

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SELF-CONTROL AND PSYCHOPATHY

by

Mykle L. Ayala, B.S.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science
with a Major in Criminal Justice
May 2019

Committee Members:

Shayne E. Jones, Chair

Wesley G. Jennings

Josh D. Miller

COPYRIGHT

by

Mykle L. Ayala

2019

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work, I, Mykle L. Ayala, refuse permission to copy in excess of the "Fair Use" exemption without my written permission.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to those who have pushed and supported me throughout the process. Albreesha Culberson, Adaeze Edwards, and Sheana Mata, I would not be in the position I am today without your continued encouragement during your time in the master's program. Even when all three of you graduated, neither of you ever stopped checking in on me and for that I am truly grateful. It may not seem like much, but I hope all three of you know that it is because of your guidance that I was able to succeed in graduate school.

To my parents and sister, thank you for being understanding and patient with me. Through all of the late nights writing and reading, your love never wavered, and gave me the strength to push forward with everything I did. No matter how difficult my work reached, all of you were there to either alleviate the stress or remind me of all the obstacles I overcame in the past. Needless to say, the unconditional support you all provided me reassured my resolve and assisted with getting me to the finish line. I am not sure what lies beyond this point, but I feel comfortable knowing all of you will be there right by my side every step of the way.

Lastly, abuela Eva Carrasco and abuela Guadalupe Ayala who are watching me from above, this is for you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It goes without saying that my accomplishments and successes at Texas State can be attributed have been a result of the teachings and direction provided by my professors. I would like to thank Dr. Scott Bowman for providing me information regarding the graduate program, his efforts to acclimate master's students, and for being an exemplary master's coordinator. Dr. Bob Vasquez, thank you for guiding me as an undergraduate and informing me about the life/work as a graduate student. To Dr. Lucia Summers, thank you for always being welcoming and for being an additional pillar of support. Also, thank you to Dr. Richard Morley, Dr. Mark Stafford, and Dr. Sean Roche for being amazing assignments during my time as a graduate and research assistant.

Finally, I would like to thank my thesis committee for their contributions towards this work. Thank you, Dr. Wesley Jennings and Dr. Josh Miller, for taking the time to be a part of this and for giving me the opportunity to learn from you. Lastly, but certainly not least, thank you Dr. Shayne Jones. I know it was difficult to put up with my quips and quibbles concerning the quality of my work, but you were always honest and upfront with me to erase any notion of doubt. Having you as my mentor through this process has been nothing short of fun and enlightening. There are not enough words I can type on this page to express my gratitude for accepting me as your student, but I hope you know you have been instrumental in my improvement as an academic and person.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Self-Control	3
Psychopathy	6
Self-Control and Psychopathy	11
III. METHODOLOGY	15
Sample	15
Measures	15
Offending	15
Self-Control	16
Psychopathy	17
IV. RESULTS	19
V. DISCUSSION	24
Limitations	26
REFERENCES	28

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Cleckley's (1941) Behavioral Characteristics of Psychopathy.....	7
2. Items in the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised	8
3. Correlation Matrix of Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) and Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV).....	19
4. Correlation Matrix of Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) and Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)	20
5. Correlation Matrix of Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI), Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV), Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI), and Offending (Months 12-84).....	22

ABSTRACT

Self-control and psychopathy, despite being dominant conceptualizations from their respective fields, have seldom been compared with one another to assess their similar and unique attributes as well as measured in their ability to predict future offending. Therefore, the focus of this thesis is to observe how various scales of self-control and psychopathy relate with one another at both the total and facet level. The data used for analysis was pulled from the 2000-2003 Pathways to Desistance study, with the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990), Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003), and Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Stattin, & Levander, 2002) scales used for comparison. Results indicate substantial overlap between the two constructs, including between various facets that comprise each scale. This is particularly true in terms of impulsivity and aggression. However, the affective deficits captured in the psychopathy measures are somewhat distinct from the self-control measure. All measures moderately predicted offending, with self-control demonstrating a slight advantage.

I. INTRODUCTION

In an attempt to identify important individual-level correlates of antisocial behavior, the fields of criminology and psychology have focused on two, somewhat distinct constructs. In criminology, the role of self-control has received extensive attention and is robustly related to antisocial behavior (de Ridder, Lensvelt-Mulders, Finkenauer, Stok, & Baumeister, 2011; Pratt & Cullen, 2000). In psychology, psychopathy has been studied for decades and is also consistently associated with antisocial behavior (Leistico, Salekin, DeCoster, & Rogers, 2008).

Despite their importance in both fields, little is known about how they are alike and how they are unique. An exception to this is the work of Wiebe, as well as DeLisi and colleagues. Wiebe (2003) tested whether self-control and psychopathy could be unified into a single construct due to their similarities, whereas DeLisi, Tostlebe, Burgason, Heirigs, and Vaughn, (2018) did a direct comparison in order to identify which was more associated with various forms of delinquency. To our knowledge, these are the only empirical examinations of these two constructs being assessed simultaneously. Not only does this require replication, but many questions remain. For instance, how do the elements (or facets) of each construct relate to one another? Are the similarities and differences consistent across different measurements (e.g., self-report versus clinician-rated psychopathy)?

Addressing these questions is the focus on the current study. Specifically, we use well-validated measures of self-control (Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990) and psychopathy (both self-reported and clinician-rated; Andershed, Kerr, Stattin, & Levander, 2002; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003). We explore the convergence between these different

measures in an effort to see how they are similar to one another, and whether either construct demonstrates something unique. We also replicate the work of DeLisi et al. (2018) by examining how self-control and psychopathy are uniquely related to offending among an adolescent offender sample, and whether one offers advantages over the other in terms of its relationship to offending. By exploring these questions, we can help bridge criminological and psychological literatures – a feat that has only rarely been carried out despite the importance of these constructs for both fields.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Self-Control

One of the most recognizable and widely used explanations for crime stems from the work of Michael Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi's *A General Theory of Crime* (1990), also known as self-control theory. In their work, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) assert the most important element in explaining criminality is self-control, referring to the ability to renounce immediate pleasures that possess some negative consequences and instead act in favor of longer-term benefits. Furthermore, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) posit that crime and delinquency are rooted by the immediate gratification or desire for pleasurable outcomes, and therefore tend to be committed by individuals who demonstrate low self-control. Some negative consequences by seeking the individual's wants and desires can include physical harm, disapproval from family or friends, or legal ramifications.

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) define low self-control through six unique elements. They are impulsivity or failure to delay gratification, a preference for physical rather than mental activities, adventurousness or risk-seeking, self-centeredness or insensitivity towards others, a preference for simple tasks, and minimal tolerance for frustration. Although Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argue that self-control has a strong influence over crime and delinquency, self-control itself is influenced by a multitude of factors before it is established. Specifically, it is assumed that human nature exemplifies the idea of the pursuit of needs and desires and, if left unchecked, can lead to conflicts with others and the possibility of harmful consequences to the individual. Hence, self-control must be regulated in the early stages of life so that children can be taught to

recognize the long-term repercussions of their actions. Self-control is developed through the socialization of the child in which the parent must first take an active role in monitoring the behavior of the child. Then, when the parent observes behavior and recognizes it as inappropriate, they must take the necessary steps to sanction the behavior. As a result, early and active socialization in a child's life allows for the development of self-control and acts as a stable trait over the course of their lifetime.

While rooted on the premise of controlling impulses through regulation of behavior at a young age, there remains strong evidence of self-control as a predictor of crime. A meta-analysis of empirical studies shows an inverse relationship for self-control and crime that is consistent across multiple outcomes, such as self-reported offending and delinquency, as well as across various methods (Pratt & Cullen, 2000). Additionally, individuals who exhibit low levels of self-control engage in other conduct typically related with crime such as substance abuse, poor physical health, or problems with social life (e.g., analogous behaviors; Moffitt, Arseneault, Belsky, Dickson, Hancox, Harrington, et al., 2011). However, there is a debate as to whether it is better to employ attitudinal or behavioral measures for self-control (Piquero, 2008). Walters (2016) meta-analysis revealed comparable correlations between behavioral and attitudinal measures of self-control, but found neither correlated higher than the other with crime and delinquency. Overall, research has provided support for self-control as a strong predictor of crime across a multitude of samples (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004; Schulz, 2006; Engel, 2012; Vazsonyi, Mikuska, & Kelley, 2017), with no clear differences between the attitudinal or behavioral measures used (Tittle, Ward, & Grasmick, 2003).

One of the main issues and criticisms of the general theory of crime is how the authors failed to operationalize or define self-control (Akers, 1991). This has led to the development of various behavioral and attitudinal scales (Piquero, 2008), such as the Grasmick scale (Grasmick, Tittle, Bursik, Arneklev, 1993). Other measures, not specifically designed as a response to The General Theory, also assess self-control well (e.g., the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory, Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990; see also Jones, 2017). However, the creation of so many scales has led to discussion on which scale captures self-control best. The reason for this is due to these scales having subscales that assess different attributes, such as impulsivity and conscientiousness. On the other hand, some research contends that the selection of a specific scale to measure self-control is not important (Pratt & Cullen, 2000). This stems from the notion that self-control scales correlate enough to the point where they are measuring the same construct, similar to the findings by Walters (2016) in his analysis of behavioral and attitudinal measures. A meta-analysis on the convergent validity among measures of self-control showed moderate overlap, concluding it to be a multidimensional construct rather than a unidimensional one (Duckworth & Kern, 2011). This suggests self-control is best measured using multiple scales that combine for an overall measure, rather than using a single scale. So, while there were some notable differences in measures, Duckworth and Kern (2011) conclude that choice in scale does not matter substantively.

Notwithstanding some self-control scales being moderately convergent and similar, this does not imply that they are interchangeable with one another. As Jones (2017) found, some self-control scales shared similar attributes, but differed when considering dimensionality and use of subscales. The Grasmick scale (Grasmick et al.,

1993), Weinberger Adjustment Inventory-Restraint (Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990), and the Tangney Scale (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004) demonstrated high correlations with one another, but showed differences in their relationship with personality traits and subscales. In sum, the above-mentioned scales were strongly correlated and well-validated. In the current study, we will use the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990) for the purposes of measuring self-control and its eventual comparison with psychopathy. Justification for using the WAI is due to its use in previous research and differential relation to offending and aggression (Farrell & Sullivan, 2000; Jones, 2017; Steinberg, Blatt-Eisengart, & Cauffman, 2006).

Psychopathy

While there is much discussion on the various traits that are indicative of psychopathy, research has conceptualized psychopathy as a personality disorder that is characterized by interpersonal, affective, and behavioral deficits (Cooke & Michie, 2001). In his influential work, *The Mask of Sanity*, Cleckley (1941) observed psychopaths as individuals who are capable of disguising their disposition towards self-centered behavior and lack of genuine emotion by mimicking the outward functions of a normal individual. Cleckley's observations, including his identification of the 16 behavioral characteristics of psychopathy (see Table 1), served as the modern inspiration for the conceptualization of psychopathy. However, much like Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) construction of self-control, Cleckley (1941) did not provide a means of measuring the construct of psychopathy. Hence, researchers over time assisted with formulating and developing valid ways of assessing psychopathy.

Table 1

Cleckley's (1941) Behavioral Characteristics of Psychopathy

1. Superficial charm and good intelligence
 2. Absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking
 3. Absence of nervousness or psychoneurotic manifestations
 4. Unreliability
 5. Untruthfulness and insincerity
 6. Lack of remorse and shame
 7. Inadequately motivated antisocial behavior
 8. Poor judgment and failure to learn by experience
 9. Pathologic egocentricity and incapacity for love
 10. General poverty in major affective reactions
 11. Specific loss of insight
 12. Unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations
 13. Fantastic and uninviting behavior with drink and sometimes without
 14. Suicide threats rarely carried out
 15. Sex life impersonal, trivial, and poorly integrated
 16. Failure to follow any life plan
-

One of the most widely used and reputable instruments for measuring psychopathy in adult criminal offenders is the Psychopathy Checklist (Hare, 1980), which was later updated to the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 1991). The PCL-R assesses behavioral and personality traits by using 20 items (see Table 2), each scored on a 3-point scale. Scoring this instrument consists of a semi-structured interview and detailed file-record documentation of the subject. The final score can be any number from 0 to 40, with those who score higher demonstrating traits closely resembling the archetypal psychopath. Originally, the PCL-R specified two related factors. Factor 1 captures personality traits associated with interpersonal and affective deficits of psychopathy such as callousness, lack of remorse, and manipulativeness. Factor 2 consists of impulsivity and irresponsibility, as well as behavioral items that capture an antisocial/delinquent lifestyle. This two-factor structure would go on to serve as an integral piece into the research of psychopathy.

Table 2

Items in the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised

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

Cooke and Michie (2001), however, suggested that the two-factor structure of the PCL-R did not suffice as an adequate model for psychopathy, nor was it sustainable. They instead propose a three-factor hierarchical model that places an emphasis on the personality domain rather than a behavioral-centric one. Furthermore, they argued that the three core components of psychopathy were arrogant and deceitful interpersonal style, deficient affective experience, and impulsive and irresponsible behavioral style, choosing to exempt an antisocial factor. Conversely, Neumann, Vitacco, Hare, & Wupperman (2005) posit that an antisocial factor is critical for the construct of psychopathy, and present a four-factor model based on the PCL-R. Although this remains a lively debate, a full discussion of these models is beyond the scope of this current study.

Due to the reliability and validity of PCL-R scores, it has seen increases in use especially in part to its effectiveness in predicting dangerousness and recidivism of violent and criminal offenders (Salekin, Rogers, & Sewell, 1996; Walters, 2003; cf., Murrie, Boccaccini, Guarnera, & Rufino, 2013). Implementation of the PCL-R, however, did not stop the development of other validated methods of measuring psychopathy.

Alternate measures of psychopathy also sought to compensate for the limitations of the PCL-R, such as its lengthy process, requirement of trained administrators, and restricted use for criminal populations. Thus, the development of self-report measures to assess noncriminal subjects, such as Hare's Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (HSRP; Hare, 1985), the Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (LSRP; Levenson, Kiehl, & Fitzpatrick, 1995), the Antisocial Personality Questionnaire (APQ; Blackburn & Fawcett, 1999) and the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996), ensued. The core traits of psychopathy, such as manipulation and lying, led to questions regarding the accuracy of self-report measures (Ray, Hall, Rivera-Hudson, Poythress, Lilienfeld, & Morano, 2013). However, others have shown that self-reports of psychopathy are valid (Jones & Miller, 2012; Kelley, Edens, Donnellan, Mowle, & Sörman, 2018; Reidy, Shelley-Tremblay, & Lilienfeld, 2011). The availability of these various measures has allowed for the examination of psychopathy among community and noninstitutionalized samples.

Regardless of whether using clinical or self-report measures, or how the construct is operationalized, previous literature has shown psychopathy to be associated with various aspects of crime, including delinquency and sexual offending (Thomson, 2018). Psychopathic traits have been linked to higher rates of recidivism, violent and nonviolent offending, substance abuse problems, and volume of crimes compared to their nonpsychopathic counterparts (Hare, McPherson, & Forth, 1988; Porter, Birt, & Boer, 2001). Similarly, Edens, Campbell, and Weir (2007) conducted a meta-analysis and found a significant association between psychopathy and both general and violent recidivism. Simourd and Andrews (1994) meta-analysis found psychopathy to be one of

the risk factors, among antisocial peers and attitudes, and other personality traits, in predicting both male and female delinquency. Meta-analytic evidence also reveals moderate associations between psychopathy and juvenile delinquency, as well as general and violent recidivism (Asscher, Van Vugt, Stams., Deković, Eichelsheim, & Yousfi, 2011), leading to the risk of adolescents becoming future violent offenders (Forsman, Lichtenstein, Andershed, & Larsson, 2010). Ultimately, without intervention, individuals with psychopathic traits during adolescence become at risk for offending throughout adulthood (Vaughn & DeLisi, 2008).

As referenced earlier, operationalism of psychopathy has led to the development of various measures, each accounting for different traits of what defines psychopathy. Ultimately, the choice of psychopathy measure is dependent on researcher preference and the target group of evaluation. For the purposes of our comparison with self-control, we will be using the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Stattin, & Levander, 2002), and the clinician-rated Psychopathy Checklist-Youth Version (PCL: YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003). The YPI is a valid measure and captures undisputed dimensions of the construct – grandiose-manipulative, callous-unemotional, and impulsive-irresponsible (Andershed, Hodgins, & Tengström, 2007). Usage of the PCL: YV stems from its popular usage in the literature as a variation of the gold-standard PCL: R and reliability in measurement (Jones, Cauffman, Miller, & Mulvey, 2006; Kosson, Cyterski, Steuerwald, Neumann, & Walker-Matthews, 2002). Moreover, both the YPI and PCL: YV demonstrated modest overlap and correlations between them, although results are mixed when concerning predictive ability (Cauffman, Kimonis, Dmitrieva, & Monahan, 2009; Dolan & Rennie, 2006; Skeem & Cauffman, 2003).

Self-Control and Psychopathy

As illustrated in the prior sections, self-control and psychopathy have demonstrated their impact on criminology and psychology. While their development has largely been independent of one another, both have etched themselves into dominant constructs that explain the likelihood of committing crimes. Within their own respective fields, self-control and psychopathy occupy a role of importance that still presides to this day. And yet, relatively few studies have seized the opportunity to observe these constructs in ways that they converge and differ. Both have shown the ability to explain crime and delinquency, but rarely have they been compared with one another or tested to understand the reason for their overlap.

The capacity of both construct to account for criminal propensity is understandable considering the similarity between the elements that comprise them. As discussed earlier, the six elements of self-control are impulsivity or failure to delay gratification, a preference for physical rather than mental activities, adventurousness or risk-seeking, self-centeredness or insensitivity towards others, a preference for simple tasks, and minimal tolerance for frustration. The 20 elements of psychopathy, outlined in the PCL-R, are glibness/superficial charm, grandiose sense of self-worth, need for stimulation/proneness to boredom, pathological lying, conning/manipulative, lack of remorse or guilt, shallow affect, callous/lack of empathy, parasitic lifestyle, poor behavioral controls, promiscuous sexual behavior, early behavioral problems, lack of realistic long-term goals, impulsivity, irresponsibility, failure to accept responsibility for own actions, many short-term marital relationships, juvenile delinquency, revocation of conditional release, and criminal versatility. Some apparent correlations between the

elements of the two constructs lie within both possessing impulsivity. Self-centeredness or insensitivity towards others can be linked with grandiose sense of self-worth, lack of remorse or guilt, callous/lack of empathy and failure to accept responsibility for own actions. Adventurousness or risk-seeking can be associated with need for stimulation/proneness to boredom. A preference for simple tasks can be linked with lack of realistic long-term goals. Lastly, minimal tolerance with frustration can be associated with poor behavioral controls.

While self-control and psychopathy overlap in many aspects, this does not insinuate that they are perfectly interchangeable with one another. For one, self-control is composed of a single factor that regulates the natural state of unsocialized individuals (Hirschi, 2004). On the other hand, psychopathy encompasses three to four different factors: interpersonal, affective, and behavioral/impulsivity-irresponsibility, and is categorized as a personality disorder (Harpur, Hart, & Hare, 1994). Additionally, psychopathy possesses a more diverse set of traits, such as grandiosity, shallow affect, manipulativeness, etc., allowing for psychopathy to be more explicit about its components. While self-control may possess fewer traits in comparison to psychopathy, as well as possess only one unique element from psychopathy in a preference for nonverbal activities, their composition is still quite similar. However, they are not necessarily equivalent, and therefore might each tap into some important aspect of criminal propensity.

Studies of self-control and psychopathy together echo the same sentiments. Wiebe (2003) notes how both self-control and psychopathy are not characterized necessarily by crime, but rather both tap into traits that increase the propensity to commit crime.

Similarly, both concepts attention towards behavioral characteristics emphasize the lack of concern of the well-being of others. In consideration of their overlap, the possibility of psychopathy and self-control integrating into a single construct arose. Wiebe (2003) tested this idea by attempting to reconcile self-control and psychopathy, with the notion of increasing the predictability of crime and delinquency in the process. Four possibilities were presented: self-control and psychopathy constitute as a single construct; they constitute as two constructs that parallel primary and secondary psychopathy proposed by Levenson, Kiehl, and Fitzpatrick (1995); they constitute antisociality; or they constitute self-direction, which comprises of both self-control and psychopathy elements. Results of the study indicated models that proposed a single construct of psychopathy or self-control fit the data poorly, with the best models suggesting antisociality be a separate construct from self-direction. Though, models that integrated self-control and psychopathy did better explain variations in offending when compared to the models that only included self-control.

While Wiebe examined self-control and psychopathy as a possible unified construct, DeLisi, Tostlebe, Burgason, Heirigs, and Vaughn (2018) sought to determine whether psychopathy or self-control had a stronger association with serious delinquency and youth violence. A modified version of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory short-form variant (PPI-SF; Lilienfeld & Hess, 2001), a self-report measure containing 56 items, was used for assessing psychopathy. For self-control, a 15 item Low Self-Control Scale (DeLisi & Vaughn, 2008) was employed. While the results of their study showed both self-control and psychopathy possessed significant associations with several forms of delinquency, low self-control demonstrated more associations with delinquency,

including violent offending, property offending, self-reported delinquency, and victimization. Psychopathy did show significant associations with self-reported delinquency and property offending, although had sporadic associations with victimization and no significant associations with violent offending. This stands in stark contrast to meta-analytic data that has found associations with violent offending and psychopathy (Hare, McPherson, & Forth, 1988; Porter, Birt, & Boer, 2001). Ultimately, youth with the lowest self-control were at a greater risk for delinquency in comparison to youth who exhibited the most psychopathic personality. Additionally, youth who had the lowest self-control and were the most psychopathic were at the greatest risk of being a serious offender.

The purpose of this study is to further assess the similarities and differences between self-control and psychopathy. The ensuing results will assist with determining which construct possesses advantages over the other when determining the relationship with offending. While prior studies have done well to compare these two constructs, there still remain questions regarding the relationship of their facets and ability to predict offending; questions this study seeks to unfold.

III. METHODOLOGY

Sample

Data from the 2000-2003 Pathways to Desistance study, obtained from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data website, were used for this study. The original Pathways to Desistance study aimed to identify how serious adolescent offenders abstain from antisocial activity and crime. The data are comprised of 1,354 juvenile participants, 1,170 males and 184 females, between the ages of 14-17 years old who were recruited if they were adjudicated for a serious offense in juvenile and adult courts in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Phoenix, Arizona. Criteria for the offense included all felony offenses excluding misdemeanor weapons offenses, less serious property crimes, and misdemeanor sexual assault. All female juveniles and youth whose cases were considered for trial in the adult court system were eligible for participation in the study (Schubert, Mulvey, Steinberg, Cauffman, Losoya, Hecker, Chassin, & Knight, 2004).

Measures

Offending. The Self-Reported Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weiher, 1991) scale was used to measure the subject's participation in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO is comprised of 24 items, from a range of 0-23, which draw out various types of crimes the subject has partaken in. For the purpose of calculating a more robust measure of self-reported offending, and that takes advantage of the longitudinal nature of the Pathways data, a variety scale across multiple waves was created. More specifically, if a participant indicated that s/he had engaged in a given offense at any point in the future, they were given a "1" for that offense. For example, if a participant engaged in burglary at waves 2 and 6, and theft at waves 3, 4, and 5, that individual

would have a score of two. If another participant engaged in burglary and theft at wave 2, theft at wave 4, drug possession at waves 6 and 7, and assault at waves 5 and 6, that individual would score a four. The variety scale used in this analysis captures offending from wave 3 (12 months after the baseline interview) through wave 10 (84 months after the baseline interview). Thus, the variety scale assesses future offending in all analyses.

Self-control. The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) assesses an individual's adjustment of their social-emotional processes within the context of external factors (Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990). The four subscales include impulse control, suppression of aggression, consideration of others, and responsibility. The latter subscale, which included acts of delinquency, was not used in this analysis to avoid predictor-criterion overlap with the dependent variable (i.e., offending). Participants are asked to rank on a scale, 1 being “false” and 5 being “true”, how much their behavior matches a sequence of statements. Examples include, “I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it” or “People who get me angry better watch out.” These scales capture Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) elements of impulsivity, temper, and insensitivity, with higher scores indicating higher self-control. Internal consistency of each of the subscales (impulse control $\alpha=.76$, suppression of aggression $\alpha=.78$, consideration of others $\alpha=.73$) were good, but only 22 of the 23 factors were used in the dataset. The lone factor, “I can do things as well as other people can,” did not fit the scale with the other items (Schubert et al., 2004). Because the psychopathy scores were calculated at different waves for the PCL: YV and YPI, two self-control scales were used. One was measured at the same time as the PCL: YV (baseline) and the other at 6 months (when the YPI was measured).

Psychopathy. The Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses personality traits and behaviors that are typically indicative of psychopathy in youth, such as pathological lying and manipulation for personal gain, callousness, and impulsivity. It uses a 20-item rating scale that is rated on a three-point scale (0=does not apply, 1=somewhat applies, 2=applies) based on the extent of the trait being exhibited by the youth. The total score can range from 0 to 40, where scores closer to the latter indicate more psychopathic features. Inter-rater reliabilities of the individual scales, such as shallow effect ($\alpha=.35$) and impression management ($\alpha=.35$), prove to not be reliable and not recommended. However, factor and total scores showed better reliability scores (Factor 1-Interpersonal/Affective $\alpha=.76$; Factor 2-Socially Deviant Lifestyle $\alpha=.78$; Total Score $\alpha=.87$). Additionally, correlating items increased model fit (Jones et al., 2006).

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI) assesses psychopathy among youth through self-report measures. The YPI is comprised of ten subscales, each with five items: dishonest charm, grandiosity, lying, manipulation, remorselessness, unemotionality, callousness, thrill seeking, impulsiveness, and irresponsibility (Andershed, Kerr, Stattin & Levander, 2002). Moreover, the YPI includes three dimensions of psychopathy which are the Grandiose Manipulative Dimension (20 items), Callous Unemotional Dimension (15 items), and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension (15 items). These scales are based on a 4-point Likert scale with responses that range from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well." An example question would be: "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you." Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate a higher degree of whichever facet is being

measured. However, all scales are measured such that higher scores are consistent with higher psychopathic traits. Internal consistency of the ten subscales ranged from marginal to good (Callousness $\alpha=.45$; Unemotionality $\alpha=.60$; Irresponsibility $\alpha=.62$; Grandiosity $\alpha=.64$; Impulsivity $\alpha=.65$; Thrill Seeking $\alpha=.66$; Remorselessness $\alpha=.71$; Lying $\alpha=.79$; Dishonest Charm $\alpha=.81$; Manipulation $\alpha=.84$). The three dimensions demonstrated higher internal consistency (Callous-Unemotional $\alpha=.74$; Impulsive-Irresponsible $\alpha=.82$; Grandiose-Manipulative $\alpha=.91$). Overall, the total YPI internal consistency score was $\alpha=.93$.

IV. RESULTS

Correlational analyses were used to observe the relationship between scales of self-control and psychopathy, with the first comparison between the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) and Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV), and the second comparison between the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) and Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI). Total scores and their elements or facets were compared across scales to assess how closely they measure towards the same construct, if at all. Finally, the scales (and elements/facets) were compared based on their relationship with future offending.

Table 3

Correlation Matrix of Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) and Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV)

	Self-Control (Baseline)	WAI: Impulse Control	WAI: Suppression of Aggression	WAI: Consideration of Others
Total PCL: YV Score	-.413	-.315	-.373	-.266
Factor 1 PCL: YV Score	-.309	-.222	-.278	-.186
Factor 2 PCL: YV Score	-.409	-.330	-.366	-.209

Note $n = 1,298$. All correlations were significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

As demonstrated in Table 3, the Total PCL: YV score was moderately related to Self-Control, as well as moderately related to Suppression of Aggression and Impulse Control. However, the Total PCL: YV score only modestly correlated to Consideration of Others. We observe the same pattern of modest correlations for both Factor 1 and Factor 2 PCL: YV scores with Consideration of Others. Factor 1 scores for the PCL: YV

Table 4

Correlation Matrix of Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) and Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

	Self-Control (Six Months)	WAI: Impulse Control	WAI: Suppression of Aggression	WAI: Consideration of Others
YPI: Dishonest Charm	-.415	-.362	-.388	-.153
YPI: Grandiosity	-.221	-.166	-.270	-.042
YPI: Lying	-.361	-.384	-.294	-.108
YPI: Manipulation	-.450	-.370	-.415	-.197
YPI: Remorselessness	-.471	-.380	-.440	-.209
YPI: Unemotionality	-.322	-.241	-.328	-.132
YPI: Callousness	-.332	-.116	-.231	-.395
YPI: Thrill Seeking	-.502	-.481	-.439	-.173
YPI: Impulsiveness	-.518	-.541	-.397	-.192
YPI: Irresponsibility	-.410	-.361	-.351	-.184
YPI: Grandiose- Manipulative Dimension	-.443	-.391	-.416	-.156
YPI: Callous-Unemotional Dimension	-.505	-.338	-.452	-.318
YPI: Impulsive- Irresponsible Dimension	-.577	-.558	-.479	-.222
YPI: Total Score	-.577	-.496	-.514	-.251

Note $n = 1,079$. All correlations were significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

moderately correlated only with Self-Control, with Impulse Control and Suppression of Aggression modestly correlating modestly with Factor 1. Factor 2 scores for the PCL: YV displayed somewhat stronger correlations compared to Factor 1 scores, as Self-

Control, Suppression of Aggression, and Impulse Control all moderately correlated. All results generated were significant.

Correlational analyses between the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) and Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI) yielded a wide variety of significant results. As shown in Table 4, Self-Control moderately correlated with the YPI items of Dishonest Charm, Lying, Manipulation, Remorselessness, Unemotionality, Callousness, and Irresponsibility, while only being modestly correlated with Grandiosity. Self-Control did however correlate strongly with both Thrill Seeking and Impulsiveness, with the latter being the strongest. Impulse Control weakly correlated with Grandiosity and Callousness, modestly correlated with Unemotionality, and moderately correlated with Dishonest Charm, Lying, Manipulation, Remorselessness, Thrill Seeking and Irresponsibility. The only strong correlation between Impulse Control and facets of the YPI was Impulsiveness. Suppression of Aggression did not correlate strongly with any YPI scales, and modestly correlated with Grandiosity and Callousness. The rest of the items, Dishonest Charm, Lying, Manipulation, Remorselessness, Unemotionality, Thrill Seeking, Impulsiveness, and Irresponsibility all moderately correlated with Suppression of Aggression. Consideration of Others demonstrated weak correlations with nearly all of the YPI scales, save for Remorselessness and Callousness. Of the two, Suppression of Aggression modestly correlated with the former and moderately correlated with the latter.

Correlations between the broader dimensions of the YPI and WAI returned significant results as well. Continuing on Table 4, Self-Control moderately correlated with the Grandiose-Manipulative Dimension, but strongly correlated with the Callous-Unemotional Dimension, Impulsive-Irresponsible Dimension and YPI Total Score.

Table 5

Correlation Matrix of Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI), Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV), Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI), and Offending (Months 12-84)

	Offending (Months 12-84)
Self-Control (Six Months)	-.362
WAI: Impulse Control	-.260
WAI: Suppression of Aggression	-.298
WAI: Consideration of Others	-.244
Total PCL: YV Score	.335
Factor 1 PCL: YV Score	.230
Factor 2 PCL: YV Score	.345
YPI: Grandiose-Manipulative Dimension	.241
YPI: Callous-Unemotional Dimension	.323
YPI: Impulsive-Irresponsible Dimension	.305
YPI: Total Score	.326

Note $n = 964\sim 1,192$. All correlations were significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Both Impulse Control and Suppression of Aggression displayed similar outputs, with both moderately correlating with the Grandiose-Manipulative Dimension and Callous-Unemotional Dimension. Furthermore, Impulse Control and Suppression of Aggression both correlated strongly with the Impulsive-irresponsible Dimension and YPI Total Score. However, Consideration of Others demonstrated a weak correlation with the Grandiose-Manipulative Dimension and modest correlations with the Impulsive-

Irresponsible Dimension and YPI Total Score. The only moderate correlation for Consideration of Others was with the Callous-Unemotional Dimension.

Finally, correlational analyses between the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI), Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV), Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI), and Offending in Months 12-84 were performed. As illustrated in Table 5, Impulse Control and Consideration of Others modestly correlated with offending; whereas Suppression of Aggression moderately correlated with offending. Factor 1 scores of the PCL: YV modestly correlated with offending compared to Factor 2 PCL: YV scores moderately correlating. For the YPI dimensions, Grandiose-Manipulative correlated modestly with offending while both Callous-Unemotional and Impulsive-Irresponsible moderately correlated with offending. Overall, Self-Control, Total PCL: YV Score and YPI: Total Score all moderately correlated with offending, with Self-Control demonstrating the strongest relationship.

V. DISCUSSION

Self-control and psychopathy have garnered a tremendous amount of recognition within their respective fields, to the point where they have become instrumental in assessing individuals and understanding criminal propensity (Asscher et al., 2011; Pratt & Cullen, 2000). As a result, the current study sought to understand how closely these two constructs related with one another, including in what aspects they differed. Correspondingly, this study aimed to determine which construct was better suited to predicting future offending.

Comparisons between the three measures revealed moderate to strong results, with the relationship between the WAI and YPI demonstrating a stronger correlation compared to WAI and PCL: YV relationship. This would suggest a considerable amount of overlap between psychopathy and self-control, consistent with what Wiebe (2003) outlined. Specifically, despite the multiplicity of traits, behaviors, and styles between the two constructs, both self-control and psychopathy relate to one another substantively. This is further seen when looking at how the WAI, PCL: YV Total Score, and the YPI Total Score provide moderate to strong associations with their respective elements.

Elements of the WAI and PCL: YV showed both convergent and divergent relationships. Impulse Control and Suppression of Aggression demonstrated moderate correlations with Factor 2 Scores, which is to be expected considering how the latter taps into a socially deviant lifestyle and antisocial behavior. Although, Factor 1 Scores were weakly correlated with Consideration of Others, suggesting these elements are not necessarily capturing the same concepts. Comprehensively, the data poses that the WAI is somewhat tapping into aspects of Factor 2, the same cannot be said for Factor 1.

Additionally, the findings convey that interpersonal/affective deficits from psychopathy are not as pronounced in self-control.

Maintaining consistency with the above findings, correlations between the WAI and YPI yielded similar results. The association between Impulsive-Irresponsible Dimension and Impulse Control revealed the strongest correlation, with Suppression of Aggression relating well with all of the YPI dimensions. Yet, as what was observed with the WAI and PCL: YV, Consideration of Others did not correlate strongly with the expected YPI dimension of Callous-Unemotional. This inherently posits that the WAI is not tapping into Callous-Unemotional aspects of psychopathy as well. Other notable distinctions are how Suppression of Aggression is spreading across the facets of the YPI. This could be in part due to the aggression being captured, similar to temper from Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), is not differentiating across psychopathy components. Similar marks can be seen with Impulse Control across the YPI facets as well.

In regard to the relationship with offending, the WAI, PCL: YV and YPI showed moderate correlations with offending; with the WAI possessing the strongest correlation and the YPI possessing the weakest of the three. These observations align with those found by DeLisi et al. (2018), where they concluded with self-control having stronger relations with more serious forms of delinquency and violence. However, it is worth noting that the magnitudes of the correlations are nearly identical, with self-control producing only a slight advantage over the two psychopathy measures. At the same time, DeLisi et al.'s study separated offending into property and violent categories, whereas our study condensed offending into a single category, possibly masking the deeper relations with the constructs. Although, it must also be acknowledged that both DeLisi et

al. and our study made use of different measures, constituting different means of assessing the constructs among the sample. Nonetheless, results of this study appear to parallel with empirical research concerning the relationship between offending, self-control and psychopathy.

In terms of the relationship between the elements and offending, Suppression of Aggression, Callous-Unemotional Dimension and Impulsive-Irresponsible Dimension are the most consistent with offending. This raises questions regarding their similarities; perhaps a result of these elements tapping into impulsivity and behavioral dysregulation. They are unique in the way they each capture affective deficits, with psychopathy being more inclusive. Consideration of Others may simply be tapping into a general notion of disconcern for the welfare of others.

Limitations

A limitation presented in this study is through the use of self-report measures to assess the constructs, allowing for the possibility of validity issues and shared method variance. The choice of measures also presented itself as a limitation, particularly given that only one measure of self-control was included. However, Jones (2017) suggested the WAI offered some advantages over other measures of self-control. Still, future research should incorporate other measures, such the Grasmick scale (Grasmick et al., 1993). In terms of psychopathy, both self-report and clinician-rated measures were used, which offsets some of the limitations of measurement mentioned above. All three measures, however, were well-validated measures. One other limitation lies within the offender sample used for analysis, as the uniqueness of the sample may not be generalizable. As such, future research should feature non-offender samples to further assess propensity to

offend across a multitude of samples. Although, use of the offender sample does provide utility in the way of formulating justice policies and strategies for designing interventions (Schubert et al., 2004).

In spite of these limitations, we were able to uncover more information into the relationship between self-control and psychopathy. Moreover, we advanced our knowledge of how these constructs are similar and unique. Nonetheless, there is still much to learn, and future research should continue to comprehend and analyze the relationship between these two conceptualizations of criminal propensity. Using strengths from both can help to not only predict potential future offending, but to also help grasp the components that characterize offenders.

REFERENCES

- Akers, R. L. (1991). Self-control as a general theory of crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 7, 201-211.
- Andershed, H., Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Levander, S. (2002). Psychopathic traits in non-referred youths: Initial test of a new assessment tool. In E. Blaauw & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Psychopaths: Current International Perspectives* (pp. 131-158). The Hague, the Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Andershed, H., Hodgins, S., & Tengström, A. (2007). Convergent validity of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI) association with the Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV). *Assessment*, 14, 144-154.
- Asscher, J. J., van Vugt, E. S., Stams, G. J. J., Deković, M., Eichelsheim, V. I., & Yousfi, S. (2011). The relationship between juvenile psychopathic traits, delinquency and (violent) recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 52, 134-1143.
- Blackburn, R., & Fawcett, D. (1999). The Antisocial Personality Questionnaire: An inventory for assessing personality deviation in offender populations. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 15, 14.
- Cauffman, E., Kimonis, E. R., Dmitrieva, J., & Monahan, K. C. (2009). A multimethod assessment of juvenile psychopathy: Comparing the predictive utility of the PCL: YV, YPI, and NEO PRI. *Psychological Assessment*, 21, 528-542.
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The mask of sanity: An attempt to reinterpret the so-called psychopathic personality*. Oxford, England: Mosby.

- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment, 13*, 171-188.
- DeLisi, M., & Vaughn, M. G. (2008). The Gottfredson-Hirschi critiques revisited: Reconciling, self-control theory, criminal careers, and career criminals. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 52*, 520–537.
- DeLisi, M., Tostlebe, J., Burgason, K., Heirigs, M., & Vaughn, M. (2018). Self-control versus psychopathy: A head-to-head test of general theories of antisociality. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 16*, 53-76.
- Dolan, M., & Rennie, C. (2006). Psychopathy checklist: Youth version and Youth Psychopathic Trait Inventory: A comparison study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*, 779-789.
- Duckworth, A. L., & Kern, M. L. (2011). A meta-analysis of the convergent validity of self-control measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 45*, 259-268.
- de Ridder, D., Lensvelt-Mulders, G., Finkenauer, C., Stok, F. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2011). Taking stock of self-control: A meta-analysis of how trait self-control relates to a wide range of behaviors. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 16*, 76–99.
- Edens, J. F., Campbell, J. S., & Weir, J. M. (2007). Youth psychopathy and criminal recidivism: A meta-analysis of the psychopathy checklist measures. *Law and Human Behavior, 31*, 53-75.
- Engel, C. (2012). *Low self-control as a source of crime: A meta-study*. Bonn, Germany: Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods.

- Farrell, A. D., & Sullivan, T. N. (2000). Structure of the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory Self-Restraint scale and its relation to problem behaviors in adolescence. *Psychological Assessment, 12*, 394.
- Forsman, M., Lichtenstein, P., Andershed, H., & Larsson, H. (2010). A longitudinal twin study of the direction of effects between psychopathic personality and antisocial behaviour. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 51*, 39-47.
- Forth, A. E., Kosson, D. S., & Hare, R. D. (2003). *Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth version*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Grasmick, H.G., Tittle, C.R., Bursik, R.J., Arneklev, B.J. (1993). Testing the core empirical assumptions of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 30*, 5-29.
- 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. (1985). Comparison of procedures for the assessment of psychopathy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 7-16.
- Hare, R. D., McPherson, L. M., & Forth, A. E. (1988). Male psychopaths and their criminal careers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 710-714.
- Hare, R.D. (1991). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

- Harpur, T. J., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1994). Personality of the psychopath. In P. T. Costa, Jr. & T. A. Widiger (Eds.), *Personality Disorders and the Five-Factor Model of Personality* (pp. 149-173). Washington, D.C., US: American Psychological Association.
- Hirschi, T. (2004). Self-control and crime. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Research, Theory, and Applications* (pp. 537-552). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Huizinga, D., Esbensen, F., & Weiher, A. (1991). Are there multiple paths to delinquency? *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 82, 83-118.
- Jones, S., Cauffman, E., Miller, J. D., & Mulvey, E. (2006). Investigating different factor structures of the Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version: Confirmatory factor analytic findings. *Psychological Assessment*, 18, 33-48.
- Jones, S., & Miller, J. D. (2012). Psychopathic traits and externalizing behaviors: A comparison of self-and informant reports in the statistical prediction of externalizing behaviors. *Psychological Assessment*, 24, 255-260.
- Jones, S. (2017). Does choice of measure matter? Assessing the similarities and differences among self-control scales. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 50, 78-85.
- Kelley, S. E., Edens, J. F., Donnellan, M. B., Mowle, E. N., & Sörman, K. (2018). Self- and informant perceptions of psychopathic traits in relation to the triarchic model. *Journal of Personality*, 86, 738-751.

- Kosson, D. S., Cyterski, T. D., Steuerwald, B. L., Neumann, C. S., & Walker-Matthews, S. (2002). The reliability and validity of the Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV) in nonincarcerated adolescent males. *Psychological Assessment, 14*, 97-109.
- Leistico, A. M. R., Salekin, R. T., DeCoster, J., & Rogers, R. (2008). A large-scale meta-analysis relating the Hare measures of psychopathy to antisocial conduct. *Law and Human Behavior, 32*, 28-45.
- Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 151-158.
- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal population. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*, 488-524.
- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Hess, T. H. (2001). Psychopathic personality traits and somatization: Sex differences and the mediating role of negative emotionality. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 23*, 11-24.
- Moffitt, T. E., Arseneault, L., Belsky, D., Dickson, N., Hancox, R. J., Harrington, H., Houts, R., Poulton, R., Roberts, B. W., Ross, S., Sears, M. R., Thompson, W. M., & Caspi, A. (2011). A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, 108*, 2693-2698.

- Murrie, D. C., Boccaccini, M. T., Guarnera, L. A., & Rufino, K. A. (2013). Are forensic experts biased by the side that retained them? *Psychological Science*, 24, 1889-1897.
- Neumann, C. S., Vitacco, M. J., Hare, R. D., & Wupperman, P. (2005). Reconstructing the “reconstruction” of psychopathy: A comment on Cooke, Michie, Hart, and Clark. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 19, 624-640.
- Porter, S., Birt, A. R., & Boer, D. P. (2001). Investigation of the criminal and conditional release profiles of Canadian federal offenders as a function of psychopathy and age. *Law and Human Behavior*, 25, 647-661.
- Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F. T. (2000). The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: A meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 38, 931-964.
- Piquero, A. R. (2008). Measuring self-control. In E. Goode (Ed.), *Out of control: Assessing the general theory of crime* (pp. 26-37). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ray, J. V., Hall, J., Rivera-Hudson, N., Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Morano, M. (2013). The relation between self-reported psychopathic traits and distorted response styles: A meta-analytic review. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 4, 1-14.
- Reidy, D. E., Shelley-Tremblay, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2011). Psychopathy, reactive aggression, and precarious proclamations: A review of behavioral, cognitive, and biological research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16, 512-524.

- Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., & Sewell, K. W. (1996). A review and meta-analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist and Psychopathy Checklist-Revised: Predictive validity of dangerousness. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 3, 203-215.
- Schubert, C. A., Mulvey, E. P., Steinberg, L., Cauffman, E., Losoya, S. H., Hecker, T., Chassin, L., & Knight, G. P. (2004). Operational lessons from the pathways to desistance project. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 2, 237-255.
- Schulz, S. (2006). *Beyond Self-Control: Analysis and Critique of Gottfredson & Hirschi's General Theory of Crime (1990)*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Simourd, L., & Andrews, D. A. (1994). Correlates of delinquency: A look at gender differences. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 6, 26-31.
- Skeem, J. L., & Cauffman, E. (2003). Views of the downward extension: Comparing the youth version of the Psychopathy Checklist with the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 21, 737-770.
- Steinberg, L., Blatt-Eisengart, I., & Cauffman, E. (2006). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful homes: A replication in a sample of serious juvenile offenders. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16, 47-58.
- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 271-324.
- Thomson, N. D. (2018). Psychopathy and violent crime. In M. DeLisi (Ed.), *Routledge International Handbook of Psychopathy and Crime* (pp. 508-525). London, UK: Routledge.

- Tittle, C. R., Ward, D. A., & Grasmick, H. G. (2003). Self-control and crime/deviance: Cognitive vs. behavioral measures. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19, 333-365.
- Vaughn, M. G., & DeLisi, M. (2008). Were Wolfgang's chronic offenders psychopaths? On the convergent validity between psychopathy and career criminality. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36, 33-42.
- Vazsonyi, A., Mikuska, J., & Kelley, E. (2017). It's time: A meta-analysis on the self-control deviance link. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 48, 48–63.
- Walters, G. D. (2003). Predicting institutional adjustment and recidivism with the psychopathy checklist factor scores: A meta-analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*, 27, 541-558.
- Walters, G. D. (2016). Are behavioral measures of self-control and the Grasmick self-control scale measuring the same construct? A meta-analysis. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41, 151-167.
- Weinberger, D. A., & Schwartz, G. E. (1990). Distress and restraint as superordinate dimensions of self-reported adjustment: A typological perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 58, 381-417.
- Wiebe, R. P. (2003). Reconciling psychopathy and low self-control. *Justice Quarterly*, 20, 297-336.