.13	.08	.09	-.15
HEA	.05	-.02	-.18	-.13	-.15	.03	-.24	-.03	-.01	.003
BIZ	.11	.20	.04	.10	-.03	-.03	-.12	-.11	-.07	-.10
LSE	.11	-.30*	-.15	.14	-.12	-.10	.006	.14	.23	-.16
SOD	.09	-.07	-.25	-.02	-.34*	.15	.19	.05	.07	-.14
FAM	.03	-.23	.02	.10	.01	-.04	-.06	.20	.08	.15
APS	.0006	-.05	.25	.25	.23	-.12	-.04	-.03	-.08	-.02
AAS	.21	-.32*	.39**	.23	.17	.06	-.11	-.13	-.09	-.02

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001. IMP = Impression Management; SDE = Self-Deceptive Enhancement; DEN = Denial; LCP = Law, Courts, Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators; IO = Identification With Criminal Others; SSC = Social Support for Crime; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the correlates of self-reported criminal behaviour within the Psychology of Criminal Conduct. Further, it sought to expand that psychology by adding measures linking hypermasculinity, punitive socialization practices and family factors to the study of criminal behaviour. Data were collected from groups of university men, women, and officially defined offenders, thus affording an opportunity to identify group differences among measures. These data were subjected to controls for confounding due to age differences, and for socially desirable response biases. Results indicated that, with few exceptions, strong associations existed among all measures with self-reported criminal behaviour, even after controls for the effects of age and socially desirable responding were introduced.

Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour

Self-reported criminal behaviour was the criterion variable for this study. An examination of group means revealed that offenders reported greater involvement and variety in criminal behaviour than university males and that university males reported greater involvement, and greater variation in their self-reports of criminal activity than their female counterparts. These results are consistent with recent research using university and offender samples (e.g. Scott, 1995), and reflect the utility of self-report measures as valid tools in the assessment of criminal behaviour (see, for instance, Hindelang & Weis, 1981). The presence of criminal activity in all groups suggests that

criminal behaviour is ambient in our society.

Socially Desirable Responding

Socially desirable responding was strongly correlated with self-reported criminal behaviour among all three groups of subjects, underscoring the need for employing measures of socially desirable responding in any paper-and-pencil, self-report research. Between groups defining university men and offenders, and university men and women, there were no statistical differences in the **overall** patterns of socially desirable responding. For all three groups, the associations between self-reported crime scores and Impression Management were almost uniformly strong (university males' scores more so than the others). When the similarity among those results taken into account, a pattern of results for offenders emerges, revealing an Impression Management/Self-Deceptive Enhancement bias. However, both groups of university subjects reported an Impression Management/Denial pattern. Drawing from interpretations suggested in the literature (e.g. Paulhus, 1984; Paulhus and Reid, 1991), these results suggest offender responses were most influenced by an idealistic, self-centred, or "autistic" perception of the self, meaning that these respondents may have been more inclined to distort their responses to conform with an idealized self-image (Damarin & Messick, 1965; Paulhus 1984; Paulhus & Reid, 1991). Moreover, Paulhus and Reid (1991) have reported data which suggests that a response bias engaging self-deceptive enhancement reflects an inflated sense of control and

confidence in one's thinking powers. They have likened this style of responding to a type of processing they say is central to the enhancement construct called "cognitive narcissism," and which is most closely associated with instrumental self-deception, and is more than simple, indiscriminant claiming of positive attributes (Paulhus, 1989; Paulhus & Reid, 1991). Impression management is also an instrumental strategy wherein people decide to present themselves favourably, and accordingly calculate which responses will most impress their audience.

The instrumental nature of an impression management strategy is also present in the response biases of the university subjects, whose pattern indicates a greater inclination towards Impression Management and Denial (rather than Impression Management and Self-Deception observed for the offenders). Paulhus and Reid (1991) describe denial as a response bias engaged to deny psychological threats, such as one's hostility or sexuality. The literature relevant to socially desirable responding notes, however, the strong relationship between denial and impression management (Paulhus, 1984; Paulhus & Reid, 1991). Indeed, in this study the intercorrelation between the two is exceptionally strong (refer to Tables 8-10) for all subjects, as well as for the male subjects collapsed ($r = .70, p < .001$). These results replicate past research on the impression management/denial constructs (Paulhus, 1984), which prompted Paulhus and colleagues to suggest "the provocative possibility" that subjects may be "faking-good" on denial items, a tactic which they suggest is, by any other

name, an impression management strategy (Paulhus & Reid, 1991).

For the purposes of this study, however, it is sufficient to understand that socially desirable responding (in any of its forms) is strongly correlated with self-reported criminal behaviour, and therefore, as a result, all analyses have included statistical procedures (partialling, ANCOVA and MANCOVA, and hierarchical regression analysis) normally employed to control for the confounding effects of response biasing, and that even with these controls, strong associations were observed between the major sets of variables, beginning with the Psychology of Criminal Conduct Variables.

Psychology of Criminal Conduct (PCC) Variables

There is a burgeoning literature demonstrating the importance of certain variables in our collective understanding of criminal behaviour. Within this literature, Andrews and Bonta (1994) have described the four most promising of these as measures assessing 1) antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs; 2) antisocial associates; 3) certain personality traits, and 4) past engagement in criminal activity. A measure of the last category has been included in this study as the criterion variable and is assessed by self-reported criminal behaviour. As mentioned above, offenders score higher on this measure than either of the university groups. Personality traits will be discussed shortly. The other two variables have been assessed using Criminal Sentiments scale, and the Social Support for Crime scale. As well, a PCC also

predicts that socialization is related to criminal activity, and is usually assessed with the Socialization scale of the California Personality Index (CPI-So).

Criminal Sentiments:

Recall that this scale assesses attitudes values and beliefs supportive of crime and contains items which assess attitudes toward the criminal justice system, and identification with and tolerance for criminal others. As expected the subscale measuring pro-social attitudes to the criminal justice system (Law, Courts, Police - "LCP"), correlated negatively with criminal behaviour for two of the three groups, university males being the exception. High measures of pro-social behaviour as measured by the LCP subscale were associated with low levels of self-reported criminal behaviour, even when controls were introduced to account for socially desirable responding, and differences owing to age.

The association between self-reported criminal behaviour and Tolerance for Law Violations was positive and significant for all groups, though stronger among the university sample. Again, this relationship remained after controls for socially desirable responding and age were introduced

Robust, positive and resilient (to controls for age and socially desirable responding) associations were observed for social support for crime among university subjects, but not for offenders, where no significant associations were observed until the effects of age were removed from the equation. This finding suggests that age

differences between subject groups, though statistically controlled, nevertheless may account for some of the variation within this group of variables.

Social Support for Crime: For two of the three groups (offenders being the exception), scores on the Social Support for Crime scale were significantly correlated with self-reported crime. When age effects were introduced for the offender sample, social support for crime scores also reached statistical significance. This pattern of results is consistent with the Psychology of Criminal Conduct. Within that psychology, social support, conceptualised as having an association with criminal others, ranks second behind attitudes values and beliefs and, according to Andrews and Bonta (1994), is among the best predictors of criminal behaviour (see also Pilliavin, Hardyck, and Vadum, 1968; Linden and Hackler, 1973). Data collected in this study using the Social Support for Crime scale (see **Appendix E**), age variations notwithstanding, clearly demonstrate that awareness of and proximity to opportunities for involvement in criminal activities, along with the criminal activities of close associates and of others, is significantly associated with self-reported crime. Moreover, a test of difference (i.e. Univariate F obtained through MANOVA) between offender means ($\bar{x} = 26.25$) and means for university males ($\bar{x} = 22.47$) on social support for crime yielded significant results, meaning that offenders (who, recall, also reported significantly greater involvement and variation in self-reported crime) reported significantly greater awareness of opportunities and more associations with others which supported their

criminal activity. Such was also the case for university men who, recall, reported significantly greater involvement in criminal activity than their female counterparts, and whose mean social support for crime scores were also significantly greater. These results are consistent with and contribute to the research literature which has added social support for crime to the psychology of criminal conduct (e.g. Andrews, 1989; Andrews, Lescheid & Hoge, 1992; Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

Socialization to Conventional Norms: High negative and significant correlations between self-reported crime and scores on the California Personality Index Socialization Scale (CPI-So), of the sort observed for university subjects, indicate, as expected, that high socialization to conventional norms and beliefs is associated with reduced levels of criminal activity. When compared to the university men, the mean CPI-So score for offenders ($\bar{x} = 34.13$ versus $\bar{x} = 42.42$ for student men) was significantly lower. As might be expected, for offenders this pattern suggests a significantly reduced socialization to conventional norms and beliefs in the direction associated with increased criminal activity.

As reported elsewhere in the literature (see Andrews & Bonta, 1994 for a review), the results of this study have demonstrated that those variables associated with a Psychology of Criminal Conduct share strong, resilient and significant associations with self-reported criminal behaviour, even when the effects of socially desirable responding were controlled. As well, several of these variables (i.e. Social Support for

Crime and the Socialization Scale of The California Personality Index) were capable of distinguishing in the appropriate directions between university males and offenders, and between university men and women.

Between group differences for the university males and offenders on age (see Table 28) accounts for the largest difference between these two groups ($\text{Eta}^2 = .42$), and accordingly it seems likely that this difference has an influence on the data as noted in the example for social support, where statistically significant results were not observed until the age effect was statistically controlled. Beyond this empirical difference in the data, and on a purely speculative note, the fact that subjects in the offender sample were resident in a voluntary treatment facility within an Ontario correctional institution may have further influenced the results of this study, although the opportunity to collect control data from another offender population to test this possibility was not present. Future study designs should attempt to include such a control feature.

Other Variables of Theoretical Interest:

Data were collected on a series of other variables, several of which had never before been tested using an offender sample, yet seemed promising for use with that group. For the most part, these “new” measures included an attempt to explore the observation that men are disproportionately linked to crime (Smith & Visser, 1980; Horner, 1993; Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Another group of variables targeting

masculinity, in particularly "hypermasculinity," were included, along with variables exploring shame, psychopathy, and a host of family factors, all thought to be associated with self-reported criminal behaviour were also included. As well, a measure of "punitive" socialization was included.

Punitive Socialization:

Recall that punitive socialization emerges in families which the Gluecks (Glueck & Glueck, 1950) described as comprising social environments demonstrating little understanding of children's needs, and who were unable or unwilling to provide adequate affection and stability for their children.

The Punitive-Rewarding Socialization scale was positively and significantly correlated with self-reported crime for both the university men and women's groups, and this relationship was sustained when controls for the effects of age and socially desirable responding were introduced. There was no such significant relationship observed among offenders, however. Punitive socialization depends on recall of family of origin experiences, rendering this data vulnerable to the effect of age which, as reported above, accounts for the bulk of the difference between the university sample and offenders.

Extended Hypermasculinity Index:

Correlations between self-reported crime and the Extended Hypermasculinity Index were positive, robust and resilient for all three subject groups. As expected, the

measure of Callous Sexual Attitude Toward Women was not significantly correlated with crime self-reports in the women's sample.

Among all three groups, the largest correlations were observed for the Danger as Exciting and Violence as Manly subscales, respectively, with high positive correlations observed in the offender sample (e.g. Danger as Exciting $r = .66$). The size and resilience of these observations suggests that hypermasculinity may well be a powerful assessment instrument in corrections research.

Examination of the adjusted means (see Table 26) indicates that offenders report higher subscription to the hypermasculinity variables (except toughness as control) than university males at rates which approach significance ($p < .07 - .09$). These same variables significantly distinguish ($p < .001$ in all cases) between university males and females (see Table 30). Significant relationships between hypermasculinity variables (except for callous sexual attitudes toward women) and self-reported crime were also observed within the university women's sample. Together, these results indicate that, regardless of one's gender, the extent to which these hypermasculine attitudes are held will indicate the degree to which criminal activity will be reported. It is tempting to interpret these results as offering insight into the reasons why men's self-reported involvement in criminal activity is greater than that of women, especially given that their mean scores on these measures are significantly greater than those for university women. The validity of this result, however, remains to be tested with

tighter controls employing subject samples drawn from both male and female offender populations.

Internalised Shame: Shame, it was suggested, is the emotional experience the hypermasculine male defends himself against through invocation of the hypermasculine elements of machismo. An interesting though unexpected observation was made in terms of self-reported crime and shame scores which would support this proposal. First, shame scores for all three groups did not differ: they were statistically the same. However, only the men's shame scores were positively and significantly correlated with self-reported crime. The women's scores were not. This would suggest that, while the experience of shame was virtually the same for all groups, the women were dealing with it in a different way than the men. This observation requires further study and is reported here with cautious optimism.

Psychopathy Checklist - Self Report Form:

The Psychopathy Checklist Self-Report Form (SRP-II) is an experimental scale that is in the process of construction and revision at this time. Its performance in this study was equivocal. While there was evidence of significant correlations between self-reported crime and the SRP-II subscales, there were no such observations made for self-reported crime among offenders. Nevertheless, the present observations may help in further refinements of this scale. For instance, among university men, the subscale used to estimate psychopathy Factor 2 scores (core personality traits, including a

chronically unstable and antisocial lifestyle, early behavioural problems, and impulsivity), and SRP-II total score were positively and significantly correlated with self-reported crime. Among university females, strong correlations with self-reported crime were observed for scores estimating psychopathy Factor 1 (core personality traits such as selfish, callous, and remorseless use of others, glibness and superficial charm, lying and deception), as well as estimates of psychopathy Factor 2, and SRP-II total scores.

Once again, the effects of age may be acting as a confound among these measures. For example, as previously reported the student sample is a much younger population than the offenders by an average of ten years. It might be expected that younger persons would endorse items indicative of instability, tendency to boredom, impulsivity, and frequent relationships, all of which are among the "traits" comprising Factor 2 estimates. Indeed, being younger is one of the most reliable predictors of criminal behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 1994, p.31). This researcher is at a loss to explain why, however, university women would be more inclined to report higher Factor 1 scores than either university males or offenders.

Colorado Family Functioning Scales:

Three scales of the Colorado Family Functioning Scale were variously correlated with self-reported criminal activity within each of the subject groups. Consistent with other research (i.e. Andrews, 1989; Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Agnew,

1993; Andrews, Leschied and Hoge, 1992; Hirschi, 1977,1969) subscales measuring family conflict, a laissez-faire family style, and family cohesiveness were significantly correlated with self-reported crime. In terms of family cohesion and conflict, these observations indicate that chaotic, disorganized, emotionally cold and punitive homes are not conducive to the development of commitment and attachment, and that subjects scoring low on family cohesion and high on family conflict measures are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour. Andrews and Bonta, 1994, p. 232 cite "a variety of problems within the family of origin and, in particular, low levels of affection, caring and cohesiveness; poor parental supervision and discipline practices, and outright neglect and abuse," as family factors strongly linked to future criminal behaviour. Of particular note, among officially defined offenders, scores on these measures retained significance in their relationship with self-reported crime even after controls for socially desirable responding were introduced.

In terms of a home environment typified by a laissez-faire family style, increased criminal activity was reported among subjects from homes where family rules were not well defined or were inconsistently enforced, and where the types of punishment were unpredictable, sporadically applied, or at other times were inflicted in measures out of proportion with the severity of the behaviour (Bloom, 1985). These observations are not new. The Gluecks (Glueck & Glueck, 1950) spoke of delinquents as individuals with "weak internal controls . . . resulting from poor

parenting practices and parental modelling," (Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

These results, especially among offenders, give credence to the idea of a family-crime link. Respondents who report their family of origin experience as cold, affectionless, and punitive, also report increased levels of criminal behaviour.

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory -Version 2

In terms of its correlations with self-reported crime, the MMPI-2 did not perform well, which is not surprising, given that it is less of a "predictive" instrument than it is a "clinical" scale designed for use among psychiatric populations. Nevertheless, it is frequently used in many correctional settings as an aid to assessment and treatment, and hence its inclusion in this study. As with the other measures employed in this study, some relatively consistent pattern of association with self-reported crime across subject samples should be evident if the MMPI-2 is to be considered as a significant referent in the prediction of criminal behaviour. This quality is lacking. The value of the MMPI-2 in this and perhaps in other studies might be found in its status as a comprehensive measure offering "background" to the measures associated with self-reported crime. For instance, unexplored in this study are the effects of "exogenous" or "endogenous" variables which might have been assessed through path-analytic or other model-building techniques employed in the process of theory construction. The MMPI-2 data in this study are reported, therefore, in consideration of such future interests.

Prediction of Self-Reported Crime:

The prediction of self-reported crime employing measures associated with a Psychology of Criminal Conduct have been replicated. More than this, however, the present data strongly suggest the inclusion of the construct of hypermasculinity, as measured by the Extended Hypermasculinity Index, as an important addition to that psychology. One of the ways of further determining the usefulness of adding another set of variables to an already well established psychology of criminal behaviour, is to establish if it can add substantive (i.e. incremental) understanding to the analysis of variation in self-reported crime among different subject samples of the sort employed in this study. Restated in terms of statistical validity, do these other variables add incremental predictive validity beyond their correlations with criminal behaviour self-reports? To answer these questions, and to replicate the PCC literature, a series of stepwise, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed with self-reported crime scores as the dependent variable, and were repeated with items from the self-reported crime scale describing "serious" crime only.

Results of this series of analyses revealed that two groups of variables -- those associated with PCC (especially in terms of predicting serious crime), and hypermasculinity (Danger as Exciting and, for serious crime, Violence as Manly) -- routinely predicted self-reported crime and self-reported involvement in serious crime. While other variables moved in and out of the regression analyses (for example,

psychopathy among university men and punitive socialization among university women), it must be recalled that these variables were inconsistently correlated with self-reported crime across groups. As mentioned previously, the psychopathy self-report scale is not only experimental, it is also under construction, and its form is likely to change

The results in this study, therefore, suggest that social support for crime, socialization to conventional norms and beliefs (CPI-So), and Hypermasculinity (i.e. Danger as Exciting and Violence as Manly) are able to reliably predict self-reported crime and self-reported "serious" crime. In this context, the term "predict" is understood as the ability of these variables to additionally account for a unique proportion of the variation in self-reported crime left unexplained after controls for age and socially desirable responding have been introduced. The results of this study suggest that approximately 20% of that unexplained variance in self-reported crime can be attributed to social supports for crime, and to reduced socialization to conventional norms and beliefs. A further 4-7% of the variation in self-reported crime can be accounted for through increased subscription to attitudes, values and beliefs associated with hypermasculinity.

Gender Differences in Crime:

A further analysis was conducted to determine which variables were most able to distinguish university women and men. Differences between groups in terms of

mean self-reported criminal behaviour, controlling for the effects of each variable in turn, was performed using multivariate analysis of covariates (MANCOVA). The “best” of these variables were determined by observing which variables best eliminated differences between the two groups. As reported in **Table 31**, university women and men were best distinguished by their differences in their toleration for law violations (men reporting greater tolerance), and as expected from the literature (i.e. Mosher & Sirkin, 1984; Mosher, 1984) differences in hypermasculinity, with men reporting consistently greater subscription to hypermasculine values and beliefs.

Conclusion

Results of this study clearly indicate that having increased tolerance for law violations, of identifying with criminal others, of having increased social support for criminal activity (antisocial associates), and being less well socialized to conventional norms and beliefs, are factors directly associated with self-reported crime. These are the now classic “Psychology of Criminal Conduct” (PCC) variables. The results of this study have also added to this psychology with strong results demonstrating that endorsement of variables associated with hypermasculinity are also directly associated with self-reported crime. This study hypothesised that persons who see danger as exciting, who felt that violence was manly, who report a callous sexual attitude toward women, and who believe that toughness is a way of being in control of their lives, would, as this study has confirmed, report increased involvement in criminal activity.

These results hold regardless of gender, despite the fact that these variables are associated with the hypermasculine construct. Nevertheless, men reported significantly greater endorsement of hypermasculine items, especially for the subscale of items describing a callous sexual attitude toward women.

This study sought insight into the reasons why men are over represented in crime statistics (Simon & Sharma, 1979; Braithwaite, 1977, Smith & Visser, 1980; Conter, 1982; Warner, 1982; Ouston, 1984; McGarrell & Flanagan, 1985; Marash, 1986; Riley, 1986). As in the literature just cited, men in the present study have also reported increased levels of self-reported criminal behaviour compared to women. Tests of differences between university males and offenders have helped shed light on why this might be so. Offenders reported statistically significant ($p < .05$) increases in levels of social support for their criminal activities, and reduced socialization to conventional norms, and increased endorsement of hypermasculinity (Dangerousness as Exciting, Violence as Manly, and Callous Sexual Attitude Toward Women), at levels approaching significance ($p < .09 - .07$). Among family variables expected to account for differences between men and officially defined offenders, decreased levels of family cohesion and increased levels of family conflict were reported by offenders also at rates approaching significance ($p < .07 - .09$).

To conclude, the literature provides ample evidence of utility in using the psychology of criminal conduct variables in terms of offender risk/needs through

assessment of attitudes, values and beliefs and social supports for crime, socialization factors, and of family factors associated with criminal activity (see Andrews & Bonta, 1994 for a review). This study provides data which replicates and supports that literature, and adds to the psychological risk/needs understanding of criminal conduct with the addition of the construct of hypermasculinity.

Turning once more to hypermasculinity, one of the ethical concerns from the outset was that items from the hypermasculinity scale employed in this study are highly offensive to some people, especially to women, and to homosexuals. Offensive or not, the attitudes which this scale seeks to assess exist in society. This researcher has maintained that if psychology is prepared to use exceptionally offensive material -- including child pornography -- in the phallometric assessment of suspected sex offenders (as an example), then the use of a paper-and-pencil instrument which asks subjects to respond to offensive items in an attempt to assess, for example, a callous sexual attitude toward women (attitudes which are known to be held by some members of society) is also an acceptable assessment strategy. The results of this study are all the more gratifying given that the research, following explicit direction from the ethics committees in terms of briefing and debriefing subjects following testing, was conducted without amending the hypermasculinity scales.

Future Research

The construct of hypermasculinity presents a unique way of assessing a variety

of antisocial behaviours. To explore hypermasculinity further within the context of the psychology of criminal conduct, future research might include a measure which explores the degree to which individuals enjoy social support for the development and maintenance of a hypermasculine way of being. Mosher (1991), for instance, has described an "Ideology of Masculinity" which "chauvinistically exalts male dominance by assuming masculinity, virility, and physicality to be the ideal essence of real men." Some measure of how these attitudes are shared with a person's peer group would be useful.

With respect to groups, however, future research must take the initiative not only to include offenders and non-offenders within the sample, but to pay closer attention to other demographics which define variation within groups, such as age and literacy. For this research to advance, especially if more answers are sought as explanation for the inequality of gender representation within crime statistics, then considerable effort has to be made to include comparisons between groups of male and female offenders on measures included in this study, especially hypermasculinity. As well, effort should be made to include a matched sample of male and female non-offenders from outside the university community, which would allow for not only a broader comparison between groups, but a concomitant generalization of results. With specific reference to the offender population used in this study, it would be helpful in future to sample from across offender populations to include low-risk, and high-risk

offenders serving sentences for a variety of index offences.

Male batterers:

The male batterer literature provides evidence for the instrumental nature of abuse executed at the hands of men against their intimate partners (see Dutton, 1995, pp. 80-82, for a brief review). For instance, Epstein (1989), using Falbo and Peplau's (1980) Power Strategies in Intimate Relationships scale, found that macho males self-reported greater reliance on unilateral power strategies (e.g. persuading, persisting, demanding, threatening, angry expression, angry withdrawal) in relations with their intimate partners. Dutton (1995) (citing Toch, 1969) has described how abuse and increased violence by men may be precipitated by "humiliating affronts or threats to reputation and 'manly' status." The use of a hypermasculinity measure in the assessment of men who abuse their partners may shed some light on the extent of their endorsement of such things as male privilege as a rationalization for abuse.

Correctional Settings:

Mobayed (1990) found that macho men displayed more overtly aggressive affects during conversational interactions. These observations suggest that hypermasculinity may be an important element of study within correctional settings, but not just in terms of studying inmates. Mobayed (1990) observed that hypermasculine men confronted by other hypermasculine men (e.g. a hypermasculine correctional worker), neutralized the conversation in terms of expressions of

vulnerability and need, and in terms of expressions of bravado, tended to make statements about themselves at a higher level of superficiality. He speculates that this may have been the result of the hypermasculine man's fear that he may be risking an escalation of self-disclosure, or of exposure of his vulnerability, or of an escalation of bravado in the interaction, all of which might result in a negative evaluation of his masculinity by the other, also hypermasculine man. In either case, he risks either exposure as a vulnerable person, therefore becoming a potential victim, or increased violence, in which case he may end up being the actual victim, if not of the violence itself, then of its consequences. Moreover, it is thought that, in the presence of a hypermasculine man, it is more acceptable for many affects to be numbed, intellectualised, or masked by hostility. A hypermasculine approach to a hypermasculine man will potentially shut down meaningful communication, and relegate any exchange to the level of the superficial and/or the hostile. Further research in this direction would be useful.

Shame: Results concerning the construct of shame were disappointing in this study. Further research, however, should not be abandoned in this area. It is notable, for instance that, while mean scores on the Internalised Shame scale were practically indistinguishable between subject groups, only the scores for male subjects (university males and offenders) were correlated significantly with self-reported crime (notwithstanding the effects of socially desirable responding). It seems that men may

be processing their experiences of shame differently compared to women. This assertion requires further investigation. Further, shame is not a unitary construct (see Wurmser, 1994). Its dual nature should be included in future research.

Finally, it is worth noting that all of the correlates of criminal behaviour observed in this study are dynamic in nature. At the level of the individual this means they represent areas where real changes in a person's life could be made that would mediate involvement in criminal activity. On a communal level, this bespeaks hope -- hope that the human and material costs of crime might one day be reduced.

References

- Akers, R.L. & Cochran, J.K. (1985). Adolescent marijuana use: A test of three theories of deviant behavior. Deviant Behavior, 6, 323-346.
- Agnew R. (1993). Why do they do it? An examination of the intervening mechanisms between "social control" variables and delinquency. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 30, 245-266.
- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. Criminology, 30, 47-48.
- Ajzen I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Alen, B. (1991). Wife abuse - The impact on children. The National Clearinghouse on Family Violence. Ottawa: Health and Welfare Canada.
- Allen, G.S. (1992). Shame and release to the captives: A Christian education program for the shame-based prisoner. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Massachusetts.
- Alexander, P.C. Moore, S. & Alexander, E.R. (1991). What is transmitted in the intergenerational transfer of family violence. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 53, 657-668.

- Altemeyer, B. (1988). Enemies of freedom: Understanding right wing authoritarianism. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- American Psychiatric Association (1980). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Andrews, D.A. (1985). Notes on a Battery of Paper-and-Pencil Instruments: Part I Assessment of attitudes and personality in corrections. Unpublished paper, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Andrews, D.A. (1982a). A personal, interpersonal and community reinforcement perspective on deviant behaviour (PIC-R). Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D.A. (1980). Some experimental investigations of the principles of differential association through deliberate manipulations of the structure of service systems. American Sociological Review, 45, 448-462.
- Andrews, D.A. (1989). Recidivism is predictable and can be influenced: Using risk assessments to reduce recidivism. Forum on Corrections Research, 1, 11-18
- Andrews, D.A. & Bonta, J. (1994). The psychology of criminal conduct. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Andrews, D.A., Kiessling, J.J., Russel, R.J. & Grant, B.A. (1979). Volunteers and the one-to-one supervision of adult probationers. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services.

3

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

- Andrews, D.A., Leschied, A.W. & Hoge, R.D. (1992) A review of the classification and treatment literature. Toronto: Ministry of Community and Social Services.
- Andrews, D.A., Wormith, J.S. , & Kiessling, J.J. (1985). Self-reported criminal propensity and criminal behaviour: Threats to validity of assessment and personality. Program Branch User Report. Ottawa. Solicitor General Canada.
- Archer J & Rhodes, C. (1989). The relation between gender-related traits and attitudes. British Journal of Social Psychology, 28, 149-157.
- Aronson, E. & Carlsmith M. (1963). Effect of the severity of threat on the devaluation of forbidden behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 584-588.
- Bacon, M.K., Child, I.L.& Barry, H. (1963). A cross-cultural study of the correlates of crime. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 291-300.
- Balcom, D. (1991). Shame and violence: Consideration in couples treatment. Journal of Independent Social Work, 5, 165-181.
- Bandura, A. (1977b). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Bandura, A. & Walters, R.H. (1963). Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Becker, H.S. (1963). Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. New York: Free Press.
- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Berkowitz, L. (1962). Aggression: A social psychological analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bernard, M.L. & Bernard, J.L. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. Family Relations, 32, 283-286.
- Block, J. (1965). The challenge of response sets. New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts.
- Block, J. (1977). Another look at sex differentiation in the socialization behavior of mothers and fathers. In J. Sherman & F.K. Denmark (Ed.), Psychology of Women: Future Directions of Research. New York: Psychological Dimensions.
- Bloom, B.L. (1985). A factor analysis of self-concept measures of family functioning. Family Process, 24, 225-239.
- Bly, R. (1990). Iron John: A book about men. Don Mills: Addison-Wesley.

- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss. London: Hogarth.
- Bowlby, J. (1979). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. London: Tavistock.
- Braithwaite, J. (1977). Australian delinquency: Research and practical considerations. In P.R. Wilson (Ed.), Delinquency in Australia. A critical appraisal. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (1979) Inequality, crime and public policy. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Braithwaite, J. (1980). The political economy of punishment. In E.L. Wheelwright & K. Buckley (Eds.), Essays in the political economy of Australian capitalism, Volume IV, Sydney: ANZ Books.
- Braithwaite, J. (1981). The myth of social class and criminality revisited. The American Sociological Review, 46, 36-47.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). Crime, shame and reintegration. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brannon, R. (1985). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. In A.G. Sargent (Ed.), Beyond sex roles (pp. 110-116). St Paul MN: West & Co.
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint for manhood, what it's done for us lately. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Brannon, R. (1978). Measuring attitudes towards women (and otherwise): A methodological critique. In J. Sherman & F. Denmark (Eds.), The psychology of women: New directions in research. New York: Psychological Dimensions.
- Brannon, R. & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. Psychological Documents, 14, 6-7.
- Brod, H. (1987). Themes and theses of Men's Studies. In H. Brod (Ed.), The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies. Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin.
- Brodsky, S.L. & Smitherman, O. (1983). Handbook of scales for research in crime and delinquency. New York: Plenum.
- Broude, G.J. (1990). Protest masculinity: A further look at the causes and the concept. Ethos, 18, 103-122.
- Burgess, R.L. & Aker, R.L. (1966). A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. Social Problems, 14, 128-147.
- Butcher, J.N. & Williams, C.L. (1992). Essentials of MMPI-2 and MMPI-A interpretation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press (pp. 7-8).
- Carroll, J.C. (1977). The intergenerational transmission of family violence: The long-term effects of aggressive behavior. Aggressive Behavior, 3, 289-299.

- Cattell, R.B. (1966). The meaning and strategic use of factor analysis. In R.B. Cattell (Ed.), Handbook of multivariate experimental psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Chodrow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering. Berkley, CA: The University of California Press.
- Comins, C.A. (1984). Courtship violence. A recent study and its implications for future research. Paper delivered at the Second National Conference for Family Violence Researchers, Durham, NH: (August 7-10).
- Conter, (1982). Family correlates of male and female delinquency. Criminology, 20, 149-167.
- Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 80, 389-407.
- Cronbach, L.J. & Meehl, P. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 281-302.
- Damarin, S. & Messick, F. (1965). Response styles as personality variables: A theoretical integration of multivariate research (Research Bulletin No. 65-10). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Deaux, K. (1993). Commentary: Sorry, wrong number -- A reply to Gentile's call. Psychological Science, 4, 125-126.

- Dinnerstein, D. (1976). The mermaid and the minotaur: Sexual arrangements and human malaise. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dollard, J. & Miller, N. (1950). Personality and psychotherapy: An analysis in terms of learning, thinking and culture. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O.H. & Sears, R. (1939). Frustration and aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dutton, D.G. (1995). The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives. Vancouver, B.C. UBC Press.
- Eagly, A.H. & Carli, L.L. (1981). Sex of researchers and sex-typed communications as determinants of sex-differences in influenceability: A meta-analysis of social influence studies. Psychological Bulletin, 90, 1-20.
- Eccles, J.S. (1987). Gender roles and achievement patterns: An expectancy value perspective. In J.M. Reinisch, L.A. Rosenblum & S.A. Sanders (Eds.), Masculinity/Femininity: Basic perspectives (pp. 240-280). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Epstein, E.E. (1989). Characteristics of substance abusers subtyped by antisocial personality and depressive disorders: Psychological markers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Epstein, R.J. (1991). Macho personality and the punitive socialization of distress: Implications for child abuse. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. University

of Connecticut, Storrs.

- Eron, L.D., Laulicht, J.H., Walder, L.O., Farber, I.F. & Spiegel, J.P. (1961). Application of role and learning theories to the study of the development of aggression in children. Psychological Reports, 9 (Suppl. 9-2), 291-334.
- Falbo, T. & Peplau, L.A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 618-628.
- Farrington, D.P. (1978). The family backgrounds of aggressive youths. In L.A. Hersov & M. Berger (Eds.), Aggression and anti-social behavior in childhood and adolescence. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Finley, W.H., McDonal, C.E., Finley, S.C. (1973). Prison survey for the XYY karotype in tall inmates. Behavior Genetics, 1, 97-100.
- Freud, S. (1936). The problem of anxiety. H.A. Bunker (Trans.). New York: W.W. Norton.
- Freud, S. (1966). Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis. J. Stracney (Trans.). New York: W.W. Norton. Original work published 1920, E.I. Bernays, ed.
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of culture. New York: Basic Books.
- Gendreau, P., Andrews, D.A., Coggin, C. & Chanteloupe, F. (1992). The development of clinical and policy guidelines for the prediction of criminal behavior in criminal justice settings. Unpublished manuscript available from the Department of Psychology, University of New Brunswick, St. John, NB.

- Gentile, D.A. (1993). Just what are sex and gender anyway? A call for a new terminological standard. Psychological Science, 4, 120-124.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, E.T. (1950). Unravelling juvenile delinquency. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gold, S.R., Fultz, J., Burke, C.H., Prisco, A.G. & Willett, J.A. (1992). Vicarious emotional responses of macho college males. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, 165-174.
- Gough, H.G. (1965). Cross-cultural validation of a measure of asocial behavior. Psychological Reports, 17, 379-387.
- Gough, H.G. (1969). Manual for the California Personality Index. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Gough, H.G. & Bradley, P. (1992). Delinquent and criminal behavior as assessed by the revised California Personality Inventory. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 48, 298-308.
- Graham, J.R. (1990). MMPI-2: Assessing Personality and Psychopathology. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Graham, J.R. (1989). The meaning of elevated MacAndrew Alcoholism scale scores for non-clinical subjects. Paper presented at the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta.

- Grotevant, H.D. & Carlson, C.I. (1989). Family Assessment: A guide to methods and measures. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Hall, J.A. (1991). Development and validation of an Expanded Hypermasculinity Inventory and the Ideology of Machismo Scale. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Hare, R.D. (1980). A research scale for the assessment of psychopathy in criminal populations. Personality and Individual Differences, 1, 111-119.
- Hare, R.D. (1991). The Psychopathy Checklist -- Revised: Manual. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.
- Harper, J.A. & Hoopes, M.H. (1990). Uncovering shame: An approach integrating individuals and their families. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Harpur, T.J. Hakstian, A.R. & Hare, R.D. (1988). Factor structure of the Psychopathy Checklist. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 741-747.
- Hartley, R. (1959). Sex-role pleasure in the socialization of the male child. Psychological Reports, 5, 457-468.
- Haywood, T.W., Grossman, L.S. & Hardy, D.W. (1993). Denial and social desirability in clinical evaluations of alleged sex offenders. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 181, 183-188.

- Herrnstein, R. (1990). Biology and crime. In L.J. Siegel (Ed.), American justice: Research of the national institute of justice. St. Paul, MN: West.
- Hills S.L. (1980). Demystifying social deviance. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- Hindelang, M.J. (1972). The relationship between self-reported delinquency to scales of the CPI and The MMPI. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 63, 75-81.
- Hirschi, T. (1977). Causes and preventions of juvenile delinquency. Sociological Inquiry, 47, 322-341.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of delinquency. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hooks, B. (1984). Feminist theory: From margin to center. Boston, MA: South end Press.
- Horner, B. (1993) Crime prevention in Canada: Toward a National Strategy. Twelfth Report of The Standing Committee on Justice and The Solicitor General. House of Commons Canada. Issue No. 87.
- Howland, E.W., Kosson, D.S., Patterson, C.M. & Newman, J.P. (1993). Altering a dominant response: Performance of psychopaths and low-socialization college students on a cued reaction time task. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102, 379-387.

- Idle, T. (1993). Gender-role socialization in toy play situations - mothers and fathers with their sons and daughters. Sex Roles, 28, 679-691.
- Izard, C.E. (1991). The psychology of emotions. New York: Plenum.
- Jackson D.N. (1974). Personality Research Form -- Form E. Goshen, NY: Research Psychologists Press.
- Jackson, D. (1990). Unmasking masculinity: A critical autobiography. Boston, MA. Unwin Hyman.
- Jessor R. & Jessor, S.L. (1977). Problem behavior and psychosocial development: A longitudinal study of youth. New York: Academic Press.
- Johnson, R.E. (1979). Juvenile delinquency and its origins: An integrative theoretical approach. Cambridge, England. Cambridge University Press.
- Kalmuss, D.K. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 42, 11-19.
- Kaufman, G. (1974). The meaning of shame: Toward a self-affirming identity. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 21, 568-574.
- Keen, S. (1991). Fire in the belly: On being a man. Toronto: Bantam.
- Kelly G. (1967). A psychology of the optimal man. In A.W. Landfield & L.M. Leiter (Eds.), Personalconduct psychology. New York: Wiley.
- Kiesler, D.J. (1983). The 1992 interpersonal circle: A taxonomy for complementarity in human transactions. Psychological Review, 90, 185-214.

- Komarovsky, M. (1976). Dilemmas of masculinity: A study of college youth. New York: Norton.
- Kroner, D.G. & Weekes, J.R. (1994). Response style measures in an inmate sample. Manuscript under review.
- Lab, S.P. & Allen, R.B. (1984). Self-report and official measures: A further examination of the validity issue. Journal of Criminal Justice, 12, 445-455.
- Lenderking, W.R. (1988). Reactions to acquaintance rape: Effects of macho personality and history of aggressive behaviour. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Lenderking, W.R. (1991). deception about sexually-transmitted disease as a function of personality, guilt and attitude toward condoms: Sex, lies., and guided imagery. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Lewis, M. (1992). Shame: The exposed self. Toronto:Maxwell Macmillan Canada.
- Loeber, R. & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1987). Prediction. In H.C. Quay (Ed.), Handbook of juvenile delinquency (pp. 325-382). New York: Wiley.
- Maccoby, E.E. & Jacklin, C.N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Matza, D. (1964). Delinquency and drift (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- McAvoy, L. (1993). Psychosocial risk factors of drug use within a probation sample. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

McCord, J. (1991). Questioning the value of punishment. Social Problems, 38, 167-179.

McCord, J. (1988). Parental behavior in the cycle of aggression. Psychiatry, 51, 14-23.

McCord, J. (1983). A forty-year perspective on effects of child abuse and neglect. Child Abuse and Neglect, 7, 263-270.

McDougal, W. (1908). An introduction to social psychology. New York: University Paperbacks.

McGarrell & Flanagan (1985:340-1). Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics - 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Mead, G.H. (1934). Mind, self and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist. In C. Morris (Ed.), The works of George Herbert Mead, vol 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meade, M. (1993). Men and the water of life: Initiation and the temepering of men. San Francisco, CA:Harper SanFrancisco.

Megargee, E.I. (1972). The California Psychological Inventory Handbook. San Francisco: Jursey-Boss.

Meinicke, C. E. (1981). Socialized to die younger? Hypermasculinity and men's health. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 241-245.

- Merton, R.K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. American Sociological Review, 3, 672-682.
- Merton, R.K. (1957). Social theory and social structure. New York: Free Press.
- Millham, J. (1974). Two components of need for approval score and their relationship to cheating following success and failure. Journal of Research in Personality, 8, 378-392.
- Mohayed, C.D. (1990). Hypermasculinity as a predictor of self-disclosure in males: A sequential analysis. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Monte, C. (1987). Beneath the mask. An introduction to theories of personality, (3rd ed.). Montréal: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.
- Moos, R. (1974). The Social Climate Scale: An overview. Palo Alto CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Moos, R. H., Insel, P.M. & Humphrey, B. (1974). Preliminary manual for the Family Environment Scale, Work Environment Scale, Group Environment Scale. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Moran, P. & Barclay, A. (1988). Effect of fathers' absence on delinquent boys: Dependency and hypermasculinity. Psychological Reports, 62, 115-121.
- Morosh, M. (1986). Gender, peer group experiences and seriousness of delinquency. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 23, 43-67.
- Mosher, D.L. (1991). Macho men, machismo, and sexuality. Annual review of sex

research, 2, 199-245.

Mosher, D.L. & Tomkins, S.S. (1988). Scripting the macho man: Hypermasculine socialization and enculturation. Journal of sex research, 25, 60-84.

Mosher D.L. & Anderson, R.D. (1986). Macho personality, sexual aggression, and reactions to guided imagery of realistic rape. Journal of Research In Personality, 20, 77-94.

Mosher, D.L. & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. Journal of Research in Personality, 18, 150-163.

Motiuk, M.S., Motiuk, L.L. & Bonta, J. (1992). A comparison between self-report and interview-based inventories in offender classification. Criminal Justice And Behavior, 19, 143-159.

Murray, J.M. (1931). Son of woman: The story of D.H. Lawrence. London: Jonathon Cape.

O'Leary, K.D. & Curley, A.D. (1986). Assertion and family violence: Correlates of spouse abuse. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 12, 281-289.

Norusis, M.J. (1994) SPSS professional statistics 6.1 (pp.54-55). Chicago. SPSS Inc.

O'Leary, J. & Wright, F. (1986). Shame and gender issues in pathological narcissism. Psychoanalytic Psychology, 3, 327-339.

Olson, D.H., Bell, R. & Portner, J. (1978). FACES item booklet. St. Paul, MN: Family Social Sciences, University of Minnesota.

- Ouston, (1984) Delinquency and family background and educational attainment. British Journal of Criminology, 24, 2-26.
- Overall, J.E. & Woodward, J.A. (1977). Nonrandom assignment and the analysis of covariance. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 588-594.
- Patterson, G.R., Dishion, T.J. & Bank, L. (1984). Family interaction: A process model for deviant training. Aggressive Behavior, 10, 253-267.
- Paulhus, D.L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 598-609.
- Paulhus, D.L. (1986). Self-deception and impression management in test responses. In A. Angleitner & J.S. Wiggins (Eds.), Personality assessment via questionnaire (pp. 142-165). New York: Springer.
- Paulhus, D.L. (1989). Measuring self-deception and impression management in self-reports: The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding - Version 6. Unpublished Manual.
- Paulhus, D.L. & Reid, B.R. (1991). Enhancement and Denial in socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 307-317.
- Pedhazur, E.J. & Tetenbaum T.J. (1979). Bem sex role inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 996-1016.

- Pilliavin, I.M., Hardyke, J.E. & Vadam, A.C. (1968). Constraining effects of personal cost on the transgressions of juveniles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 227-231.
- Pulkkinen, L. (1983). Search for alternatives to aggression in Finland. In D.H. Crowell & M.H. Segall (Eds.), Aggression in global perspective. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Reckless, W.C. (1967). The Crime Problem. New York: Appeltion-Century-Crofts.
- Reingold, H.L. & Cook, K.V. (1975). The content of boys' and girls' rooms as an index of parents' behavior. Child Development, 46, 459-653.
- Retzinger, S.M. (1991). Violent emotions: Shame and rage in marital quarrels. London: Sage.
- Riley, (1986). Sex differences in teenage crime: The role of lifestyle. Research Bulletin, Home Office Research Planning Unit, 20, 34-38.
- Rogers, S. (1981). Factors related to recidivism among adult probationers in Ontario. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Rodgers, K. (1994). Wife assault: The findings of a national survey. Juristat Service Bulletin. Canadian Centre For Justice Statistics, 14(9), 1-22.
- Rosenbaum, A. & O'Leary, K.D. (1981). Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 63-71.
- Roth, D.L., Snyder, C.R. & Pace, L.M. (1986). Dimensions of favourable self-presentation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 867-874.

- Sægert, S. & Hart, R. (1976). The development of sex differences in the environmental competence of children. In P. Burnett (ed.), Women In Society. Chicago, IL: Maaroufa Press.
- Schneider, C. (1977). Shame, exposure and privacy. Boston: Beacon.
- Schur, E.M. (1973). Radical nonintervention: Rethinking the delinquency problem. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Scott, H.A. (1995). The determinants of rape: An examination of risk factors in self-reported and convicted rapists. Unpublished Masters thesis, Carleton University. Ottawa, Canada.
- Segal, L. (1990). Slow motion: Changing masculinities, changing men. London: Virago.
- Sherrod, D. (1987). The bonds of men: Problems and possibilities in close male relationships. In H. Brod (Ed.), The making of masculinities: The new men's studies. Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin.
- Simon, R.J. & Sharma (1979). Women and crime: Does the American experience generalize? In F. Adler and R.J. Simon (Eds.), Criminology of deviant women. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Simourd, D. Bonta, J. , Andrews, D.A. & Hoge, R.D. (1991). The assessment of criminal psychopathy: A meta-analysis. Unpublished paper, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

- Simpson, H. (1982). D.H. Lawrence and feminism. London: Croom Helm, Ltd.
- Skinner, H.A. Steinhauer, P.D. & Santa-Barbara, J. (1983). The Family Assessment Measure. Canadian Journal of Mental Health, 2, 91-105.
- Slater, P.E. & Slater, D.A. (1965). Maternal ambivalence and narcissism: A cross-cultural study. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 11, 241-259.
- Smith & Visher, (1980). Sex and involvement in deviance/crime: A quantitative review of empirical literature. American Sociological Review, 45, 691-701.
- Solicitor General Canada, Ministry Secretariat (1993). Aboriginal People's Collection: Community holistic circle healing: Hollow Water First Nation. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.
- Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1972). The Attitude Toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes towards the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 2, 66.
- Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Statistics Canada (1992). 1991 Census of Canada. Catalogue No. 93-311D.
- Sullivan, J.P. & Mosher, D.L. (1991). Acceptance of guided imagery and marital rape as a function of macho peronality. Violence and Victims, 5, 275-286.
- Sutherland, E.H. (1947). Principles of criminology (3rd ed). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

- Sutherland, E.H. & Cressey, D.R. (1970). Principles of criminology (6th ed.). New York: Lippincott.
- Sykes G.M. & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. American Sociological Review, 14, 664-670.
- Tabachnick & Fidell (1989). Using multivariate statistics (2nd ed.). Northridge, CA: Harper Collins.
- Telch, C.F. & Lindquist, C.U. (1984). Violent versus non-violent couples: A comparison of patterns. Psychotherapy, 21, 242-248.
- Tellegen, A. & Ben-Porath, Y.S. (1992). The new uniform T-scores for the MMPI-2: Rationale, derivation, and appraisal. Psychological assessment: A Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 4, 145-155.
- Thompson, E.H. & Pleck, J.H. (1987). The structure of male role norms. In M.S. Kimmel (Ed.), Changing Men: New directions in research on men and masculinity (pp. 25-37). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Thornberry, T.P. & Farnworth, M. (1982). Social correlates of criminal involvement: Further evidence on the relationship between social class and criminal behavior. American Sociological Review, 47, 505-518.
- Tittle, C.R. & Meier, R.F. (1990). Specifying the SES/delinquency relationship. Criminology, 28, 271-299.

- Tittle, C.R. & Meier, R.F. (1991). Specifying the SES/delinquency relationship by social characteristics of contexts. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28, 430-455.
- Tittle, C.R., Villemez, W.J. & Smith, D.A. (1978). The myth of social class and criminality: An empirical assessment of the empirical evidence. American Sociological Review, 43, 643-656.
- Toch, H. (1969). Violent men: An enquiry into the psychology of violence. Chicago Aldine.
- Tomkins, S.S. (1991). Affect imagery and consciousness: Volume III: The negative affects: Anger and fear. New York: Springer.
- Tomkins, S.S. (1987). Script theory. In J. Arnoff & R. Zucker (Eds.), The emergence of personality, (pp.147-216). New York: Springer.
- Tomkins, S.S. (1965). Affect, imagery, consciousness Vol. 2. The negative affects New York: Springer.
- Tucker, L.R. (1971) Relations of factor score estimates to their use. Psychometrika 17, 401-419.
- Turner, R. (1970). Family interaction. New York: JohnWiley.
- Ullmann, L. & Krasner L. (1976). A psychological approach to abnormal behavior (2nd ed.). Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- van der Veen, F. (1965). The parent's concept of the family unit and child adjustment. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 12, 196-200.
- Warner, (1982). A study of self-reported crime of a group of male and female high school students. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 15, 255-272.
- Waters, E., Hay, D. & Richters, J. (1986). Infant-parent attachments and the origins of prosocial and antisocial behavior. In D. Olweus, J. Block, & M. Radke-Yarrow (Eds.), Development of antisocial and prosocial behavior: Research, theories, and issues. New York: Academic Press.
- Widom, C.S. (1989c). The intergenerational transmission of violence. In N. Weiner, M.E. Wolfgang (Eds.), Pathways to criminal violence (pp. 137-201). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Widom, C.S. (1989a). Child abuse, neglect and adult behavior: Research design and findings on criminality, violence and child abuse. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59, 355-367.
- Widom, C.S. (1989b). The cycle of violence. Science, 244, 160-166.
- Wiggins, J.S. (1964). Convergences among stylistic measures from objective personality tests. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 24, 551-562.
- Williams, J.E. & Best, D.L. (1982). Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty-nation study. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Wilson, I.Q. & Herrnstein, R.J. (1985). Crime and Human Nature. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Wurmser, L. (1995). The Mask of shame. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Zaitchik, M.C. & Mosher, D.L. (1993). Criminal justice implications of the macho personality constellation. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 20, 227-239.
- Zelditch, M. (1955). Role differentiation in the nuclear family: A comparative study. In T. Parsons & F. Bales (Eds.), Family, socialization and interaction process. New York: Free Press.
- Zuckerman, M. (1979). Sensation-seeking: Beyond the optimal level of arousal. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Appendix A**INFORMED CONSENT - University**

I understand that the purpose of this study is to gain insight about some of the attitudes, values and beliefs of adults.

I AM AWARE THAT SOME OF THE QUESTIONS I WILL BE ASKED TO ANSWER MAY BE OF A HIGHLY OBJECTIONABLE AND OFFENSIVE NATURE TO ME AND TO GROUPS OF PEOPLE IN SOCIETY. I AM AWARE THAT I MAY EXPERIENCE SOME DISCOMFORT WHILE DEALING WITH THEM.

I am also aware that I may withdraw from this study at any time. This means I may refuse to participate or answer some or all of the questions.

The purpose and method of study has been explained to me, and I understand those explanations. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study, and I am satisfied with the answers I received.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary. I understand that the questionnaires will take about 2 - 2½ hours to complete.

I also understand that there is no reward for participating in this study, and that there is no penalty for not participating.

I understand that all the information I provide in this study is completely confidential and will be used by the researcher for research purposes only. I understand that no individual will be identified in any reports on this study.

I understand that some of the questions asked in this study may be upsetting to some people. I understand that the researcher has made arrangements for me in case I wish to talk privately about any personal issues raised by any of the questions in this study.

If I want more information about this study, I can contact either ANDREW MCWHINNIE, who is the principal investigator, or his supervisor, Dr. D.A. Andrews, through the Department of Psychology.

I HEREBY GRANT PERMISSION TO THE RESEARCHER TO MAKE USE OF THE INFORMATION GATHERED IN THIS STUDY FOR CONFIDENTIAL RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

YES ____ NO ____

Signature of Participant Date

I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained the above to the participant in detail, and to the best of my knowledge, it was understood.

Signature of Researcher Date

YES ____ NO ____

Appendix A-1
INFORMED CONSENT - OFFENDERS

I understand that the purpose of this study is to gain insight about some of the attitudes, values and beliefs of adults.

I AM AWARE THAT SOME OF THE QUESTIONS I WILL BE ASKED TO ANSWER MAY BE OF A HIGHLY OBJECTIONABLE AND OFFENSIVE NATURE TO ME AND TO GROUPS OF PEOPLE IN SOCIETY. I AM AWARE THAT I MAY EXPERIENCE SOME DISCOMFORT WHILE DEALING WITH THEM.

I am also aware that I may withdraw from this study at any time. This means I may refuse to participate or answer some or all of the questions.

The purpose and method of study has been explained to me, and I understand those explanations. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study, and I am satisfied with the answers I received.

By signing this form, I understand that . . .

- ☛ my participation in this study is voluntary, and that the questionnaires will take about 2 hours to complete;**
- ☛ there is no reward for participating in this study, nor is there any penalty for not participating, nor will participation have any influence on future treatment plans;**
- ☛ all the information provided by me in this study is confidential and will become part of a pool to be used for research purposes only;**
- ☛ I will not be identified in any reports on this study;**
- ☛ some of the questions in this study may be emotionally upsetting;**
- ☛ I will have the opportunity to talk privately about any personal issues raised as a result of this study.**

If I want more information about this study, I can contact either ANDREW MCWHINNIE, the principal investigator, or his Institutional supervisor, DR. DAVE BAXTER.

I HEREBY GRANT PERMISSION TO THE RESEARCHER TO MAKE USE OF THE INFORMATION GATHERED IN THIS STUDY FOR CONFIDENTIAL RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

YES ____ NO ____

Appendix B

Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour

Instructions: This questionnaire deals with material which you might consider highly sensitive and personal. We agree. However, but it is important that you help us understand the level to which participants engage in sometimes potentially illegal activities.

Remember, **NO ONE KNOWS WHO YOU ARE**, and like your answers to the other questionnaires, none will be made available to anyone but the researcher. **YOUR ANSWERS ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL, AND NO NAMES APPEAR ANYWHERE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRES.**

Following are descriptions of some activities you may have participated in. Please circle the letter which represents your level of participation in these activities.

That is, if you you have . . .

NEVER engaged in an activity, circle "A"

Engaged in the activity at least one in your life but **NOT IN THE PAST YEAR**, circle "B"

engaged in the activity **ONCE IN THE LAST YEAR** circle "C"

engaged in the activity **TWICE IN THE LAST YEAR** circle "D"

engaged in the activity **THREE OR MORE TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR** circle "E"

A = NEVER

B = NOT IN LAST YEAR

C = ONCE IN LAST YEAR

D = TWICE IN LAST YEAR

E = THREE OR MORE TIMES IN LAST YEAR

1. Bribed or attempted to bribe police officer or any other type of official.

A B C D E

2. Used force to get money or valuables from another person.

A B C D E

3. Sold beer, wine, or liquor without a licence.

A B C D E

4. Visited prostitutes or solicited for sex.

A B C D E

5. Carried a razor, switchblade, or gun (besides ordinary pocketknife).

A B C D E

6. Attacked someone with the idea of taking his/her life.

A B C D E

7. Taken part in a gang fight.

A B C D E

8. Taken things of large value (worth more than \$200.00) that did not belong to me (excluding an automobile).

A B C D E

9. Broken in and entered a home, store, building.

A B C D E

10. Had marijuana or hashish in my possession.

A B C D E

11. Taken a car for a ride without the owner's knowledge.

A B C D E

12. Attempted to force or forced someone to have sexual intercourse with me.

A B C D E

13. Started a fist fight during an argument or struck, or "beat up" someone who had not hit me first or who had not threatened to hit me.

A B C D E

14. Purposefully damaged property not belonging to me.

A B C D E

15. Driven a car without a driver's licence or a permit.

A B C D E

16. Falsified information while filling out an application or report, or falsified an official document (e.g. student loan application or U.I.C. application).

A B C D E

17. Sold marijuana or hashish.

A B C D E

18. Started or helped set fire to a building.

A B C D E

19. Participated in illegal gambling.

A B C D E

20. Taken things of medium value (worth between \$5 and \$200) that did not belong to me (e.g. library books, cigarettes).

A B C D E

21. Made false cab or ambulance calls, fire alarms, food orders, etc.

A B C D E

22. Driven a car in a very fast or reckless manner.

A B C D E

23. Went onto someone's property when I knew I wasn't supposed to.

A B C D E

24. Threatened to hurt or injure someone.

A B C D E

25. Taken little things (worth less than \$5) that didn't belong to me (e.g. shoplifting).

A B C D E

26. Had in my possession things I knew were stolen.

A B C D E

27. Have cheated on exams or assignments.

A B C D E

28. Driven a car while impaired by alcohol or drugs or when I knew I had consumed more alcohol than allowed by law to drive.

A B C D E

29. Caused a disturbance in a public place by shouting, screaming, fighting, swearing, or using obscene or insulting language.

A B C D E

30. Had illegal drugs other than marijuana or hashish in my possession.

A B C D E

31. Sold illegal drugs other than marijuana or hashish.

A B C D E

32. Have stolen a car for purposes other than joy riding.

A B C D E

33. Got some money or something from others by deception or false pretence.

A B C D E

APPENDIX B-1

CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR SCALE "SERIOUSNESS" RATINGS

B. LOW **n = 16**

Item No.	Short Description (Rating = 1, 2, 3 and 4)	Item No.	Short Description (Rating = 1, 2, 3 and 4)
3	Bootlegged Alcohol (3)	17	Sold Marijuana or Hashish (4)
4	Visited Prostitutes/Solicited (3)	19	Illegal gambling (3)
10	Possession of Marijuana (3)	20	Theft under \$200 (3)
14	Damaged Property (2)	21	False Ambulance /Police Calls (3)
15	Driven Car Without License (3)	22	Driven Car Fast and Recklessly (2)
23	Trespassed (1)	25	Petty Theft (<\$5.00) (3)
26	Possession of Stolen Property (3)	27	Cheated on Exams and Assignments (2)
28	Driven While Impaired (4)	29	Caused a Disturbance In Public (1)

A. SEVERE: **n = 7**

Item No.	Short Description (Rating = 8, 9 and 10)
1	Bribed or attempted to bribe police officer (8)
2	Used Force to Get Money (9)
12	Force Someone to Have Sex (10)
13	Started Fight/Beat Someone Up (8)
7	Gang Fight (8)
6	Attacked with Intent to Kill
18	Fire Setting

B. MODERATE: **n = 10**

Item No.	Short Description (Rating = 5, 6 and 7)
30	Possession Other Than Marijuana (5)
9	Break and Enter (7)
8	Theft over \$200 (6)
16	Falsified Forms/Documents (5)
11	Stolen Car To Joyride (6)
33	Obtained Money By False (5)
31	Sold other than Marijuana or Hash (6)
32	Stolen Car Not To Joyride (7)
24	Threatened Bodily Harm (6)
5	Carried a weapon (7)

Appendix C**BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING****VERSION 6: FORM 60**

**(REVERSALS INDICATED [*]). ADD ONE POINT FOR EVERY 6 OR 7:
MINIMUM = 0; MAXIMUM = 20 FOR EACH SCALE.)**

INSTRUCTIONS: Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

+	-----	+	-----	+	-----	+	-----	+	-----	+	-----	+	
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7
Not true			somewhat							very true			

A. Self Deceptive Enhancement:

- ___ 1. My first impressions about people usually turn out to be right.
- * ___ 2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
- ___ 3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
- * ___ 4. I have not always been honest with myself.
- ___ 5. I always know why I like things.
- * ___ 6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
- ___ 7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
- * ___ 8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
- ___ 9. I am fully in control of my own fate.

- * ___ 10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
- ___ 11. I never regret my decisions.
- * ___ 12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
- ___ 13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
- * ___ 14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
- ___ 15. I am a completely rational person.
- * ___ 16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
- ___ 17. I am very confident of my judgements.
- * ___ 18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
- ___ 19. It's alright with me if some people happen to dislike me.
- * ___ 20. I don't always know the reason why I do the things I do.

Impression Management

- * ___ 21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
- ___ 22. I never cover up my mistakes.
- * ___ 23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone
- ___ 24. I never swear.
- * ___ 25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
- ___ 26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
- * ___ 27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.

- ___ 28. When I hear people talking privately, I try not to listen.
- * ___ 29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
- ___ 30. I always declare everything at customs.
- * ___ 31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
- ___ 32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
- * ___ 33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
- ___ 34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
- * ___ 35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
- ___ 36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
- * ___ 37. I have never taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
- ___ 38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
- * ___ 39. I have some pretty awful habits.
- ___ 40. I don't gossip about other people's business.

Denial

- * ___ 41. I sometimes get irritated when I don't get my own way.
- ___ 42. I could never enjoy being cruel.
- * ___ 43. Seeing any attractive person of the opposite sex makes me think of sex.
- ___ 44. I have never felt joy over someone else's failure.

- * ___ 45. I have gotten so angry at a friend that I felt like hitting him(her).
- ___ 46. I have never felt like I wanted to kill someone.
- * ___ 47. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
- ___ 48. I never enjoy watching sexy scenes in a movie.
- * ___ 49. I enjoy it when obnoxious people get put down.
- ___ 50. I rarely have sexual fantasies.
- * ___ 51. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
- ___ 52. I have never wanted to rape or be raped by someone.
- * ___ 53. More than once it felt good when I heard on the news that someone had been killed.
- ___ 54. I can't think of anyone I hate deeply.
- * ___ 55. There have been occasions when I have felt like smashing things.
- ___ 56. Few of the things I do are simply for my own gain.
- * ___ 57. I must admit that revenge can be sweet.
- ___ 58. I never get jealous over the good fortune of others.
- * ___ 59. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against authority, even though I knew they were right.
- ___ 60. I have never done anything that I'm ashamed of.

Appendix C-1

Items deleted from the balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR-6).

BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIREABLE RESPONDING: FORM-6

List of Items "Having to do with Antisocial Attitudes, Beliefs and/or Behaviors."

1. DENIAL SUBSCALE

0 Items

2. IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT SUBSCALE

- 21. Sometimes I tell lies if I have to.
- 23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
- 25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive.
- 29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
- 31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
- 33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.

3. DENIAL SUBSCALE

- 45. I have become so angry at a friend that I felt like hitting him or her.
- 47. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
- 53. More than once it felt good when I heard on the news that someone had been killed.
- 55. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
- 57. I must admit that revenge can be sweet.
- 59. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against authority, even though I knew they were right.

TOTAL = 12 Items:

These Items were selected based on agreement obtained through blind assessment of all BIDR items by two graduate students.

Appendix D:**Criminal Sentiments Scale**

SCORING INSTRUCTIONS: Reversals are indicated by the Letter "R." Score SA =1 through SD = 5, reversing as indicated.

INSTRUCTIONS: The following questionnaire contains forty-one questions. You will find that you may agree with some of the questions, and disagree with others. For some, you may feel less certain.

There are no right or wrong answers -- this is not a test.

Circle the answer which best represents how you usually feel about the things these questions are asking about.

If you **STRONGLY AGREE** circle SA

If you **AGREE** circle A

If you are not sure or **UNDECIDED** circle U

If you **DISAGREE** circle D

If you **STRONGLY DISAGREE** circle SD

Strongly				
Strongly				
	Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
Disagree				

R 1. Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a person cannot respect the law.	SA	A	U	D	SD
---	----	---	---	---	----

2. Nearly all laws deserve our respect.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. It is our duty to obey all laws.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 4. Laws are usually bad.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 5. The law is rotten to the core.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 6. Almost any jury can be fixed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 7. You can't get justice in court.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. On the whole, lawyers are usually honest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 9. Fake witnesses are often produced by the prosecution.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. On the whole, policemen are honest.	SA	A	U	D	SD

11. A cop is a friend to people in need.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 12. Life would be better with fewer policemen.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Policemen should be paid more for their work	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 14. Policemen are just as crooked as the people they arrest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. All laws should be strictly obeyed because they are the laws.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 16. The law does nor benefit the common man.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. The law as a whole is sound.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. In the long run, law and justice are the same	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 19. The law enslaves the majority of people for The benefit of the few.	SA	A	U	D	SD

20. On the whole, judges are honest and kind hearted.	SA	A	U	D	SD
21. Court decisions are almost always just.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 22. Almost anything can be fixed in the court if you have enough money.	SA	A	U	D	SD
23. A judge is a good man.	SA	A	U	D	SD
24. Our society would be better off if there were more policemen.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 25. Policemen rarely try to help people.	SA	A	U	D	SD
26. Sometimes a person like myself has to break the law in order to get ahead.	SA	A	U	D	SD
27. Most successful people used illegal means means to become successful.	SA	A	U	D	SD

28. People who have been in trouble with the law have the same sort of ideas about life that I have.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 29. People should always obey the law no matter how much it interferes with their personal ambition.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 30. I would rather associate with people that obey the law than those who don't.	SA	A	U	D	SD
31. It's all right for people to break the law if they don't get caught	SA	A	U	D	SD
32. I'm more like who the people can make a living outside the law than I am like those who only break the law occassionaly.	SA	A	U	D	SD
33. Most people would commit crimes if they knew wouldn't get wouldn't get caught.	SA	A	U	D	SD

34. People who have been in trouble with the law are more like me than people who don't have trouble with the law.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 35. There never is a good cause for breaking the law.	SA	A	U	D	SD
36. I don't have anything in common with people who never break the law.	SA	A	U	D	SD
37. I hungry person has the right to steal.	SA	A	U	D	SD
38. It's alright to evade the law if you don't actually violate it.	SA	A	U	D	SD
R 39. No one can violate the law and be my friend.	SA	A	U	D	SD
40. A person should obey only those laws which are reasonable.	SA	A	U	D	SD
41. People are fools to work for a living if they can get by some easier way even if it means violating the law.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Appendix E**Social Support For Crime Scale**

Instructions: Please **CIRCLE THE ANSWER** which **BEST DESCRIBES** your situation in the last six months.

1. Think of the people you know and have been associating within the last six months:

a) Are any of them involved in activities such as fraud, or stealing (cars, money, or other property)?

Most Are Several Are Very Few Are None Are

b) Are any of them the type of person who enjoys fighting and/or destroying things and/or just gets into fights whether they enjoy it or not?

Most Are Several Are Very Few Are None Are

2. Think of your best friends, that is, close friends who you have seen most frequently over the last six months.

a) Are any of them involved in activities such as fraud or stealing (cars, money, or other property)?

Most Are Several Are Very Few Are None Are

b) Are any of them the type of person who enjoys fighting and/or destroying things and/or just gets into fights whether they enjoy it or not?

Most Are Several Are Very Few Are None Are

3. If I want to purchase some stolen goods at a reduced price, I'd know where to go or who to see.

Definitely Yes Yes Not Sure No

4. If I want to get some money for some stolen goods, I'd know where to go or who to see.

Definitely Yes Yes Not Sure No

5. If I was planning to commit a crime, I know some people who could and would help me plan it.

Definitely Yes Yes Not Sure No

6. While I might not call them friends, and while I might not see them very often, I know some people who are involved in criminal activity.

Definitely Yes Yes Not Sure No

7. I know of at least one person in my neighbourhood or area of town who appears to be doing "just fine" as a result of his/her criminal activity.

Definitely Yes Yes Not Sure No

8. In my neighbourhood or area of town there are people who are involved in criminal activity and are liked and respected by others in the neighbourhood.

Definitely Yes Yes Not Sure No

9. In my neighbourhood or area of town there are people who are involved in criminal activity and are disliked and not respected by others in the neighbourhood.

Definitely Yes Yes Not Sure No

Appendix F

California Personality Index - Socialization Scale

Instructions: This instrument has 54 statements. Read each statement carefully, and answer whether it is true for you by circling "T", or whether it is not true for you by circling "F" (False).

1. I often feel that I made a wrong choice in my occupation.	T F
2. When I was going to school I played hooky quite often.	T F
3. I think John A. Macdonald was greater than Lester B. Pearson.	T F
4. I would do almost anything on a dare.	T F
5. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to anything.	T F
6. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.	T F
7. I am somewhat afraid of the dark.	T F
8. I hardly ever get excited or thrilled.	T F
9. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.	T F
10. My home life was always happy.	T F
11. I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.	T F
12. My parents have generally let me make my own decisions.	T F
13. I would rather go without something than ask for a favour.	T F
14. I have had more than my share of things to worry about.	T F

15. When I meet a stranger I often think that she or he is better than I am.	T F
16. Before I do something I try to consider how my friends will react to it.	T F
17. I have never been in trouble with the law.	T F
18. In school I sometimes often sent to the principle for goofing off/acting the clown.	T F
19. I keep out of trouble at all costs.	T F
20. Most of the time I feel happy.	T F
21. I often feel as though I have done something wrong or wicked.	T F
22. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.	T F
23. I have often gone against my parents wishes.	T F
24. I often think about the way I look and what impressions I am making on others.	T F
25. I have never done any heavy drinking.	T F
26. I find it easy to "drop" or "break up" with a friend.	T F
27. I get nervous when I have to ask someone for a job.	T F
28. Sometimes I used to feel that I would like to leave home.	T F
29. I never worry about my looks.	T F
30. I have been in trouble one or more times because of my sex behaviour.	T F

31. I go out of my way to meet trouble rather than try to escape it. T F
32. My home life was always very pleasant. T F
33. I seem to do things that I regret more often than other people do. T F
34. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company. T F
35. It is pretty easy for people to win arguments with me. T F
36. I know who is responsible for most of my troubles. T F
37. I get pretty discouraged with the law when a smart lawyer gets a criminal free. T F
38. I have used alcohol excessively. T F
39. Even when I have got into trouble I was usually trying to do the right thing. T F
40. It is very important to me to have enough friends and a social life. T F
41. I sometimes wanted to run away from home. T F
42. Life usually hands me a pretty raw deal. T F
43. People often talk about me behind my back. T F
44. I would never play cards (poker) with a stranger. T F
45. I don't think I'm quite as happy as others seem to be. T F
46. I used to steal sometimes when I was a youngster. T F

47. My home as a child was less peaceful and quiet than those of most people.	T F
48. Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.	T F
49. As a youngster in school I used to give the teachers a lot of trouble.	T F
50. If the pay was right, I would like to travel with a circus or carnival.	T F
51. I never cared much for school.	T F
52. The members of my family were always very close to each other.	T F
53. My parents never really understood me.	T F
54. A person is better off if he or she doesn't trust anyone.	T F

Appendix G**Rewarding-Punitive Socialization of Distress Scale**

Instructions: The following questionnaire has twenty questions. Many of these questions are about children growing up. Think of the way you were brought up as a child, and the lessons you learned then. Some of the questions are about how you feel now. Think of how you feel about these issues today.

Read each question carefully.

CIRCLE THE LETTER which BEST describes how you think and feel.

1. The sight and sound of most people weeping arouses my:

- A. sympathy; I want comfort them.
- B. contempt; I want to move away from them.

2. Children should be taught:

- A. not to cry.
- B. that it is only natural for them to cry.

3. Part of growing up is learning:

- A. how to control crying, even when you're greatly distressed.
- B. that you never outgrow the need to cry when you feel distressed.

4. As a child, I can remember:

- A. my parents' looks of concern when I was crying.
- B. my parents' angry faces when I was crying.

5. As an adult:

- A. I try never to cry.
- B. when I cry, I look for someone to comfort me.

6. A child who cries because he/she doesn't want to go to bed should be:

- A. punished for crying and sent to bed anyway.
- B. comforted and asked why he or she is upset.

7. When a 5 or 6 year old child has a problem with crying you should say:

- A. "You should be ashamed of yourself, a big boy/girl like you, crying like a little baby."
- B. "Let's see if we can find out what is making you so upset and make it better."

8. As a child, if I cried, I was:

- A. given something to really cry about.
- B. held and comforted.

9. A child who cries when he/she is being disciplined:

- A. should be stopped from crying.
- B. should be reasoned with and comforted.

10. As a child, when I cried:

- A. I was sent to my room until I stopped crying.
- B. I went to my parents for help and comfort.

11. Children should be taught:

- A. life is hard and only the tough survive.
- B. to have sympathy toward all who suffer in life.

12. Overall, I believe my parents reacted to my crying by:

- A. comforting me.
- B. punishing me.

13. When an infant or child is crying, your most important concern should be:

- A. to lessen his or her suffering.
- B. to teach him or her that crying only makes things worse.

14. A child who is injured and crying should be:

- A. treated for their injury while you discourage their crying.
- B. comforted as you treat their injury.

15. A child who is crying but who is not really hurt or injured, should be:

- A. told that they are not hurt and are just crying over nothing.
- B. comforted as you find out what is so distressing that they are crying.

16. If a child who is fretting, crying and demanding attention, you should:

- A. command the child to "Stop it" in a sudden, sharp tone.
- B. comfort the child and give the child the attention that he or she seeks.

17. A child should be taught:

A. anyone, including the parent, may cry anywhere if they are really distressed, or upset and suffering.

B. to never cry in public and not to let anyone see you crying, in public or private.

18. The only effective way to deal with a "weepy" child is:

A. to help the child solve its problems.

B. to ignore the child until its mood changes.

19. When I look back on scenes in which I was crying, they were mostly:

A. happy endings.

B. unhappy endings.

20. When it comes right down to it, I would say:

A. I am basically FOR the person who cries.

B. I am basically AGAINST the person who cries.

Appendix H**EXPANDED HYPERMASCULINITY INDEX
LIMITED CHOICE - REVISED****KEY:****D = DANGER AS EXCITING****S = SEX AS ENTITLEMENT****T = TOUGHNESS AS SELF-DISCIPLINE****V = VIOLENCE AS NECESSARY**

INSTRUCTIONS: The following scale consists of 80 questions. You are to respond to each of the 80 questions as honestly as you can according to the following 7-point scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not At						Extremely
All True						True Of
Of (For)						(For) Me.
Me.						

On this scale, (0) means "Not at all true of (for) me," and (6) means "Extremely true of (for) me." Ratings of (1) through (5) represent ratings between these statements.

Beside each question is a space where you should write the number of the answer which best describes what you most feel or believe to be true.

There is no right or wrong answer to any of these questions.

- ___ 1. Masturbation is a legitimate and pleasurable way for a person to reduce sexual tension.
- S 2. Real men or a real women have sex with their mate, not with themselves.
- ___ 3. I like quiet parties with good conversations.

D 4. I like wild parties where anything goes.

5. When I am bored, I watch TV or read a book.

D 6. When I am bored I look for excitement.

V 7. It's natural for men to get into fights.

8. Physical violence never solves an issue.

V 9. I still enjoy remembering my first real fight.

10. I hope to forget past experiences with aggression.

D 11. I am a person of action, seeking to live hard and fast.

12. I am a thinker, a planner, seeking success and security.

13. After I have gone through a really dangerous experience, my knees feel weak and I shake all over.

D 14. After I have gone through a dangerous experience, I feel really high.

15. Risk has to be weighed against possible maximum loss.

D 16. If the payoff is big enough, there is no such thing as too big a risk.

17. Any mature person can do without sex.

S 18. Real men and real women need to have sex regularly.

19. If you are chosen for a fight, its time to talk your way out of it.

V 20. If you are chosen for a fight, there is no choice but to fight.

D 21. No risk is too great, no danger too grave to keep me from victory, from triumph.

___ 22. Avoiding needless risk, escaping foolish danger permits me to find solutions to life's problems.

T 23. The person with the strongest will wins.

___ 24. The person with the greatest flexibility wins.

V 25. Call me a name and all call you another.

___ 26. Call me a name and I'll pretend not to hear you.

T 27. If I am tough on others, it's only because I am tough on myself.

___ 28. If I am considerate to others, it is because I like myself.

T 29. When you get down to it, pride truly earned is all there really is.

___ 30. A real person is more than pride, more than honor, and above all is one who seeks wisdom and justice.

V 31. If you insult me, be prepared to back it up.

___ 32. If you insult me, I'll try to turn the other cheek.

___ 33. Most people deserve the same respect you would show for your mother or father.

S 34. Some women and some men are good for only one thing.

- ___ 35. A man or a woman should have sex only when he/she wants to, never when he/she is uninterested or angry.
- ..S_ 36. A girlfriend, boyfriend, wife or husband has a sexual duty to satisfy her/his partner.
- ___ 37. You should behave decently with all women and men.
- ..S_ 38. Pick-ups should expect to put out.
- ..T_ 39. If the world is dangerous, I must be fearless; if hard, I must be tough.
- ___ 40. If the world is dangerous and hard, I am always cautious, sometimes scared.
- ___ 41. I would not want a reputation for being a tough guy or a tough broad.
- ..T_ 42. Honour is a person's most precious possession.
- ___ 43. It's just plain dumb to fight.
- ..V_ 44. The one who can, fights; the one who can't runs away.
- ___ 45. Fair play still counts in love and war.
- ..S_ 46. All is fair in love and war.
- ___ 47. If I feel afraid, I am not ashamed to avoid danger.
- ..D_ 48. If you master fear, danger is exciting.

S 49. Get the right person drunk, high, or hot, and they'll let you do whatever you want.

___ 50. It's gross and unfair to use drugs or alcohol to convince anyone to have sex.

T 51. If ever I want to cry, I feel disgust with myself.

___ 52. When I cry, I comfort myself.

D 53. I like to drive fast, right on the edge of danger.

___ 54. I like to drive safely, avoiding all possible risks.

T 55. Emotions are the friend of women, the enemy of men.

___ 56. Emotions are fiendly to all, urging us to care.

T 57. When the going gets tough, I tough it out.

___ 58. When the going gets tough, I seek new solutions.

V 59. I fight to win.

___ 60. I win by not fighting.

V 61. Like warriors throughout history, above all else, I value my honour.

___ 62. Like the peacemakers throughout history, I seek to turn swords into plows.

T 63. I discipline myself by controlling my emotions.

___ 64. I experience myself by expressing my emotions.

T 65. I would be proud to wear the tattoo, "Death Before Dishonour."

66. I would not enjoy being tattooed with anything.

V 67. If you are not prepared to fight for what is yours, then be prepared to lose it.

68. Even if I feel like fighting, I try to think of alternatives.

___ 69. Violence is never honourable, always shameful.

V 70. War shows the strength of a nation, like fighting proves a person's true heart.

S 71. In war, you fuck your enemy, his women, and the horse he rides on.

72. Rape is inexcusable, even during war time.

73. I'd rather live safely now than sorry in the future.

D 74. I'd rather gamble than play it safe.

___ 75. Lesbians and gays choose their own life style and should be respected for it.

S 76. The only thing a lesbian needs is a good, stiff cock, and a gay guy needs to be fucked by a real woman.

S 77. You have to fuck someone before they know who's boss.

78. You have to love someone before they know you don't want to be the boss.

___ 79. Some people tell me I ought to take more chances

D 80. Some people tell me I take foolish risks.

Appendix H-1**Validity Data For The Hypermasculinity Index and
The Expanded HMI, Forced Choice and Limited Choice Formats**

Source	N	Scale	r with HMI
Mosher & Sirkin (1984)	135	Jackson's Personality Research Form	
		- Need For Play	.48
		- Impulsivity	.44
		- Exhibition	.40
		- Aggression	.29
		- Autonomy	.25
		- Dominance	.24
		- Understanding	-.47
		- Harm-Avoidance	-.36
		- Cognitive Structure	-.30
		- Nurturance	-.22
		- Order	-.19
		- Social Desirability	-.18
		Delinquency Scale - Modified (Kulik, Stein & Sarbin, 1968)	
		- Total scale	.38
		- Drugs and alcohol	.27
		- Fighting	.47
		- Law Breaking	.18
		- Sex experience	.36
		- Delinquent role	.38
		- Assaultiveness	.20
		- Aggression	.47

Source	N	Scale	r with HMI
	135	Self-Report Alcohol and Drug Use	
		- in high school	.28
		- currently	.26
Mosher & Anderson (1986)		- Self-report Sexual Aggression	
		(total scale)	.33
		- sexual force	.40
		- use of threats	.33
		- anger expression as a means to obtain sex	.24
		- use of drugs/alcohol to obtain sex	.46
Cornman (1987)	127	Wiggins Short Form of Interpersonal Behaviour (Wiggins, 1979)	
		- Hostile Dominant Quadrant	.47
		- Friendly Submissive Quadrant	-.31
Lenderking (1988)	166	Differential Aggressive Sexual Behaviour Inventory	.42
		Proclivity to Rape (Malamuth, 1981)	.21
		Interpersonal Style of Dating (Keisler, 1983) (total scale)	.92
		- Dominant	.54
		- Competitive	.62

Source	N	Scale	r with HMI
		- Mistrust	.47
		- Cold	.53
		- Hostile	.78
Archer and Rhodes (1989)	-	Bem (1974) Sex Role Inventory	
		- Male subscale	.40
		- Female subscale	-.25
	-	Attitude Toward Women Scale - British Version (Spence, 1983)	-.50
Epstein (1989)	127	Peer Ratings	
		- Male peers	.37
		- Female peers	.63
		- Aggregate	.57
Epstein (1989)	76	California Personality Index - Socialization Scale (Gough, 1969)	-.26
		Million Multiaxial Inventory (Million, 1977)	
		- Histrionic-gregarious	.28
		- Antisocial/Aggressive	.50
		Zuckerman's (1979) Sensation Seeking Scale - total score	.43
		- Boredom susceptibility	.51
		- Disinhibition	.39

Source	N	Scale	r with HMI
Polarity Scale (Tomkins, 1965)			
		- Normative Ideology	.31
		- Punitive Socialization of Distress	.49
Zaitchik & Mosher (1991)	55	Antisocial Behaviour Self-Report (Kulik, et al., 1968)	.77
		Sexual Aggression Scale (Mosher & Anderson, 1986)	.75
		Drinking Behaviour Self-report (total scale)	.66
		- fighting and dangerous driving after drinking	.74
		- use of marijuana	.42
		- use of amphetamines	.60
		- use of cocaine	.45
Lenderking (1991)	111	Differential Aggressive Sexual Behaviour (Lenderking, 1988)	.42
Hall (1992)	313	100 Items from Williams & Best (1982) Trait Adjectives	.50
		Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960)	-.01/.08
		Extended Hypermasculinity Scale - Forced Choice Version	-.08

Source	N	Scale	r with HMI
		- Limited Choice Version	-.14
		Pancultural Adjective Checklist (Williams & Best, 1982;1990)	
		- Self-image	.32/.40
		with EHMI (LC)	.50
		with EHMI (FC)	.50
		- Ideal Man	.16
		with EHMI (LC)	.17
		with EHMI (FC)	---
		Rotters (1966) Locus of Control	-.24
		Altmeyer's Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale	.21
		Modern-Traditional Sex Role Ideology (Katlin & Tisby, 1978)	.54
		Self-Reported Illegal Behaviours	
		- frequency of intimate fights/arguments	.22
		- hitting instructors, supervisor, or manager	.23
		- serious fights at school/work	.32
		- gang fights	.40
		- hurting someone bad enough to need doctor	.30
		- theft under/over \$50	.22
		- shoplifting	.27

			242
Source	N	Scale	r with HMI
		- taking car parts	.23
		- illegal entry	.18
		Sexual Aggression Scale (Mosher & Anderson, 1986)	.38
		Self-Reported substance useage (currently)	
		- alcohol	.35
		- marijuana	.23
		Ideology of Machismo Scale	
		- EHMI (LC)	.69
		- EHMI (FC)	.59
	154	Altmeyer (1988) Attitudes Toward Homosexual Scale	.42

Appendix I

INTERNALISED SHAME SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS: The following questionnaire contains 30 statements. They describe feelings or experiences that you may have from time to time, or that are familiar to you because you have had these feelings for a long time.

Most of these statements describe feelings and experiences that are painful and negative in some way. Some people will seldom or never have had many of these feelings.

Some of the feelings and experiences described here, however, are experienced by almost everyone.

Read each statement carefully, and then circle the number which describes how often you find yourself feeling this way.

This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers.

1	2	3	4	5
NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALMOST ALWAYS

-
1. I feel like I am
never quite good enough.	1 2 3 4 5
2. I feel somehow left out.	1 2 3 4 5
3. I think that people look
down on me.	1 2 3 4 5
*4. All in all, I am inclined
to think I am a success.	1 2 3 4 5
5. I scold myself and put
down.	1 2 3 4 5

6. I feel insecure about others opinions of me.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Compared to other people, I feel like somehow I never measure up.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I see myself as being very small and insignificant.	1	2	3	4	5
*9. I feel I have much to be proud of.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I feel intensely inadequate and full of self doubt.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I feel as if somehow I am defective as a person, like there is something basically wrong with me.	1	2	3	4	5
12. When I compare myself to others, I am just not as important.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I have an overpowering dread that my faults will be revealed in front of others.	1	2	3	4	5
*14. I feel I have a number of good qualities.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I see myself as striving for perfection only to continually fall short.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I think others are able to see my defects.	1	2	3	4	5

17. I could beat myself over the head whenever I make a mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
*18. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I would like to shrink away when I make a mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I replay painful events over and over in my mind until I am overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4	5
*21. I am a person of worth at least on an equal plain with others.	1	2	3	4	5
22. At times I feel like I will break into a thousand pieces.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I feel as if I have lost control over my body functions and my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Sometimes I feel no bigger than a pea.	1	2	3	4	5
25. At times I feel so exposed that I wish the earth would open up and swallow me.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I have this painful gap within me that have not been able to fill.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I feel empty and unfulfilled.	1	2	3	4	5

***28. I take a positive attitude
toward myself.**

1 2 3 4 5

**29. My loneliness is more like
emptiness.**

1 2 3 4 5

**30. I feel like there is
something missing.**

1 2 3 4 5

Appendix J

Psychopathy Checklist Self Report

Instructions: On the following pages are 60 statements that have been used by people to describe their beliefs and behaviours, and the beliefs and behaviours of others.

Read each statement carefully and decide whether you agree or disagree with it. Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement according to the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly	

For example, if you **Disagree Moderately** with a statement, write the number "2" next to it. If you neither agree nor disagree with a statement, write the number "4" next to it, indicating **Neutral**.

There are no right or wrong answers to any of these questions, and none of these questions have any trick to them. Some of the questions are similar to one another, but judge each one separately. It does not matter if you answered to a similar question differently -- simply indicate how you would respond to the current question.

Be sure not to miss any questions.

_____ (01) I enjoy driving at high speed.

_____ (02) I enjoy giving "bossy" people a hard time.

_____ (03) I think I could "beat" a lie detector.

_____ (04) Sometimes you have to be crafty or sly.

_____ (05) It's best to be dominant and assertive because no one else is going to look out for you.

_____ (06) I worry a lot about possible misfortunes.

- ____ (07) I like to change jobs fairly often.
- ____ (08) I can be fairly cunning if I have to be
- ____ (09) Everybody likes to hear my stories.
- ____ (10) I am usually very careful about what I say to people.
- ____ (11) I have often done something dangerous just for the thrill of it.
- ____ (12) I wish I were more assertive.
- ____ (13) I expect a great deal from other people.
- ____ (14) I am not at all calculating.
- ____ (15) I think of myself as self-assured and confident.
- ____ (16) I didn't get into much trouble at school.
- ____ (17) I get a kick out of "conning" someone.
- ____ (18) I get in trouble for the same things time after time.
- ____ (19) I am very good at most things I try to do.
- ____ (20) I was never in trouble with the police when I was a kid.
- ____ (21) It's more effective to be straight forward and honest if you want people to do things for you.
- ____ (22) Being unemployed would depress me.
- ____ (23) I enjoy taking chances.
- ____ (24) I wouldn't do anything dangerous just for the thrill of it.

- ___ (25) I often worry unnecessarily.
- ___ (26) I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
- ___ (27) The best way to get things done is to be forceful and persistent.
- ___ (28) I got in a lot of trouble at school.
- ___ (29) Rules are made to be broken.
- ___ (30) I usually feel quite confident meeting new people.
- ___ (31) Not hurting other's feelings is important to me.
- ___ (32) I would be good at a dangerous job because I like making fast decisions.
- ___ (33) I have used few, if any, hallucinogenic drugs.
- ___ (34) On average, my friends would probably say I am a kind person.
- ___ (35) I see myself as a good leader.
- ___ (36) I can read people like a book.
- ___ (37) I can usually talk my way out of anything.
- ___ (38) I have used most of the hallucinogenic drugs.
- ___ (39) I have sometimes broken an appointment because something more interesting came along.
- ___ (40) I enjoy gambling for large stakes.
- ___ (41) I have a strong will to power.
- ___ (42) I would describe myself as a crafty individual.

- ___ (43) I prefer having many sexual partners rather than just one.
- ___ (44) I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
- ___ (45) One must live only for the present and not worry about the future.
- ___ (46) If I ruled the world it would be a much better place.
- ___ (47) Sometimes at night I get so worried about things that my heart pounds and I can't fall asleep.
- ___ (48) I don't think of myself as tricky or sly.
- ___ (49) I almost never feel guilty over something I have done.
- ___ (50) It's sometimes fun to see how far you can push someone before they catch on.
- ___ (51) People can usually tell if I'm lying.
- ___ (52) I wouldn't describe myself as shy or stupid.
- ___ (53) Conning people gives me the "shakes."
- ___ (54) When I do something wrong, I feel guilty even though nobody else knows it.
- ___ (55) I always know what I am doing.
- ___ (56) I find it easy to manipulate people.
- ___ (57) I am a soft-hearted person.
- ___ (58) I enjoy drinking and doing wild things.
- ___ (59) Ideally people should be undemanding.
- ___ (60) I am the most important person in this whole world and nobody else matters.

Appendix K

Colorado family Functioning Scale

Instructions: This questionnaire has 75 questions. It asks questions about your family life when you were a child, growing up.

Read each question carefully and answer as best you can remember by circling the number on the line which goes with the answer that **BEST describes your home life as a child.**

For example: My family did most of its grocery shopping in a shopping mall.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

Circling number 4 means your family probably never did their grocery shopping in a shopping mall.

A.

1. Family members really helped and supported one another.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

2 There was a feeling of togetherness in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

3. Our family did not do things together.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

4. We really got along well with each other.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

5. Family members seemed to avoid contact with each other when at home.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

B.

1. Family members felt free to say what was on their minds.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

2. Our family did not discuss its problems.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

3. Family members discussed problems and usually felt good about the solutions.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

4. In or family, it was important for everyone to express their opinion.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. We didn't tell each other about personal problems.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

C.

1. We fought a lot in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

2. Family members some got so angry they threw things.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

3. Family members hardly ever lost their tempers.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

4. Family members sometimes hit each other.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. Family members rarely criticized each other.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

D.

1. We rarely went to lectures, plays or concerts.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

2. We rarely had intellectual discussions.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

3. Watching TV was more important than reading in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

4. Family members really liked music, art, and literature.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. We were very interested in cultural activities.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

E. - 1. We often went to movies, sports events, camping, etc.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

2. Everyone in our family had a hobby or two.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

3. Family members were not very involved in recreational activities outside work or school.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

4. Family members sometimes attended courses or took lessons for some hobby or interest.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. Friends rarely came over to dinner or to visit.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

F.

1. Family members attended church, synagogue, mosque, temple fairly often.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

2. We didn't say prayers in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

3. We often talked about the religious meaning of Christmas, Passover, Ramadan, or other religious holidays and events in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

4. We didn't believe in a heaven or hell.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. The Bible, Talmud, or Koran was very important in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

G.

1. It was often hard to find things when you need them in our household.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

2. Being on time was very important in our household.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

3. Family members made sure their rooms were neat.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

4. Dishes were usually done immediately after eating.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. We were generally pretty sloppy around the house.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

H. 1. We were full of life and good spirits.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

2. Our family enjoyed being around other people.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

3. Socializing with other people often made my family uncomfortable.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

4. As a family, we had a large number of friends.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. Our family like having parties.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

I.

1. In our family, we encouraged each other to develop in his or her own individual way.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

2. We were satisfied with the way in which we lived.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

3. As a family, our decisions were not our own, but were forced upon us by things beyond our control.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

4. Our family had more than its share of bad luck.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

5. My family felt that it had very little influence over the things that happened to them.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

J. - 1. I didn't think any family could live together with greater harmony than my family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

2. I didn't think anyone could possibly be happier than my family and I when we were together.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

3. My family had all the qualities I have always wanted in a family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

4. Our family was as well adjusted as any family in this world could have been.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

5. My family could have been happier than it was.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

K.

1. It was difficult to keep track of what other family members were doing

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

2. In our family we knew where all family members were at all times.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

3. Family members did not check with each other when making decisions.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

4. Family members were extremely independent.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. Family members were expected to have the approval of others before making decisions.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

L - 1. Family members made the rules together.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

2. Family members felt they had no say in solving problems.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

3. Each family member had at least some say in major family decisions.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

4. Parents and children in our family discussed together the method of punishment.

1	2	3	4
very true	fairly true	fairly untrue	very untrue
for my	for my	for my	for my
family	family	family	family

5. In our family, parents did not speak with the children before making important decisions.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

M.

1. Members of our family could get away with almost anything.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

2. Family members were not punished or reprimanded when they did something wrong.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

4. It was always hard to know what the rules were in our family, because they always changed.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

5. There was strong leadership in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

N.

1. Parents made all the important decisions in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

2. There was strict punishment for breaking the rules in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

3. Family members were severely punished for anything they did wrong.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

4. There were very few rules in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

5. Nobody ordered anyone around in our family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

O. - 1. Family members found it hard to get away from each another.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

2. It was difficult for family members to take time away from the family.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

3. Family members felt pressured to spend most of their free time together.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

4. Family members felt guilty if they wanted to spend some time alone.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

5. It seemed like there was never any place to be alone in our house.

1	2	3	4
very true for my family	fairly true for my family	fairly untrue for my family	very untrue for my family

APPENDIX L

Table L-1 Intercorrelations between variables associated with general criminal behaviour, age, and socially desirable responding

VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH GENERAL CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR										
MALE SUBJECTS ONLY		Desireable Responding				Criminal Sentiments				
	CRIMBEH†	AGE	Impman	SelfDec	Denial	LCP	TLV	IO	SSC	CPI-SO
1. CRIMBEH	--									
2. AGE	-.05	--								
BIDR-6										
4. IMPMAN	-.57***	.02	--							
5. SELFDEC	-.23**	-.03	-.25**	--						
6. DENIAL	-.47***	.15	.69***	.36***	--					
CRIMINAL SENTIMENTS										
7. LCP	-.21**	.16	.15	.06	.21**	--				
8. TLV	.30***	-.19*	-.23**	-.21**	.36***	-.67***	--			
9. IO	.28***	-.17*	-.15	-.15	-.24**	-.39***	.46***	--		
SOCIAL SUPPORT FOR CRIME										
	.36***	.05	-.24**	.15	-.22**	-.10	.18*	.23**	--	
CPI-SO	-.30***	-.29***	.28***	.13	-.18*	-.05	.12	.13	-.14	--

Notes: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. † Scale abbreviations: CRIMBEH = Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour; BIDR-6 = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Form 6; IMPMAN = Impression Management; SELFDEC = Self Deceptive Enhancement; LCP = Law, Courts Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violations; IO = Identification with Criminal Others; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

Table L-2: Inter-correlations: variables associated with general criminal behaviour, other variables of theoretical interest, desirable responding, and age.

MALE SUBJECTS ONLY	OTHER VARIABLES OF THEORETICAL INTEREST										
	REWPUN	DAN	VIOL	CASEX	TOUGH	SHAME	SF1	SF2	STOT59	COH	CON LAIS
1. CRIMBEH	.08	.54***	.44***	.32***	.23**	.25**	-.01	.21**	.20*	.17*	-.33***
2. AGE	-.02	-.36***	-.41***	.14	.41***	.01	-.08	-.02	-.13	.14	-.09
BIDR-6											
4. IMPMAN	-.05	-.30***	-.23**	-.21**	.09	-.22**	-.07	-.24**	-.21**	.21**	.18*
5. SELFDEC	.13	-.14	-.01	-.04	.09	-.57***	.19*	-.14	-.04	-.31***	.34***
6. DENIAL	-.16	-.33***	.30***	.23*	-.17*	-.39***	-.04	-.29***	.31***	-.24**	.23**
CRIMINAL SENTIMENTS											
7. LCP	-.17*	-.37***	-.22**	-.14	.10	-.17*	.16	-.02	-.06	-.18*	.06
8. TLV	.32***	.46***	.38***	.30***	.23**	.32***	-.12	.26***	.25**	.10	-.11
9. IO	.09	.32***	.23**	.21**	.10	.14	-.07	.24**	.23**	.06	-.01
SOC SUPP CRIME	.07	.18*	.06	.11	.07	.25**	-.07	.27***	.29***	.15	-.26***
CPI-SO	-.06	-.06	-.03	.15	.03	-.31***	-.01	-.24**	-.16	-.21**	.28***

Notes: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. REWPUN = Rewarding Punitive Socialization; DAN = Danger as Exciting; VIOL = Violence as Meanly; TOUGH = Toughness as Control; SF1 = Psychopathy Factor 1; SF2 = Psychopathy Factor 2; STOT59 = Psychopathy Self-Report Total Score; COH = Family Cohesiveness; CON = Family Conflict; LAIS = Laissez-Faire Family Style; CRIMBEH = Self-Reported Criminal Behaviour; BIDR-6 = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Form 6; IMPMAN = Impression Management; SELFDEC = Self Deceptive Enhancement; LCP = Law, Courts Police; TLV = Tolerance for Law Violators; IO = Identification with Criminal Others; CPI-SO = California Personality Index Socialization Scale.

Table L-3 *Inter-correlations between other variables of theoretical interest*

MALE SUBJECTS ONLY	OTHER VARIABLES OF THEORETICAL INTEREST									
	REWPUN	DAN	VIOL	CASEX	TOUGH	SHAME	SF1	SF2	STOT59	COH CON LAIS
HYPERMASCULINITY										
DANGER	.14	---								
VIOL	.17*	.60***	--							
CASEX	.41***	.48***	.51***	--						
TOUGH	.26***	.50***	.62***	.50***	--					
SHAME	.33***	.20*	.05	.13	.10	--				
SELF-REPORT PSYCHOPATHY										
SF1	.03	.06	.11	.17	.15	-.29***	--			
SF2	.16	.26**	.21**	.20*	.18*	.28***	.10	--		
STOT59	.20*	.25**	.27***	.24**	.24**	.25**	.27***	.88***	--	

FAMILY FUNCTIONING

COHESION	.27***	.12	-.09	-.05	-.06	.34***	-.09	.07	.07	--
CONFLICT	-.26***	-.24**	-.21**	-.25**	-.13	-.40***	.05	-.07	-.10	-.48***
LAISSEZ-FAIRE	-.24***	-.47***	-.31***	-.29***	-.27***	-.30***	.01	-.06	-.06	-.30***
										.33***

Notes: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. REWPUN = Rewarding Punitive Socialization; DAN = Danger as Fictitious; VIOL = Violence as Manly; TOUGH = Toughness as Control; SF1 = Psychopathy Factor 1; SF2 = Psychopathy Factor 2; STOT59 = Psychopathy Self-Report Total Score; COH = Family Cohesiveness; CON = Family Conflict; LAIS = Laissez-Faire Family Style.

Appendix M

Factor Analysis of “New” Measures

Rewarding Punitive Socialization Scale (REWPUNSO).

Recall that this twenty-item scale was designed by Mosher and colleagues to assess a person's socialization experiences. This is a dichotomous, forced-choice scale, requiring respondents to endorse one of two suggested endings to a phrase. The scale comprises two distinct types of items. The first set consists of six items, which seem to assess recollections of socialization practices within the family of origin. Item 4 is an example: “As a child, I can remember: a. my parents looks of concern when I was crying; b. my parents angry faces when I was crying.” The remaining 14 items comprise a second set, apparently directed at assessing current attitudes about expressions of distress, and about how children experiencing distress should be socialized. Item 1 is an example of the former: “The sight and sound of most people weeping arouses my: a. Sympathy; I want to comfort them b. contempt; I want to move away from them.” Item 2 is an example of an item trying to assess current attitudes toward distressed children: “Children should be taught; a. Not to cry. b. that it is only natural for them to cry.”

Of the 242 subjects who completed the study, 240 were included in this factor analysis. Two subjects were excluded because of missing data. All items were included in the analysis since none had a pattern of non-significant correlations with

the other items in the set, and all enjoyed satisfactory communalities.

Initial Principle Component Analysis extracted 20 factors. Six factors were indicated according to the “Eigenvalue >1” rule. An examination of the scree plot, however, indicated three “true” factors (Norusis, 1994; Tucker, et al., 1969; Cattell, 1966). Accordingly, data were subjected to maximum likelihood extraction with orthogonal (varimax) rotation, with a three-factor solution specified. Sampling adequacy as measured by the Kaiser-Meyer-Okin test was good at .79. Factor loadings are contained in **Table M-1**.

Factor 1 comprises items which tap early recollections of childhood socialization experiences, and accounts for most of the variance. Factor 2 seems to comprise what might be termed “global attitudinal measures” relative to the socialization of young children. Factor 3, on the other hand, comprises items which seem to tap specific situational attitudes toward the socialization of children. Item scores for each factor were summed and correlated with total scores on the outcome measure - the Criminal Behaviour Scale. Results are shown in **Table M-2**.

While a three-factor structure for this scale appears to have some conceptual value, it does not improve the performance of this scale in terms of understanding self-reported criminal behaviour.

Extended Hypermasculinity Index (EHMI)

The EHMI was adapted by Hall (1991), from the original Hypermasculinity

Table M-1

Factor Loadings for the Rewarding Punitive Socialization Scale

Item	Factor Loading	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Factor 1</u>			
12	.86	.17	.37
8	.69	.27	.45
19	.66	.30	.46
10	.66	.37	.48
4	.61	.19	.39
<u>Factor 2</u>			
3	.66	.25	.44
2	.53	.07	.06
20	.50	.08	.28
17	.46	.12	.33
14	.34	.06	.24
5	.32	.56	.50
11	.27	.25	.43
1	.25	.07	.26
<u>Factor 3</u>			
9	.61	.24	.43
16	.58	.38	.49
15	.53	.27	.44
6	.39	.15	.36
7	.36	.09	.28
18	.34	.06	.24
13	.29	.08	.28

Note: Factor 1 accounts for 15.2% of the variance; Factor 2 accounts for 13.5%, and Factor 3 accounts for 3.1% of the variance.

Table M-2

Correlations between Sums of Factor Items and Criminal Behaviour Scale -
Rewarding/Punitive Socialization

	Criminal Behaviour Scale by Subject Group		
	Univ. Males	Offenders	Univ. Females
Factor 1 of Past Experiences	.27*	.04	.18
Factor 2 Global Items	.30**	-.02	.21*
Factor 3 Situational Items	.13	-.02	.24
Scale Total Score	.33**	.005	.36***

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Index (HMI) developed by Mosher and Sirkin (1984). Mosher and Sirkin (1984) developed the HMI as a way of tapping what they have conceptualised as the "macho personality constellation." This "constellation" was derived from their factor analysis of 135 male college student scores. Though nine factors were identified through Principle Component Analysis (PCA), the last eight "did not aggregate by subscales." Only the first factor represented a "predominant, latent variable that was relatively homogenous," (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). Therefore, this single factor comprised their "macho personality pattern."

The EHMI now consists of four, 20-item subscales. These include Mosher and Sirkin's original three factors - the "Danger as Exciting," "Violence as Manly," and "Callous Sexual Attitude to Women," subscales. Hall (1991) added the "Toughness as Control" subscale. A limited-choice option for response styles was employed, employing a 7-point scale where zero indicated Not at All True for Me, and 6 indicating Extremely True for Me. Every other item was scored in reverse order to baffle response sets.

Initial Principle Component Analysis indicated a 23-factor solution based on the eigenvalue >1 rule. Examination of the scree plot, however, indicated a five-factor solution.

Accordingly, a five-factor solution employing maximum likelihood extraction with varimax rotation was ordered. Of the 242 subjects in this study, 218 were

4

of/de

4

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

included in this factor analysis. Twenty-four subjects were deleted from the analysis because of incomplete or missing data. Three items (17, 35, 78) had communality scores less than .10 indicating that they were outliers in this analysis, and were therefore dropped (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989; Norusis, 1991).

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was good at .78. Factor Loadings are reported in **Table M-3**.

While there is some overlap, distinct factors do appear. Factor 1 (accounting for 16.2% of the variance), for instance, is comprised mainly of items measuring callous sexual attitudes (9-items) and violence (6-items), with danger and toughness represented by 1 and 3 items respectively.

Factor 2 (accounting for 6% of the variance) is comprised predominantly by violence (13-items), though danger, callous sex, and toughness are represented by an additional 4 items in total.

Factor 3 (accounting for 3.7% of the variance) is comprised almost exclusively of danger items (10 in all), and one violence item. Factor 4 (3% of the variance) is less clear, in that it carries almost an even number of items for danger (5-items) and toughness (4-items). Factor 5 (2.2% of the variance) is comprised by mostly toughness items (4), with violence and sex represented by another 3 items total.

Table M-3

Means and factor loadings for the Extended Hypermasculinity Scale

Subscale	Factor Loading	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Factor 1</u>			
70	.60	1.90	1.70
76	.56	1.41	1.89
38	.55	1.53	1.74
36	.54	2.58	2.20
34	.53	2.05	2.01
21	.51	2.29	1.80
61	.50	3.91	1.66
77	.48	.67	1.28
65	.47	1.82	1.94
20	.46	2.13	1.81
49	.44	2.11	2.09
71	.42	1.74	2.05
9	.40	1.51	2.06
44	.39	2.21	1.99
46	.34	2.64	1.99
67	.34	3.50	1.92
29	.33	3.35	1.75
18	.32	3.22	1.86
42	.31	4.04	1.63

Table M-3 Continued**Factor 2**

68	.64	1.43	1.51
32	.62	3.00	1.90
60	.60	1.95	1.68
43	.60	1.96	1.86
25	.55	2.80	1.82
26	.54	3.07	1.85
41	.51	2.20	1.84
62	.49	2.24	1.60
33	.47	2.07	1.82
19	.46	1.95	1.72
31	.45	3.60	1.93
39	.41	3.42	1.75
69	.40	2.33	1.93
10	.39	2.25	2.07
7	.37	2.40	1.85
58	.31	1.89	1.53
22	.30	2.24	1.58

Factor 3

14	.62	3.03	1.97
53	.55	2.81	1.99
4	.55	3.29	1.97
74	.53	1.80	1.63
16	.51	2.27	1.85
80	.51	2.48	2.02
54	.49	2.58	1.86
59	.44	3.26	2.12
6	.44	3.80	1.62

Table M-3 Continued**Factor 4**

47	.50	1.89	1.65
73	.45	1.47	1.67
30	.41	1.70	1.45
40	.40	2.59	1.70
12	.40	1.49	1.40
23	-.37	3.81	1.74
13	.37	2.20	1.88
15	.35	1.73	1.53
45	.35	2.16	1.88
50	.33	1.05	1.78
28	.31	2.11	1.76

Factor 5

52	.54	2.44	1.93
55	.48	1.93	1.83
56	.48	1.42	1.62
51	.45	1.64	1.79
64	.37	2.20	1.74
79	-.34	3.74	1.86
1	.34	2.53	2.07

Note: Factor 1 accounts for 16.2% of the variance;

The last two factors (4 and 5) account for a small amount of the total variance, and are represented by only a few items each. Therefore, they will be interpreted with caution, and in future analysis, would likely be dropped.

The "Violence as Manly" and "Danger as Exciting" subscales, however, emerge represented by distinct factors, as does, though to a lesser extent, the "Callous Sexual Attitudes" subscale. These results suggest that the Extended Hypermasculinity Scale may not comprise "a single predominant, latent variable" like the original Hypermasculinity Index analysed by Mosher & Sirkin (1984).

Internalised Shame Scale

Recall that the Internalised Shame Scale was developed by Harper and Hoops (1988) to measure enduring, chronic shame which has become part of the internalised identity. The full scale consists of 30 items, six of which comprise a self-esteem measure employed by the authors as a means for thwarting response-set biases. These six items, while completed by all subjects, were not included in the data for this study, and therefore do not form part of this factor analysis

The remaining 24 item scale requires responses to shame items on a scale ranging from 1 = Never, to 5 = Almost Always.

Exploratory PCA indicated a 4-factor solution based on the eigenvalue > 1 rule. Examination of the scree plot indicated a two-factor solution.

A confirmatory factor analysis employing maximum likelihood extraction and varimax rotation procedures with a two-factor solution was performed. Of the original 242 subjects in the study, 6 were dropped from this analysis because of incomplete or missing data, leaving 236 cases in the analysis.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was excellent at .95. All 24 items were retained in the analysis. Communalities ranged from .22 to .87, with no outliers observed. Factor Loadings and means are reported in **Table M-4**, below. The two-factor structure of the shame scale revealed in this analysis, while not referred to by the authors (Harper & Hoops, 1988), is consistent with Wurmser's conception of the phenomenological "Two-Layered Nature of Shame," in which he distinguishes the "functional" nature of shame from its "content" form (Wurmser, 1981, 1995 pp. 75-76).

Items loading on the first factor include statements such as "I feel insecure about others opinions of me." and "I have an over powering dread that my faults will be revealed in front of others." These items speak to the "functional" aspect of shame. Wurmser describes this aspect as comprising perception (by others and the self), of being seen; shame is not only that one is exposed, but is experienced over what is The two-factor structure of the shame scale revealed in this analysis, while not referred to by the authors (Harper & Hoops, 1988), is consistent with Wurmser's conception of the phenomenological "Two-Layered Nature of Shame," in which he distinguishes the

“functional” nature of shame from its “content” form (Wurmser, 1995 pp. 75-76)

Items loading on the first factor include statements such as “I feel insecure about others opinions of me,” and “I have an over powering dread that my faults will be revealed in front of others.” These items speak to the “functional” aspect of shame. Wurmser describes this aspect as comprising perception (by others and the self), of being seen; shame is not only that one is exposed, but is experienced over what is shown as well. This includes body parts, but involves the seeing and showing of emotions, too.

Items loading on the second factor include as series of items that speak to feeling empty, about a sense of a painful gap within oneself, and that there is a sense of loss of control over one’s body. These sensations are what Wurmser (1995, p. 76) has referred to as the “content” portion of shame, referring to the “higher developmental and symbolic levels,” and of the “deeper, more global” nature of shame (Wurmser,

Table M-4**Means and factor loadings for the Internalised Shame Scale**

Items	Factor Loading	Mean	Standard Deviation
Factor 1			
6	.74	2.4	1.06
7	.71	2.14	1.04
1	.69	2.88	.95
8	.69	2.34	1.10
9	.67	1.96	1.00
5	.66	2.78	1.20
3	.65	2.33	.99
4	.65	2.67	1.04
2	.64	2.80	.99
10	.64	2.04	.97
20	.58	1.82	.99
11	.57	2.34	1.09
19	.56	1.81	.91
16	.53	2.71	1.28
15	.50	2.64	1.10
17	.50	2.18	1.06
14	.42	2.53	1.17
13	.40	2.72	.98
Factor 2			
22	.88	2.42	1.26
21	.83	2.48	1.33
24	.80	3.01	1.30
23	.73	2.49	1.27
18	.45	1.92	.98
12	.36	2.85	1.04

Note: Factor 1 accounts for 44.2% of the variance, while Factor 2 accounts for 6.4%.

The two-factor structure of the shame scale revealed in this analysis, while not referred to by the authors (Harper & Hoops, 1988), is consistent with Wurmser's conception of the phenomenological "Two-Layered Nature of Shame," in which he distinguishes the "functional" nature of shame from its "content" form (Wurmser, 1981, 1995 pp. 75-76).

Items loading on the first factor include statements such as "I feel insecure about others opinions of me," and "I have an over powering dread that my faults will be revealed in front of others." These items speak to the "functional" aspect of shame. Wurmser describes this aspect as comprising perception: (by others and the self), of being seen; shame is not only that one is exposed, but is experienced over what is shown as well. This includes body parts, but involves the seeing and showing of emotions, too.

Items loading on the second factor include a series of items that speak to feeling empty, about a sense of a painful gap within oneself, and that there is a sense of loss of control over one's body. These sensations are what Wurmser (1995, p. 76) has referred to as the "content" portion of shame, referring to the "higher developmental and symbolic levels," and of the "deeper, more global" nature of shame (Wurmser, 1995, p. 76).

Factor 1 (The "Functional Factor") accounts for 44.2% of the variance in the solution, whereas Factor 2 (The "Content Factor") accounts for 6.4% of the variance.

Together, the two factors account for 50.5% of the variance. Scores for each factor were summed and correlated with self-reported criminal behaviour. The results are reported in Table M-5, below.

Self-Reported Psychopathy (SRP-II)

This self-report measure was designed as a way of estimating results from Hare's revised form of The Psychopathy Checklist, a structured interview form. The self-report form estimates scores on the two-factor structure of the PCL-R. The first factor estimates core personality traits, while Factor 2 estimates a chronically unstable and antisocial lifestyles (Harpur, Hakstian & Hare, 1988).

Factor analysis of this scale WAS ABORTED, simply because it was unclear that the analysis would add anything to this scale in terms of its meaningfulness. For instance, exploratory PCA indicated 18 factors when the eigenvalue > 1 rule is applied, and four if the scree data are analysed. Approximately 9 items were uncorrelated with another 18 - 21 of the other items.

The analysis was discontinued.

Table M-5

Internalised Shame Scale Item-Factor total scores correlated with Criminal behaviour
Scale total Scores

<u>Subject Group</u>	<u>Factor 1 (Functional)</u>	<u>Factor 2 (Content)</u>	<u>Shame Total Score</u>
<u>Univ. Males</u>			
r Crim. Beh.	.24*	.33**	.28*
Mean (SD)	42.44(4.5)	12.68(12.8)	57.49(17.26)
<u>Offenders</u>			
r Crim. Beh.	.18	.35**	.25*
Mean (SD)	42.38(13.4)	13.68(5.0)	58.59(18.43)
<u>Univ. Females</u>			
r Crim. Beh.	.10	.01	.07
Mean (SD)	44.26(13.4)	12.51(5.0)	58.70(18.06)

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. Comparisons between means revealed no significant differences between groups.

Appendix N

Intercorrelations between PCC Variables, Other Variables of Interest, and MMPI Scales

All raw scores (including those K-corrected), are converted to standardized T-scores (Tellegen & Ben-Porath, 1992). Subject's raw scores in this study were computer scored using a program which automatically calculated K-corrections, and converted raw scores to the standardized T-scores.

With the K-correction, raw scores are converted to T-scores, which have a mean score of 50, and a standard deviation of ($\pm$)10. Therefore, for any scale a T-score of 50 indicates that a subject's score is equal to the mean score for the standardization sample, which consists of 2,600 male and female subjects drawn from across the continental United States, adjusted for demographic variables (Graham, 1990, pp. 18-19).

Theoretically, T-scores equal to or greater than 70, because they fall on the 95th percentile, were thought of as being within the "clinical" range. However, there is sometimes variation in terms of percentile range across scales. For the MMPI-2, research has indicated that a T-score of 65 is the optimal score (falling on the 92nd percentile) demarcating the "clinical" range (Butcher & Williams, 1992, p.36).

Recall that the **MMPI-2** is constructed with three validity scales - L, F, and K. The "L-scale," also known as a "Lie" scale, deals with minor flaws and weaknesses

common to most people, yet to which those who are deliberately “trying to present themselves in a very favourable way,” are not (see Graham, 1990, p. 23). The “F-scale,” is an “index of test-taking attitude,” and is helpful in determining deviant response sets (Graham, 1990, p. 24). The “K-scale” is intended to identify respondents who are attempting to deny or exaggerate psychopathology, or as a measure of test defensiveness (Graham, 1990, p. 27).

Data was screened in terms of these validity indexes. One case from the university male group was dropped because of an unusually high F-Scale score ($F > 100$). Three cases were dropped from the offender group for the same reason (i.e., $F > 100$). No cases were screened from the university female data set. The final count for this portion of the analysis resulted in 31 University Males; 64 Offenders, and 45 University Females. Responses to each of the Standard validity and clinical scales by validity group (i.e. “Minimizers,” “Normals,” and “Exaggerators”) are depicted in **Chart N-1**. Responses to each of the supplementary scales by validity group are presented in **Chart N-2**. Group results for each of the standard validity and clinical scales reported by subject type (i.e. university males, offenders, and university females) are depicted in **Chart N-3**, and for the supplementary scales in **Chart N-4**. Between group differences comparing university men and offenders on each of the standard validity and clinical scales are reported in **Table N-2**, and for each of the supplementary scales in **Table N-2**.

Chart N-1

MMPI STANDARD VALIDITY AND CLINICAL SCALES

By Validity Type N=141

MMPI Standard Validity and Clinical Scales

Chart N-2

MMPI SUPPLEMENTARY SCALES

By Validity Type N=141

Chart N-3**Standard Validity and Clinical Scales****By Subject Type N = 141**

Chart N-4**MMPI SUPPLEMENTARY and CONTENT SCALES****By Subject type N=141** **MMPI Supplementary and Content Scales**

Table N-1

Differences Between University Males and Offenders on MMPI Supplementary and Clinical Scales

	F(1,93)	p <	η^2 *	Means	
				U. Males	Offenders
MACR	206.90	.001	.69	52.03	27.60
Do	9.32	.003	.09	45.10	39.40
Re	.98	.33	.01	43.09	40.81
Ang	1.27	.26	.03	54.94	51.52
Cyn	.17	.68	.002	53.13	54.16
Asp	1.06	.31	.01	55.97	58.78
Trt	.09	.76	.001	54.55	53.62
Anx	.20	.89	.03	55.39	55.77
Frs	3.08	.08	.001	49.35	53.5
Obs	.04	.84	.007	53.77	53.20
Dep	.72	.40	.001	55.93	58.31
Hea	.10	.75	.04	55.71	56.52
Biz	3.46	.07	.004	58.16	58.08
Lsc	.37	.55	.013	53.94	52.25
Sod	.03	.85	.003	48.68	49.05
Fam	1.21	.27	.01	55.97	52.91
Aps	.25	.62	.002	54.64	55.58
Aas	8.02	.006	.08	56.10	63.31

* η^2 (eta squared) = variance explained in the variable of interest by differences between groups.

Table N-2

Differences Between University Males and Offenders on MMPI Validity and Clinical Scales

	F(1,93)	p <	η^2 *	Means	
				U Males	Offenders
L	9.47	.003	.09	48.13	54.78
F	.60	.44	.006	58.06	55.65
K	.64	.43	.007	47.16	49.07
HS	.55	.46	.006	53.81	55.78
D	3.81	.05	.04	52.00	56.88
HY	.45	.51	.005	51.77	53.37
PD	2.23	.14	.02	84.77	63.22
MF	.65	.42	.007	48.35	46.65
PA	4.23	.04	.04	52.10	58.50
PT	.28	.60	.003	58.54	57.03
SC	1.20	.28	.013	59.16	55.87
MA	.47	.50	.005	58.71	56.97
SI	.63	.43	.007	49.61	51.30

* η^2 (eta squared): variance explained in the variable of interest by differences between groups

END

2011-96

FIN