



**International
Journal of
Social Sciences**

The Influnce of Psycho-Demographic Factors on Psychopathic Deviance Among Prison Inmates.

by

Ifeoma Ebele
Department of Psychology
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

Abstract

This study examined the influence of psycho-demographic factors on psychopathic deviants. Standardized psychopathic deviance scale, personality scale, social support scale and self-efficacy scale were administered to the respondents. A total number of four hypotheses were investigated. Results from the regression analysis suggested several significant predictions of psychopathic deviance. Predictor variables such as personality, social support and self-efficacy had a joint influence on psychopathic deviance. Social support independently influenced psychopathic deviants, so also personality, but self-efficacy did not. Personality characteristics such as openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. They also had a joint influence on psychopathic deviance. Results also showed that there was no difference between male and female psychopathic deviants. Age, marriage and gender did not have any influence on psychopathic deviants. It is recommended amongst others that the government while making policies concerning rehabilitated inmates should consider their personality characteristics, self-efficacy, and the social support available to them.

1. Introduction:

Psychopathy is a clinical construct characterized by a constellation of interpersonal (e.g. deceitfulness, superficial charm, grandiosity) affective (e.g. lack of empathy, remorse, or guilt), and behavioral (e.g. irresponsibility, impulsivity, parasitic lifestyle). Features (Cleckley, 1941; Hare; 2003; Hare & Neuman, 2008). These features appear to be genetically influenced, begin to manifest in childhood, and relatively stable overtime (Larsson et al 2016). Recent studies indicate that the latent structure of psychopathy is more accurately represented as a dimensional rather than categorical construct (Edens *et al*; 2016). These findings are consistent with the view that psychopathic personality traits exist on a continuum within the general population (Hare & Neuman, 2008). Psychopathy has been described as one of the most important psychological constructs within the criminal

justice system (Harris *et al*, 2017), perhaps the most important forensic concept of the early twenty first century (Monahan, 2016), and the unified theory of crime (Delisi, 2009). Psychopathy is a variant of anti-social personality that is characterized by affective dysregulation, interpersonal deceitfulness, irresponsible lifestyle, social deviance, impulsivity, and egocentric (Cleckly, 1982).

Psychopathy is a widely misunderstood construct. While people tend to attribute any violent, aberrant, or unusual behavior to that of a psychopath", only 1% of the general population and 15-25% of the prison population meets full criteria for psychopathy. Many people believe that they have encountered someone with psychopathy, when this is, in fact, quite a rare occurrence. However, the rarity of psychopathy does not do justice to the havoc it can create. A robust predictor of violence within the criminal and psychiatric population, psychopathy has been found among those committing more crimes, earlier in their lifetimes, with more violence, and with a more diffuse offending profile.

Psychopathy is the "single most important clinical construct in the criminal justice system, with particularly strong implications for the assessment of risks for recidivism and violence and for the selection of appropriate treatment and management programmes". Hemphill *et al.* (1998) found that offenders with psychopathy were four times as likely to commit another violent crime as their non-psychopathic peers. Moreover, Hare *et al.* (1988) noted that they reoffended at a rate of 65.2%, while their peers with lower rate of psychopathy recidivated at a rate of 23.5%. Male psychiatric patients with psychopathy were also more likely to commit acts of violence (Monahan *et al.*, 2001), engaging in post-release violence at a rate of 40%, with similar findings among female psychiatric patients. People with psychopathy live life on their own terms, often expressing themselves in an aggressive, delinquent, and manipulative manner.

Psychopathy is one of the earliest personality Disorder identified in the literature (Ogloff, 2006). Harvey Cleckley (1941) described psychopathic people as "having a lack of remorse, empathy, and insight, poor affective reactions, and superficial charms, with behaviours such as lying, interpersonal unresponsiveness, impersonal sex, and failure to follow any life plan". Cleckley, (1941). Psychopathic deviance has been associated with aggression, violence, a lack of regard for authority, impulsivity, and interpersonal difficulties, which are traits mostly found among adolescents and young adults (Durand & Lobbestael, 2023). Anderson & Kiechi, (2014) linked psychopathic deviant traits to neuropsychiatric disorder and antisocial personality traits, categories by a lack concern for others and a disregard for social norms and values. DeAngelis (2022) defined psychopathy defined psychopathy as a display of disconcerting tendencies, which are associated with interpersonal, affective, and behavioural maladaptive traits, including grandiosity, aggressive, violent behaviors, lack of remorse, impulsivity and lack of empathy which can manifest in different degrees. Owoh (2022) also added that a lack of conscience, manipulative behaviours, and social deviance are some of the behavioural characteristics of individuals with psychopathic deviate tendencies.

Social support is the physical and emotional comfort given to us by our family, friends, co-workers and others. It is knowing that we are part of a community of people who love and care for us, and value and think well of us. Social support is a way of

categorizing the rewards of communication in a particular circumstance. An important aspect of support is that a message or communicative experience does not constitute support unless the receiver views it as such. Receiving support gives meaning to individuals' lives by virtue of motivating them to give in return, to feel obligated and to be attached to their ties. Being embedded in a positive social world might be more powerful than receiving a particular act of help. The most common distinction made is the one between perceived available support and support actually received. The former may pertain to anticipating help in time of need and the latter to help provided within a given time period. In terms of its emotional value, social support can have a main effect on various outcomes, or it can interact with the experiences of stress. It has been postulated that social support might reveal its beneficial effect on health and emotions only in times of distress as it buffers the negative impact of stressful events. Social support is a critical component in the assessment of overall well-being. There is growing evidence to suggest that social support affects humans differently throughout life, suggesting that the need to receive and provide social support shifts across development.

Another psychological factor that will be investigated in this study is self-efficacy. This is the belief that one is capable of performing in a certain manner to attain certain goals or a person's belief about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. It is the belief that one has the capabilities to execute the courses of actions required to manage prospective situations. It is believed that our personalized idea of self-efficacy affects our social interactions in almost every way.

Self-efficacy influences the effort one puts forth to change risky behaviour and the persistence to continue striving despite barriers and setbacks that may undermine motivation. It influences the challenges that people tend to take on as well as how high they set their goals. Bandura showed that people of differing self-efficacy perceive the world in fundamentally different ways. People with a high self-efficacy are generally of the opinion that they are in control of their own lives; that their own actions and decisions shape their lives. On the other hand, people with low self-efficacy may see their lives as somewhat out of their hands. People will be more inclined to take on a task if they believe they can succeed. People generally avoid tasks where their self-efficacy is low but will engage in tasks where their self-efficacy is high. Research has also shown that the optimum level of self-efficacy is a little above ability; this encourages people to tackle challenging tasks and gain valuable experience.

Personality refers to an individual's enduring dispositional characteristics that remain unique. The "Big Five" factors of personality are five broad dimensions of personality which are used to describe human personality; the Big Five factors are Openness, Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. Openness is a general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination, curiosity and variety of experience. The trait distinguishes imaginative people from down to earth, conventional people. They tend to be, compared to close people, more creative and more aware of their feelings. Conscientiousness is a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement. The trait shows a preference for planned rather than

spontaneous behaviour; it influences the way in which we control, regulate and direct our impulses. Extroversion is characterized by positive emotions, surgency, and a tendency to seek out stimulation and the company of others. Extroverts enjoy being with people, and are often perceived as full of energy. Introverts on the other hand, lack the social exuberance and activity levels of extroverts. They tend to seem quiet, low-key, deliberate, and less involved in the social world. Agreeableness is a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others. The trait reflects individual differences in general concern for social harmony. Agreeable individuals value getting along with others, they are generally considerate, friendly, generous, helpful and willing to compromise their interests with others. Disagreeable individuals place self-interest above getting along with others. They are generally unconcerned with others' well-being, and are less likely to extend themselves for other people. Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, or depression. Those who score high in neuroticism are emotionally reactive and vulnerable to stress. At the other end of the scale, individuals who score low in neuroticism are less easily upset and less emotionally reactive. They tend to be calm, emotionally stable, and free from persistent negative feelings.

Marital status refers to the state of being married or unmarried, and it is associated with various health outcomes, including both physical and mental health. Marital status is the legally defined marital state. There are several types of marital status: single, married, widowed, divorced, separated, and so on. Gender refers to the constructed characteristics of women and men—such as norms, roles, and relationships of and between groups of women and men. It varies from society to society and can be changed. While most people are born either male or female, they are taught appropriate norms and behaviours including how they should interact with others of the same or opposite sex within households, communities, and workplaces. When individuals or groups do not “fit” established gender norms, they often face stigma, discriminatory practices, or social exclusion—all of which adversely affect health. Gender refers to the social attributes and opportunities associated with being female and male and to the relationships between women and men and girls and boys, as well as to the relations between women and those between men. These attributes, opportunities, and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialization processes. They are context- and time-specific and changeable. Gender determines what is expected, allowed, and valued in a woman or a man in a given context. Gender is a social, psychological, and cultural construct and it is developed in the process of socialization. Societies create norms and expectations related to gender and these are learned in the course of people's lives including in the family, at School, through the media. Age is simply the number of years a person has lived, measured from their birth date. It is the actual age of an individual, it is regarded as young and old.

Psychopaths are less than 1% of the general population, they have been assented to be responsible for most criminal and nefarious activities. Some individuals with psychopathic attributes are “hidden psychopaths” and can be found in colleges or in white-collar jobs, living seemingly “normal” lives. Individuals with high index score of

psychopathy are more likely to be involved in criminal activities, such as shopliftings (Lyons, 2019).

2. Statement of Problem

The prototypical psychopath has deficits or deviances in several areas: interpersonal relationships, emotion, and self-control. Psychopaths gain satisfaction through antisocial behaviour, and do not experience shame, guilt, or remorse for their actions. Psychopaths lack a sense of guilt or remorse for any harm they may have caused others, instead rationalizing the behaviour, blaming someone else, or denying it outright (Hare 2003).

On the manifestation of psychopathic findings, they have been ethnocentric, with research participants that have been mainly Caucasian. Cross-cultural studies have been conducted on African-American groups, but this group is considered to be relatively far removed from their African cultural origins, and is therefore not representative of a traditional non-Western culture. Taking cross-cultural differences into consideration is essential when we interpret research findings and compare groups. The aforementioned lack of cross-cultural data on psychopaths represents a serious problem that precludes our generalising present Eurocentric findings to other cultures. Various studies have reported results that support the notion that there are cultural differences in personality (Pettman & Erlendsson 2000; Marsella, Duban, Hosny, Hamada, and Morse, 2000 Triandis & Suh, 2002). Difficulties such as misdiagnoses as a result of cross-cultural psychopathy evaluation are well known (Gregory, 1976; Kanjee, 2000). For example, the commonly cited Psychopathy study of Cooke and Michie (1999) suggests that the differences between American and Scottish samples could be attributed to methods of assessment, specifically the intensity of diagnostic criteria and rates of actual diagnoses. Psychopaths in this research refer to those groups of people who have difficulty in reporting values and standards of society, engaging in social or anti-social behaviour such as lying, cheating, stealing, use of alcohol or other drugs, rebellious attitudes, authority figures. Research has shown that certain psycho demographic variables such as age, gender, socio-economic status, community dysfunction, family, criminality, and other factors have a strong influence on psychopathic deviance (McCord, 1973). Theoretically, the personality traits associated with psychopathy should have a direct bearing on the actual and perceived quality of any relationship that people with psychopathic traits have. Factors that influence one's perception of others might be important in determining how individuals with psychopathic traits rate the quality of their relationships. Relationship satisfaction is influenced by both the characteristics of the perceiver and the person being perceived, as well as by unique interaction between the two individuals (e.g., Branje, Van Aken, Van Lieshout, & Mathijs, 2003). In fact, perceptual biases may determine relationship satisfaction. For example, individuals who are more agreeable perceive better support in their relationships and are perceived as more supportive by others (Tesser, Campbell, & Graziano, 2000). Unlike agreeable individuals, individuals with psychopathic traits, who are lacking in empathy, are unlikely to consider the wishes of others in their actions. They may believe that friends are present simply to please them and may perceive others as being unsupportive when they do not submit (Luna, Margaret, & Neill, 2008).

Our personality, amount of social support available, our self-efficacy, age, gender, and marital status have a significant influence on behaviour and psychopathy yet less attention is paid to this area in our Nigerian correctional system. This epidemic, its rehabilitation and hindrances to rehabilitation is a problem to the world at large, a specific problem to Nigeria because of our sheer size, neglect of rehabilitation facilities especially those having a multi-disciplinary professional, though a lot of money is being spent on rehabilitation of Nigeria inmates, not knowing specific risk factors that affect prognosis and magnitude might still not give the desired result. The researcher is therefore interested in investigating the psycho-demographic factors that could influence psychopathic deviants. Therefore, this study will attempt to find answers to the following questions:

- 1 Can psychological variables such as personality characteristics, support and self-efficacy independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance?
- 2 Will gender, age, and marital status (demographic factors) predict psychopathic deviance among Agodi prison inmates?
- 3 Will there be any significant interaction effect of psycho-demographic factors on psychopathic deviance among the correctional inmates?

3. Theoretical background

Arousal Theory

The theory was originated by Lindsley and further researched by many other psychologists and sociologists. This theory states that for a variety of genetic and environmental reasons, some people's brain functions differently in response to environmental stimuli (Lee, 1996). According to Lee, each person tries to reach an optimum level advantageous from the environment and too little stimulation causes a person to be bored while too much stimulation causes anxiety. Anxiety would lead to sensation seeking at the pace that sensation seekers are more biologically and environmentally prone to engage in deviant activities and to take illicit drugs. According to research done by Miles (2001), sensation seeking is a great predictor of drug use and abuse because those who are sensation seekers also tend to be risk takers. According to this theory, obtaining thrills and a demonstration of competence are the main crime motivator, usually with little economic gain (Karz, 1988). Zuckerman defined sensation seeking as a term defined by the seeking of varied, novel complex, and intense sensations and experiences, and the willingness to take physical, social, legal and financial risks for the sake of such experiences, so those who are willing to participate in risky behaviour and more impulsive (1994).

Impulsivity is one of the most important aspects of the arousal-seeking behavioural theory, because criminologists believe that S impulsivity warrants the most research attention of all psychological factors implicated in juvenile delinquency and crime impulsivity by refers to the inability or unwillingness of a person to think of the consequences of their behaviour before making a decision to act (or having time to make their decision). It is simply a lack of premeditation. A person who is impulsive may lack the ability to correctly process cognitive information, for example, finish a job or a huge role in assessing different forms of psychopathy. Many researchers see impulsivity as a major component of psychopathic and antisocial personality disorders (Lynam & Miller,

2004). Some researchers argue that sensation seeking is caused by both genetic and environmental factors, the main cause for a given behaviour are low level of platelet monoamine oxidase (MAO) activity in the brain. Brain chemistry and brain structure play an important role. It is argued that everybody's brain is different and that some people's brains have more nerve cells and alterations than others (Katz, 1988). According to research done on a male criminal population in Sweden, many committed dangerous and violent crimes and were diagnosed as psychopaths had low levels of platelet MAO activity usually combined with personality traits such as impulsiveness, monotony avoidance and sensation seeking tend to highly correlate with criminal behaviour, and it can cause a rehabilitated person to relapse and reoffend after they are released from the correctional center while some researchers believe that sensation seeking and impulsive behaviour are more biological, others believe that these two personality traits are more linked to be congruent with learning and cognitive processes (Wood & Cochran, 1995). Wood and Cochran proposed that people who tend to engage in substance use and delinquent behaviour do so because of internal motivations and societal pressures. They also propose that delinquent behaviour is produced in the seeking of pleasure and immediate gratification usually with no regards for future consequences or punishments. They believed that such delinquent behaviour, such as vandalizing, drug use, joyriding and fighting stem from having a low self-control which is according to research does not really provide an economic or material gain for the offender, there are, however, many non-economic reinforcements that reward delinquent behaviour such as the thrill and excitement and respect from peers (who are probably also delinquent). Gender differences in sensation seeking are apparent. According to a study performed by Newcomb & McGee, male subjects were more likely than female subjects to exhibit all different types of delinquent and deficient behaviour that can be attested by the Arousal Theory. This theory explains why psychopathic delinquents engage in so many impulsive and risk-taking behaviour without thinking of the consequences and punishment of such behaviour and also some of them are creative and adventurous like every other theory, the Arousal Theory of crime has its strengths and its weaknesses, some of the strengths of this theory are the fact that it can help predict delinquency in subjects who score high on sensation seeking and impulsiveness and the fact that it can also help explain drug use and abuse. It has also been criticized that this theory has no direct and specific testing of the Arousal theory, and that the relationship between crime and thrills is basically unknown, the theory cannot explain why some people choose delinquents and delinquent forms of sensation seeking and some choose more culturally accepted and approved forms of stimulation (Wood and Cochran, 1995) finally this theory has not really explored thrill seeking behaviour and impulsiveness related deviance into adulthood and old age and more research on needs to be done with older participants (Newcomb & McGee, 1991).

Hypotheses:

- 1 Self-efficacy, social support and personality characteristics (psychological factors) will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance among Agodi correctional inmates.

- 2 Personality characteristics (openness to experience, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness) and demographic factors will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance among the inmates.
- 3 Age, gender, and marital status (demographical factors) will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance.
- 4 There will be gender differences in psychopathic deviance

4. Review of Literature

Psychopathy is a personality disorder that can be present in male and female prison inmates and in the community at large. It is defined as an outcome of interactions between biological and behavioral predispositions and social and environmental influences and is regarded as a predictive factor in antisocial and criminal behaviour. While it is true that psychopathy is not limited solely to criminal offenders most studies on the issue have been carried out with prison populations, and research has focused almost exclusively on male convicts, given the larger number of male inmates. The inclusion of female inmates in this type of research is a comparatively recent phenomenon. However, women obtain lower scores in the PCL-R than men in correctional center populations. Current estimate indicate that psychopaths make up approximately 20% of the prison population, and are more likely to be men than women.

Women tend to present different psychopathic traits from those found in men. Behaviours characterized by jealousy, self-harm, manipulation and verbal aggression. The expression of such behaviours and the development of psychopathy is therefore different from men. However, a small sub-category of woman has been found who share the same tendencies as men. As regards criminal conduct, female psychopaths are more likely to be convicted for theft or offences related to the obstruction of justice, and are less likely to receive prison sentences. But female inmates with characteristics such as insensitivity and antisocial psychopathic traits have been found to be more likely to engage in violent behaviour in prison. About 1.2% of U.S adult men and 0.3% to 0.7% of U.S adult women are considered to have clinically significant levels of psychopathic traits. Those numbers rise exponentially in prison. Where 15% to 25% of inmates show the characteristics (Burton, & Seveh, 2020). That said, psychopathy spans socioeconomic status, race. Gender, and culture, and those who score high on psychopathy scales ranges from high – functioning executives to prison inmates to people who psychopathic symptoms may reflect difficult life circumstances more than anything else.

Lack of social support has been associated with increased risk for morbidity, mortality and psychological distress (Hawkley, Masi, Berry, & Cacioppo, 2006). However, perceptions of low parental support predicted childhood aggression, particularly for boys (Garbarino, 1999; Patterson, Kupersmidt, & Griesler, 1990).

One reason why a lack of parental support facilitates aggression may be that it is assumed to be social rejection. Previous research has indicated that interpersonal rejection affected not only aggressive behavior but also mediators of aggression, such as anger and the derogation of other people (Leary, Twenge, & Quinlivan, 2006). Because support from family or close friends is generally anticipated and socially normative (Inaba, 1998), the

lack of such support could be taken as social rejection for the lateral receiver of the support. An interaction between a lack of social supporter and psychopathy might be expected to facilitate aggressive behavior. However, a link has not been clarified between a lack of social support, psychopathy, and aggressive behavior in a non-clinical population.

Hare, Hart & Harpur in performing a theoretical, empirical and clinical analysis of the notion of psychopathy noticed that one out of the ten most diagnostic traits of such a personality is inadequate and grandiose self-esteem. Thus, the authors not only noticed the importance of self-esteem but also emphasized its influence on the functioning of psychopaths. It is underlined that psychopathic people have a great need to maintain their level of activity and experienced emotions. Thus, it can be concluded that in the affective aspect self-esteem reflects the level of experiencing emotion and managing them, and therefore can be related to style of stress (emotional) management. The affective (emotional) aspect may be twofold: positive (we react with positive emotions to what we do, say and are) and negative (we react with negative emotions to ourselves). Studies on correlates of self-esteem shows that high (meaning more positive) self-esteem is accompanied by other variable including undertaking various activities and their related efficacy and undertaking more effective (more adaptive) ways of handling stress. In the aspect of person's activity, higher self-esteem will be related to a high general feeling of one's own efficacy, and in consequence control over one's own actions thus beliefs concerning efficacy influence the evaluation of one's own resources in a stressful situation.

According to (Malterer, Glass, and Newman, (2008) psychopathy is associated with lower trait emotional self- efficacy. Individuals high on traits emotional self-efficacy are good at managing their stress levels and demonstrate enhanced psychosocial functioning, such as better social relationships (e.g. Schutte et al, 2000). The ability to repeatedly cause serious harm to others is an indicator of a profound disturbance in an appropriate "empathic" response to the suffering of another (Blair 2005). Empathy is known to inhibit and moderate aggression. Research has also shown that clinical psychopathic individuals show a selective empathic deficit in that they are impaired in the recognition of sad and fearful facial expression (e.g. Montagne et al, 2005). Traits emotional self-efficacy was associated with attributing positive effect to the neutral images and negatively associated with secondary psychopathy. Individuals high on trait emotional self-efficacy have a more positive outlook in general (Austin, Saklofske, & Egan, 2005) and experience greater psychological well-being (Maiorelli, Petrides, Rieffe, & Bakker, 2007). Secondary psychopathy negatively affects trait emotional self-efficacy when considering that secondary psychopathy is characterized by features such as aggression and impulsivity. (Farah, Amarim, Premuzic, 2009).

According to Blair, Mitchell and Blair (2005) the inherent pathology associated with psychopathy interferes with proper socialization. Farrington (2002) showed that harsh parental style of discipline can affect the affective and antisocial components of the psychopathy. This happens as children's behavior depends on rewards and punishment provided by the parents. These children become antisocial to parents, provide a model of antisocial behavior and respond in an inconsistent manner to the child's need. Parent's conflict and family disruption predicted the antisocial but not the affective component of

psychopathy (Farrington, 2002). Several explanations have been advanced for the link between family disruption and psychopathy. The first explanation states that this happens as the loss of a parent can have damaging effects on the attachment between the lost parent and the child (Trauma theory).

Life course theories states that multiple stressors like parental conflict and loss reduced economics circumstances, changes, in parental figures and maladaptive child rearing methods have an adverse effect on the growing child. Selection theories focus on the issue that disrupted families produce such children because of pre-existing differences on various risk factors (Farrington, 2006). Farrington et al, (2001) have also shown that antisocial behavior runs in families as there might be exposure to risk factors for the different generations more so for disrupted families living in deprived neighborhoods, there is also a tendency for antisocial activities females to choose antisocial parents and family members may influence each other for antisocial activities.

Social support entails the thought, feeling and reality that one is loved and cared for by a supportive network of numerous friends, family members and peers offering assistance and guidance as needed (Rafaeli, Cranford, Green, Shrout & Bolger, 2008, Reblin & Uchino, 2008). Two main forms of social support are expressive support which necessitates the provision of tangible items to support an individual (Carres & Jones, 2016). The goal of social support is to endorse a sense of belongingness and connectedness to society and one's personal social groups as a means to buffer and negative effects that might occur in the face of adversity (Brewin, McCarthy, & Furnham, 1989; Reblin & Uchino, 2008).

Psychopathy is characterized by a specific constellation of interpersonal, affective and behavioural features which begin early in life and extend throughout adulthood. Interpersonally, psychopaths are described as arrogant, dominant and deceptive, while affectively, they appeared glib, unempathic and without remorse. Their behaviour is marked by a lack of planning, impulsivity and often antisocial or criminal activities (Cooke, Michie & Hart, 2006). Interestingly, evidence is quickly accumulating to suggest that the features which underlie psychopathy are dimensional in nature, and that all individuals of all somewhere on the continuum of these traits (Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996) Patrick, Ewdens, Poythress, Lilienfeld & Benning, 2006, Blonigen, Carlson Krueger & Patrick, 2003, Maessel Chalck, Vertommen & Hooghe, 2002, Edens, Marcus, Lilienfeld & Poythress, 2006). Research investigating the nature of these features indicated that they can be broken down into two factors (Harpur, Hakstians, & Hare, 1988; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996; Benning, Patrick, Hicks, Blonigen & Krueger, 2003, Patrick et al, 2006). The first factor (Fearless Dominance) relates to the interpersonal and affective features described above, while the second factor (self-centered) impulsivity and impulsive behaviours which dominate psychopath's lives. Importantly, this factor structure has been demonstrated in both incarcerated samples using the psychopathy checklist revised (PCL- R, Hare 1991a) and in community samples using the psychopathic personality inventory (PPI; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996; Benning et al, 2003; Patrick, Edens, Poythress, Lilienfeld & Benning, 2006).

5. Method

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey design with the independent variables being psychological factors which are personality characteristics (neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness), social support which exists as high and low, and self-efficacy which also has two levels that is high and low. Demographical factors which include age, gender and marital status. These variables were examined on the dependent variable which is psychopathic deviance. The participants for this study were drawn from Nigeria correctional center Ibadan. The choice of this center was based on the peculiarity of the center. The participants for this study were selected from the total population of seven hundred and twenty (723) inmates, five hundred (500) prison inmates participated in the survey study. Four hundred and sixty-eight (468) were male (93.6%) and their mean is 39.6 and thirty-two (32) are female (6.5%) and the mean is 39.96. The participants fall under two age group, 18-45 was regarded as young while 46-65 was regarded as old. Thirty-two (32) of the participants were old (6.4%) and their mean was 39.2 and four hundred and sixty-eight (468) were young (93.6%) and mean was 40.1. Two hundred and twenty-one (221) of the inmates who participated in the study were married (44.2%) and mean was 37.4, two hundred and fifteen (215) were single (43.2%) and mean was 40.6 and sixty-four (64) of the participants were separated (12.6%) and mean was 42.0. the participants were both convicted and awaiting trial inmates.

6. Ethical Permission

A letter of introduction from psychology department of the University of Ibadan was taken to the controller in the administrative office of the Nigeria person service Ibadan branch. The letter was forwarded to the deputy controller office in Agodi where the work was approved and the researcher was referred to the officer in charge of research.

Procedure

Administration of the instruments was done with the assistance of a research assistant who was instructed on the administration of the instrument. Consent letter was given to participants where they indicated their interest to participate in the study. The questionnaire was being administered to the inmates after they have given their consent to participate in the study. The researcher took time to explain the instructions on how to fill the questionnaire.

Inclusion/Criteria

1. Participants must be between 18 and 65 years old.
2. Participants must be within the correctional facility.
3. Participants must be English or Yoruba language literate.
4. Participants must have signed the consent form after reading through and further explanation provided to indicate his or her interest to participate.

7. Statistical Tools

A structured questionnaire made of five sections and 63 items was used for this study with all section written in English and Yoruba languages.

Section A: this section has five items. This consists of the demographic attributes of the respondents such as age, sex, marital status and religion. Age, this is the actual age reported by the subjects; sex was scored as male = 1, and female = 2 marital status was scored as married = 1, single = 2, and separated = 3 and Religion was scored as Christianity = 1, Islamic = 2 and others = 3.

Section B: psychopathy deviance was measured with the clinical inventory psychopath contents scales (PCS) by Murrie & Cornell (2000). The response format is on a five-point Likert type from disagrees strongly = 1, disagree a little = 2, neither agree nor disagree = 3, agree a little = 4 and agree strongly = 5. The scale has 13 items and it has two levels of score, high and low ranging from 23 to 57, the author reported alpha coefficient of .87 and internal consistency of .86.

Section C: personality characteristics (neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness, was measured with big five personality scale (NEO-FF items version) by Costa and McCrae, (1992). The scale **has 10 items** rated on seven-point **Likert** response format ranging from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree and moderately, 3=disagree a little, 4=neither agree nor disagree, 5=agree a little, 6= agree moderately and 7= agree strongly.

Section D: social support was measured with a multidimensional scale of perceived social and emotional supports by (Zimet, Dahlem, & Farley, 1988) from, family members, friends and significant others. The scale has 14 items with an internal consistency coefficient alpha of 0.91. The reliability alpha is 0.87 while the **spearman** – Brown split – half coefficient alpha is 0.85 as reported by the authors. The response option ranged from 1= very strongly disagree, 2= strongly disagree, 3= mildly disagree, 4= neutral, 5= mildly agree, 6= strongly agree, 7= very strongly agree, the scales have two levels of score, high and low. The norm for the score 35 as reported by the author.

Section E: self-efficiency in this study was measured with general self-efficiency scale developed by Mathias & Schwarzer, (1979). The scales have 21 items rating in four likert response format ranging from 1= not all true, 2= hardly true, 3= moderately true, 4= exactly true. The scale has two levels of scores, high and low ranging from 21 to 84. The norm is 42.

Sampling Procedure for the study.

Purposive sampling was adopted for this study. This is because all prison inmates who meet the inclusion criteria stated earlier participated in this study. Also, all participated in the study were in one setting. Five hundred (500) prison inmates participated in this study from a total number of seven hundred and twenty-three (723) prison inmates as at the time of this study.

8. Results

Table 1: Summary of descriptive statistics of the influence (mean) of self-efficiency, social support, personality characteristics, age, gender, marital status on psychopathic deviance as obtained in this study.

S/N	Variable	N	%	X	Ranking
	Self-efficiency			37.6	13 th
1.	High Self-efficiency	437	87.4%	37.3	15 th
2.	Low self-efficiency	63	12.6%		
	Total	500			
	Personality characteristics				
	Openness to experience				
1.	High openness	332	66.4%	38.4	10 th
2.	Low openness	168	33.6%	35.7	18 th
	Total	500			
	Conscientiousness				
1.	High conscientiousness	161	32.2%	38.5	9 th
2.	Low conscientiousness	339	67.8%	35.6	19 th
	Total	500			
	Extraversion				
1.	High extraversion	282	56.4%	37.99	12 th
2.	Low extraversion	218	43.6%	36.1	17 th
	Total	500			
	Agreeableness				
1.	High agreeableness	346	69.2%	38.99	8 th
2.	Low agreeableness	154	30.8%	35.1	20 th
	Total	500			
	Neuroticism				
1.	High neuroticism	313	69.2%	40.0	4 th
2.	Low neuroticism	187	37.4%	34.1	21 st
	Total	500			
	Age				
1.	Old	32	6.4%	39.2	7 th
2.	Young	468	93.6%	40.1	3 rd
	Total	500			
	Gender				
1.	Male	468	93.6%	39.6	6 th
2.	Female	32	6.46%	39.35	5 th
	Total	500			
	Marital status				
1.	Married	221	44.2%	37.4	14 th
2.	Single	215	43.2%	40.6	2 nd
3.	Separated	64	12.6%	42.0	1 st
	Total	500			

Table 4.1 reveals the influence of psycho-demographic factors on psychopathic deviance in the study. It can be observed that there was no significant difference in the mean value of inmates with high self-efficacy (n,437, x=37.628) and those with low self-efficacy (n=63, x= 37.301) on psychopathic deviance. Those with high social support had a higher mean score (n, 460, x = 38.429) than those with low social support. This means that inmates with high social supports are lower on psychopathic deviance compared to those with low

social support. Inmates who are high on openness to experience have a higher mean score (n, 332, $x=38.443$) than those who are low on openness to experience (n, 168, $x = 35.686$). This means that inmates who are high on openness to experience are lower on psychopathic deviance compare to those who are low on openness to experience.

Also, high conscientiousness has a higher mean score (n, 161, $x=38.505$) than low conscientiousness (n, 339, $x=35.624$). What this means is that inmates who are high on conscientiousness are lower on psychopathic deviance than those with low conscientiousness.

Those with high extraversion score are higher on the mean score (n, 282, $x=37.995$) than those low in extraversion (n, 218, $x=36.134$) this implied that those with high extraversion are lower on psychopathic deviance than those with low extraversion. High agreeable inmates score higher on the mean (n, 346, $x=38.989$) than the low agreeable inmates, (154, $x = 35.140$). What this mean is that agreeable inmates are lower on psychopathic deviance than the lower agreeable inmates. Correctional inmates who are high on neuroticism score higher (n, 313, $x= 40,010$), Than those who are low on neuroticism (n, 187, $x = 34.119$). This means that those who are high on neuroticism are higher on psychopathic deviance. Younger inmates had a higher mean score (n, 468, $x=40.085$) than the older inmates (n, 32, $x=39.206$). This means that younger inmates are higher on psychopathic deviance than the older inmates. There is no significant difference between the mean score of males (n, 468, $x=39.584$) and that of female (n, 32, $x=39.957$) on psychopathic deviance. Separated inmates have a higher mean score (n, 64, $x=42.028$), followed by the single (n, 215, $x= 40.579$) and married mean score is (n, 221, $x= 37.379$). This means that separated inmates are higher on psychopathic deviance, followed by the single inmates.

Hypotheses One

It states that self-efficacy, social support and personality characteristics (psychological variation) will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance. The result of the analysis is presented below:

Table 2: Showing the regression of psychological variables on psychopathic deviance

Predictor Variables	R	R2	F	BETA	T	P
Self-efficacy				-.078	-1.28	.199
Social support				.254	4.14	.000
Personality characteristics	.296	.082	15.9	.166	3.74	.000

The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The hypothesis which states that self-efficacy, social support and personality characteristics (psychological variables) will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance was confirmed, $R = .296$; $F(3, 499) = 15.9$; $P < .5$. The variables also jointly accounted for 82% (Ad ; $R^2 = .082$) variance on psychopathic deviance among the inmates. Moreover, it was revealed that social support independently predicted psychopathic deviance ($\beta = .254$, $t = 4.14$, $P = .000$) and personality characteristics ($\beta = .166$; $t = 3.714$; $P = .000$); while self-efficacy did not predict psychopathic deviance ($\beta = -.078$; $T = -1.28$; $P = .199$).

Hypothesis Two

It states that personality characteristics (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism) will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance.

Table 3: showing the regression of psychopathic deviance on personality characteristics.

Predictors Variables	R	R ²	F	β	T	P
Openness to experience				.283	10.6	.000
Conscientiousness				.271	8.83	.000
Extraversion				.271	8.01	.000
Agreeableness				.272	7.69	.000
Neuroticism	.811	.654	189.7	.393	13.6	.000

The means difference is significant at the .05 level.

The hypothesis which states that personality characteristics will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance was supported $R = .811$; $f(3,499) = 189.7$, $P < .05$. The variables jointly accounted for 65% (ad, $R^2 = .654$) variance on psychopathic deviance among the inmates. Also, it was revealed that personality characteristics independently influence psychopathic deviance. Openness to experience ($\beta = .283$; $t = 10.6$; $P = .000$); Conscientiousness ($\beta = .271$; $t = 8.83$; $P = .000$); extraversion ($\beta = .271$, $t = 8.01$; $P = .000$); Agreeableness ($\beta = .272$, $t = 7.69$; $p = .000$); and Neuroticism ($\beta = .393$; $t = 13.6$, $P = .000$);

Hypothesis three

It states that male psychopaths will score significantly higher than female subjects on the psychopathic deviance scales.

Table 4: Showing the difference between male and female inmates on psychopathic deviances.

Variables	Sex	N	Mean	SD	DF	T	P
Psychopathic deviance	Male	468	38.6	6.2	498	.331	.740
	Female	32	38.2	6.7			

Hypothesis Three which states that male prison inmates will score significantly higher than female subject on the psychopathic deviance scale was not supported, $t(498) = .331$, $P > .05$. The means score of males is ($x = 38.6$), while that of the female is ($x = 38.2$), this means that male and female inmates were the same on psychopathic deviance scale. The result indicates that there was no significant difference between male and female psychopathic behavior.

Hypothesis four

Hypothesis four states that gender, age and marital status (demographic variables) will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance.

Table 5: Showing the regression of demographic variables on psychopathic deviance.

Predictor Variables	R	R ²	F	β	T	P
Age	.103	.011	.391	-.006	-.123	.902
Gender				-.014	-.312	.755
Marital Status				.047	-1.017	.309

The means difference is not significant at the .05 level.

The hypothesis which states that age, gender and marital status (demographic variables) will independently and jointly influence psychopathic deviance was not supported $R = .103$; $F(3,996) = .391$; $P > .05$, the variables jointly accounted for 11% (Ad ; $R^2 = .011$) variance on psychopathic deviance among inmates.

9. Discussion

This study investigated the influence of psycho demographic factor on psychopathic deviance among correctional inmates. The independent variables in this study were self-efficacy, social support, personality characteristics, gender, age and marital status.

Findings in the result of the computed outcomes as shown in table two revealed that there was a significant contribution of personality, social support and self-efficacy on psychopathic deviance among the inmates. Two out of the three variables contributed significantly (personality and social support) while self-efficacy did not. It is observed that personality is the highest predictor than others. This means that personality has implication on psychopathic deviance. This finding is consistent with the finding of (Otter and Egan, 2007) which states that those who are high on self -deception enhancement had low neuroticism and score high on secondary psychopathy. Self-efficacy was not statistically significantly associated with psychopathic deviance. This means that self-efficacy, whether high or low has no significant implication for psychopathic deviance. These findings support earlier works of (Christy et al, 2009), that familiar relationship can help former inmates successfully reintegrate into the community. It also affirms the assertion of (Jensen – Campbell and Graziana 2001) that individuals who are more agreeable perceive better support in their relationships and are perceived as more supportive by others.

Result from hypothesis two indicates that (agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness) is independently and jointly associated with psychopathic deviance. The result showed a significant joint contribution of the personality characteristics to psychopathic deviance. Among all neuroticism was the highly potential predictor of psychopathic deviance. This means that being nervous, emotionally unstable, moody, tense, and irritable frequently is significantly associated with psychopathic deviance. All the personality characteristics independently contributed to psychopathic deviance. The result of the present study is consistent with the work of (Ross, Benning, Patrick, Thompson and Thurston, 2009). They asserted that self-centered impulsively was significantly positively associated with neuroticism and negatively associated with conscientiousness and agreeableness. (Otter and Egan 2007) asserted that Neuroticism has been linked to an impaired ability to self-deception.

A statistically significant difference was not observed between male and female on psychopathic deviance in this study. This means that male and female inmates are the same

on psychopathic deviance. The result of this study is in consistent with the study of Rutherford, Caccida, Alterman and McKay (1996), Silverthorne, Frick & Reynolds, (2001). They reported similar personality and behavior correlates (i.e. aggressive and criminal behavior) in males and females with psychopath. Melody (1991) has a different view; he asserted that psychopaths make up about 15-25% of the male incarcerated population but only 6-16% of the incarcerated female population.

Findings of the study in table five did not show any significant joint influence of age, gender and marital status on psychopathic deviance. This means that there is no significant difference between male and female, old and young, married, single and separated among prison inmates on psychopathic deviance. This result differs from the assertion of (Widiger 1998) that there is a sharp reduction in the criminal activity of psychopathic individuals, as they grow older. In Seagrave & Grisso (2002) works, they stated that psychopathy is approximately five to seven times more prevalent in men than in women. In Lilienfeld & Hess, (2001) work male score higher than females in psychopathy. Guys and Eden (2003), (2006), asserted that certain stereotypes are made about typical criminal behavior, and this had led to biases towards gender, and the designation of psychopathy. Chirsty et al (2009) affirms that when individuals are close to the peak ages of criminal behavior (in this case, younger than 26, marriage has no discernable effect).

Implication for practice

The construct of psychopathy focuses on a constellation such as affective (e.g. lack of guilt and empathy), interpersonal (e.g. using others for one's own gain), self-referential (e.g. considers oneself more important than others) and behavioural (e.g. lack of planning and forethought) traits that are present in a subgroup of antisocial individuals (Hares, Hart, & Harpur, 1991). These traits may lead to serious societal problems if not well controlled.

The main goal of this study was to ascertain the psychological and demographic variables influencing psychopathic deviants among the correctional inmates.

Support and self-efficacy. Two out of the three variables (personality and social support contributed more significantly to psychopathic deviance while self-efficacy did not. Social support stands as a major predictor than other variables.

The study also reveals that personality characteristics (Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness) jointly contributed to psychopathic deviance and neuroticism characteristics stand out as highly potential contributor to psychopathic deviance. Gender difference was computed between male and female inmates. The result of the analysis reported that there was no significant difference between male and female psychopathic deviants. The study also finds that marital status, age and gender did not influence psychopathic deviants differently.

The results in this study have implication for the government whose duty is to make policies concerning the rehabilitation of correctional inmates. Also, personality, social support and self-efficacy jointly influenced psychopathic deviants, therefore, the Nigerian correctional center inmates' staff and health professional should pay necessary attention to these variables in dealing with psychopathic deviants. Conclusively, the result from this

study will be useful in designing interventional programs aims at improving the behavior of psychopathic deviant.

10. Limitations & Suggestions for further studies

The subjects used in this study were inmates randomly selected from Nigerian correctional center, Agodi Ibadan. The researcher did not include inmates from other states. Probably, if inmates from other states were included, the study might have yielded varied result. Also, the facts that majority of the inmates who responded to the questionnaire were male would have also affected the results.

Another problem encountered by the researcher was that due to security purpose, the researcher was not allowed to come in contact with the five hundred participants in this survey study in order to give instruction directly on how to fill the questionnaire in case they have any questions. The instruction was passed through the “correctional center land Lord” and the officer-in-charge of the research work.

11. Recommendations

First, it is recommended that the government while making policies concerning rehabilitated inmates should consider their personality characteristics, self-efficacy, and the social support available to them.

Second, it is recommended that in every correctional institution, there must be available service of a qualified psychologist who will ensure that every inmate must go through psychotherapeutic sessions before they are sent back into the society.

And third, in the management of psychopathic inmates, there should not be a gender difference because the findings of this research shows that there is no difference between male and female psychopath.

References

- Anderson, N. E, Kiehl., K. (2014). Psychopathy and aggression; when paralimbic dysfunction leads to violence. PMID 24306955 PMCID, PMC 4331058 DOI. 10. 1007/7854-2013-25700
- Austin, E. J., Saklfske, D.H., & Egan, V. (2005). Personality, well-being and health correlates of trait emotional intelligence, personality and individual differences 38, 547-558.
- Bandra, A., (1997). *Self-efficacy, the exercise of control*. New York: work publisher.
- Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Hicks, B. M., Blonigen, D. M. & Krueger, R. F. (2003). Factor structure of the psychopathic personality inventory. Validity and implications for clinical assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, 15 340-350:
- Blair, R. J. (2005). Responding to the emotions of others, dissociating forms of empathy through the study of typical and psychiatric population’s consciousness and cognition, 14, 698-718.
- Blonigen, D. M., Carlson, S. R., Krueger, R. F., & Patrick, C. J. (2003). A twin study of self-reported psychopathic personality traits. *Personality and individual difference*, 35,179-197
- Branje, S.J.T., Van Aken, MAG, Van Lieshout, C.F.M., & Mathijssen, JJJ.P. (2003). *Personality Judgments in adolescents’ families*.

- Brewing; C.R. Andrews, B., Gotlib, I. H. (1989). Psychopathology and early experience: A reappraisal of retrospective reports. DOI: 10. 1037 0033-2909. 113.182.
- Burton, B. D, Saleh, F. M. (2020). Psychopathy! Insights for General practice psychiatry times 37(10).
- Carre; J., Jones; D.N. (2016). Decision making morality, and Machiavellianism: The Role of Dispositional Fruits in Gist Extraction Review of General Psychology. 21(1)
- Christy A.V. Carly, Rik, Auron, C., John K. R. (2009). The impact of marital and relationship status on social outcomes for returning prisoners <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/09/marriage&reentry/rb.shtml/>.
- Cleakey, H. (1941). The mask of sanity. An attempt to reinterpret the so-called psychopathic personality. Oxford, M.O. Mosby
- Cleckey; H. (1982). The mask of sanity an attempt to reinterpret the so- called psychopathic personality.Oxford, M.O: Mosby.
- Coke, D.J., & Machie, C. (1999). Psychopathy across cultures: *North America and Scotland Compared Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 108(1), 58 – 68*
- Cooke, D. J., M, C. C., & Hart, S.D. (2006) Facets of Clinical Psychopathy. In C.J. Patrick (Ed.) Handbook of psychopathy (PP91-106), New York NY. The Guildford press.
- DeAngelis, T. (2022). A broader view of psychopathy. American psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2022/03/cecorner-psychopathy>
- Delisi, M.(2009). Psychopathy is the unified theory of crime [https/doi.org/10.1177/1541204009333834](https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204009333834) volume7, issue 3.
- Durand; G., Lobbestael. J. (2023). The relationship between psychopathic personality, well-being, and adaptive traits in under graduates. Personality and individual Difference, 204 (2): 112050.
- Edens, J. R. (2006). Unresolved controversies concerning psychopathy. Implications for clinical and forensic decision making. Professional Psychology. Research and Practice 37(1), 59-65
- Edens, J.F., Marcus, D.K. Lilienfeld, SO, & Poythress, N. G. (2006). Psychopathic, taxometric evidence for the dimensional structure of psychopathy. Journal of abnormal Psychology, 15, 131-144
- Farah;. A, Ines, S. A; Tomas; C. P. (2009): Empathy deficits and trait emotional intelligence in Psychopathy and Machiavellianism. Personality and individual differences 47(7), 758-762.
- Farrington, D. P. (2002) They results from the first 40 years of the Cambridge study in Delinquent Development. In T.P: Thornberry & M. D. Krohn (Eds), Taking stock of delinquency (pp. 137-183), New York: Kluwer/plenum press.
- Farrington, D. P. (2006). Family back ground and psychopathy. In C.J. Patrick (Ed) Handbook of Psychopathy (PP. 229-250. New York. The Guilford press.
- Farrington, D. P., Jolliffe, D., Loeber, R., Stouthamer - Lobber, M., & Kalb, L.M. (2001). The concentration of offenders in families and family Criminality in the prediction of boy's delinquency. Journals of Adolescent, 24, 579-506. Interpersonal 3(1)-June 2009-11
- Garbarino, J. (199). Lost boys; Why our sons turn violent and how we can save them. San francisco, Jossey- Bass.
- Gregory, R.J. (1996). *Psychological testing: History, Principles and applications*. Needham Heights, Allyn & Bacon.
- Guy; L.S, ELens, J (2006). Gender differences in attitudes toward psychopathic sexual offenders Behavioral Sciences & the law. 24(1). 65-85. 201 10. 1002/ bs1. 668.
- Hare, R.D, Neuman, C.S. Psychopathy as a clinical and empirical construct Annual Review s of Clinical Psychology 2008, 4. 217-246

- Hare, R.D. (1998). The Hare PCL-R: some issues concerning its use and misuse. *Legal and criminological Psychology*, 3, 101 - 122
- Hare, R.D. (2003) in M.W., Kelin, H., Teresa, S.C., Barry, C. Y., John, and L.P., Delroy, (Eds.) *Deviant sexual thoughts and Behaviours: The role of personality and pornography use*. Poster presented at the 16th Annual Conference of the American Psychology society, Chicago, May 2004.
- Hare, R.D. (2003). In M.W., Kelin, H. M. Teresa, S.C., Barry, C.Y., John, and L.P., Delroy, (Eds) *Deviant sexual thoughts and Behaviours. The roles of personality and pornography use*. Poster presented at the 16th Annual conference of the American psychological society Chicago, May 2004.
- Hare, R.D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist - Revised (PCLR)* 2nd edition, Toronto, Ontario, Multi- Health Systems
- Hare, R.D., Hart, S.D., & Harpur, J.J. (1991). Psychopathy and the DSM-IV Criteria for antisocial personality disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100. 391-398
- 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.
- Hart S. D., COX, D.N & Hare, R.D. (1995) *Manual for the psychopathy checklist: screening version (Pcl-sv)* Toronto: Multi-Health System.
- Hawkey, L. C., Masi, C. M, Berry, J. D., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2006). Loneliness is a unique predictor of age - related differences systolic blood pressure *Psychology and aging*, 21, 152-164. doi: 10. 1037/0- 882-7974. 21.1.152
- Hemphill, J. F., Hare, R.D., & Wong, S. (1998). Psychopathy and recidivism: A review. *Legal and criminological Psychology*, 3, 139-170
- Inaba, A. (1998). The theoretical model of social support In Y Matsui, & M ura (Eds), *Psychological science of human support* (pp. 151-176). Tokyo, Seishinshobo.
- Jensen - Campbell, L.A., & Graziano, W.G (2001) Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of personality* 69, 323-362.
- Jensen-Campbell, L.A., & Graziano, W.G. (2001) Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of personality*. 69, 323-362.
- Katz, J. (1988). *Seduction of crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions of Doing Evil*. New York: Basic Books. Retrieved on 20th July, 2010 from <http://criminology.wikia.com>
- Lee, E. (1996). *Arousal theory and the Religiosity – criminality Relationship*. *Contemporary Criminology Theory*, 65, - 84
- Lilienfed; H., Hess, T.H. (2001). Psychopathic personality traits and Somatization: Sex Differences and the mediating role of Negative emotionality. *Journal of psychopathology and Behavioural Assessment*. DOI, 10- 1023/A: 1011035306061. Corpus ID:\145328128.
- Lilienfeld, S. O. & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in non-criminal populations. *Journal of personality Assessment* 66, 488-5241.
- Luna C.N., Margaret, K. & Nejra, B. (2008). *Criminal justice and behaviour* <http://cjb.sagepub.com/cg/content/abstract/35/2/212/>.
- Lynam, D.R., Miler, J.D. (2004). Personality pathways to impulsive behavior and their relations to deviance. Results from three samples, *journal of Quantitative criminology*, 20(4) 319-341.
- Lyons, M. (2019). The dark triad of personality Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy In everyday life. Elsevier Academic press.
- Malterer, M. B, Glass, S.J., & Newman I.P. (2008). Psychopathy and trait emotional intelligence, personality and individual differences, 44,738- 848'

- Marsella, A.J., Dubanoski, J., Hamada, W.C., & Morse, H. (2000). The measurement of personality across cultures: historical, conceptual and methodological issues and considerations. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 44, 41 – 62.
- Mathias, & Schwarzer, (1979). In O. S Adegboite, (Ed). Psychological and Demographic factors predicting general health status among retirees in Ibadan and Lagos, University of Ibadan. A thesis submitted to the department of psychology University of Ibadan.
- Matterer, M. B, Glass, S. J. Newman, J. P. (2008) personality and individual differences, 44(3):735-745.
- McCord, (1973). *In the nature of psychopath.* An indept look of psychopathy.
- McCrae; R. R. Oliver. P. J. (1992), An Introduction to the five-factor. Model and its applications, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>
- Meloy, J.R. (1988), Psychopathic mind. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson
- Miles, D.R. Van Den Bree, M.B., Gupman, A.E., Newlin, D.B. Glantz, M.D., Pickens, R.W. (2001). A twin study on sensation seeking, risk taking behaviour and marijuana use. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, 32(1)57-68
- Monaghan, C. (2016) personality and individual Differences 94.72 -81 Dol: 101016/1. 2016.01.002.
- Murrie, D. C', Cornell, D.G. (2000) The Million adolescent clinical inventory and Psychopathy. *Journal of personality Assessment* 75,110-128.
- Newcomb, M.D., Mc Gee, L. (1991). Influence od sensation seeking on Deviance and specific problem Behaviours from Adolescent to young Adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(4), 614 – 628. Retrieved from "<http://criminology.wikia.com> on 20th July, 2010.
- O'Leary, M.M, Loney, B. R; Eckel; L.A. (2006). Gener differences in the association between psychopathic personality traits and cortisol response to induce stress. *Psych neuroendocrinology*. 32(2): 183-191, Joi, 10. 1016/J: Psyneuen. (DOI) (PubMed) (Google Scholar),
- Ogloff; J. R. (2006). Psychopathy/Anti-social personality Disorder. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. 40(6-7): 519-2.8, DOI. 10.1111/5. 1440-1614.2006. 01834.X
- Otter, Z. & Egan, V. (2007). The evolutionary role of self- deceptive enhancements: A protective factor again it antisocial cognition. *Personality and individual Differences*, 43, 2258 - 2269.
- Owoh I. G. (2022). Psychopathic characterization among Nigerian police personnel and influence on their work motivation. *Journal of psychology and Behaviourial disciplines*, 3, 2(3).
- Patrick, C. J., Edens, J. F. Poythress N. G, Lilientele, S. O. & Benning S.D. (2006). Construct validity of the psychopathic personality inventory for factor model with offenders. *Psychological Assessment*, 18-204-208.
- Patterson, C. M. (1991), Emotional and interpersonal sensitivity in psychopaths. Unpublished dissertation, university of Wisconsin -Madison
- Pethman, T.M.I., & Erlansson, S.I. (2000). Aberrant self-promotion or subclinical psychopathy in a Swedish General population. *This psychological Record*, 52, 33-50
- Reblin, M., Uchino; B. N. (2008). Social and Emotional support and its implication for Health, current opinion in *Psychiatry* 21(2) 201-5 -DOI: 10 1097/YCO.obo1363e82f3ad89
- Ross, S.R., Benning S.D., Patrick CJ; Thompson A. & Thurston, A. (200%). factors of the psychopathic personality inventory, criterion-related validity and relationship to the bis/bas and five-factor models of personality.

- Rutherford, M.J., Cacciola, J. S., Alterman, A.I., & McKay, J.R. (1996). Reliability and validity of the Revised Psychopathy checklist in women methadone patients. *Assessment* 3, 45-156
- Seagraves D., Grisso, O. (2002). Adolescent development and the measurement of Juvenile Psychopathy. *Law and human Behaviour*. 26: 219-239. (PubMed).
- Silverthorn, P., Frick, P.J., Reynolds, R. (2001). Timing of onset and Correlates of severe conduct problems in adjudicated girls and boys. *Journal of psychopathology and Behavioural Assessment*, 23(3), 171 - 181
- Triandis, H.C., Suh, E.M. (2003), *Cultural Influences on Personal*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 133 – 160.
- Wiliger, T.A. (1998). Sex bias in the diagnosis of personality disorders *Journal of personality Disorders*, 12.
- Wood, P.B., Cochran, J.K. Pfefferbaum, B. Arneklev, B. B.J. (1995). Sensation seeking and Delinquent substance abuse: An Extension of learning theory. *Journal of Drug issues*, 25(1), 173-193
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N.W., Ziwet, S.G. & Farley, G.K. (1988), The Multi-dimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of personality Assessment*, 52, 30-41.