

2-1986

**Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths Compared: Self-Concept,
Locus of Control, Guilt, and Quality of Religious Experience**

David W. Agnor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/psyd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths Compared:
Self-Concept, Locus of Control, Guilt, and Quality of
Religious Experience

by
David W. Agnor

Presented to the Faculty of
Western Conservative Baptist Seminary
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Clinical/Counseling Psychology

February, 1986

Portland, Oregon

Running head: Sociopaths Compared

APPROVAL

Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths Compared:
Self-Concept, Locus of Control, Guilt, and Quality of
Religious Experience

by

David W. Agnor

Signatures:

Wayne E. Colwell, Ph.D. James Sweeney
Committee Chairman Academic Dean

Rodger K. Bufford Ph.D.
Member

Robert C. Anderson, Ph.D.
Member E.S.

Date: April 11, 1986

ABSTRACT

Criminal sociopaths frequently claim commitment to Christianity, a religion which philosophically is counter to a sociopath's world view. Ascertaining whether or not religious commitment is a variable relevant to corrections is confusing in light of a lack of research which addresses this problem.

In this study 25 non-religious and 27 orthodox Christian male sociopaths, inmates from Oregon State Penitentiary, were administered the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Rotter Internal/External Locus of Control Scale, and the Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Scales. To gather data on the religious experience of the sociopath, the Spiritual Well-Being Scale, the Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale, and the God Concept Semantic Differential Scale were also given.

Christian sociopaths had significantly higher guilt and had significantly more internal locus of control than non-religious sociopaths. There were no self-esteem differences, but Christian sociopaths had higher behavior self-concept. It was concluded that the Christian and non-religious sociopaths were

distinct populations, and since higher guilt and more internal locus of control are signs in the direction of psychological health, Christian sociopaths were better positioned than non-religious sociopaths. The Christian sociopaths were possibly better prospects for rehabilitation, an idea deserving further consideration in longitudinal research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to publicly express gratitude to my wife Sharon for being patient with me and believing in me through "the duration", to Chrystal, Breanna, and David for putting off a promised trip to Disneyland, to Dr. Colwell, Dr. Bufford, Dr. Howard, and Dr. Anderson for their faithful critical reviews, to Dr. Siedler for his interest in accomodating his department for research at Oregon State Penitentiary, to the inmates there who willingly participated, and to Pattie Pratt for word processing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	1
Sociopathic Personality Disorder.....	7
Descriptive Symptomatology of Sociopathy....	8
Self-Concept, Guilt, Locus of Control and the Sociopath	12
Etiology of Sociopathic Personality Disorder.....	20
Treatment.....	23
Crime and the Sociopath.....	24
Theological Considerations and the Sociopath.....	25
God Concept.....	36
God Concept Formation.....	36
God Concept and Self Concept.....	39
God Concept and Prison Population.....	43
Spiritual Well-Being.....	45
Religious/Non-religious Assumptions.....	48
Hypotheses Stated.....	50
Chapter 2 METHOD.....	52
Subjects.....	52
Procedure.....	56
Description of Criterion Measures.....	58

The Orthodoxy Index.....	58
The Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Scale.....	60
The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.....	62
The Rotter Internal/External Locus of Control Scale.....	63
The Spiritual Well Being Scale.....	64
The Internal/External Religious Orientation Scale.....	65
The God Concept Semantic Differential Scale.....	67
Religious Opinion Questionnaire.....	68
Chapter 3 RESULTS.....	69
Biographical Data.....	70
General Demographics.....	70
Religious Beliefs and Experiences.....	71
Crimes Committed.....	78
Test Results.....	80
Personality Measures.....	80
Religious Quality Measures.....	83
Hypotheses Results.....	87
Primary Hypotheses.....	87
Secondary Hypotheses.....	88
Results Summary.....	101
Chapter 4 DISCUSSION.....	103
Guilt.....	103

Self-Concept.....	109
Locus of Control.....	113
Self-Concept and God-Concept.....	116
Self-Concept and Spiritual Well-Being.....	118
Locus of Control and Existential Well-Being.....	119
Locus of Control and God-Concept.....	120
A Religious Profile.....	121
Limitations.....	128
An Interpretation and Application of Salient Findings.....	131
Implications and Recommendations for Future Research.....	135
Summary.....	140
REFERENCES.....	143
APPENDIXES.....	160
Appendix A DSM-III Antisocial Personality Disorder.....	160
Appendix B The Interview Text.....	163
Appendix C The Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Scale.....	166

Appendix D The Tennessee Self-Concept	
Scale.....	176
Appendix E The Rotter Internal/External	
Locus of Control Scale.....	180
Appendix F The Spiritual Well-Being Scale...	184
Appendix G The Internal/External Religious	
Orientation Scale.....	186
Appendix H The God Concept Semantic	
Differential Scale	191
Appendix I Consent Form.....	195
Appendix J The Biographic Data Sheet.....	197
Appendix K The Religious Opinion	
Questionnaire.....	199
Appendix L Raw Statistical Data.....	202
Appendix M VITA.....	208

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Selection and Testing Procedure.....	53
Table 2: Sociopaths Responses to Religious Opinion Questionnaire Reported in Percentages.....	72
Table 3: The Percentage of Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths Who were Convicted of Crimes as Classified...	77
Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations for Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales.....	81
Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations for Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths on Guilt and Locus of Control Measures.....	82
Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations for Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths on Religious Quality Measures.....	84

Table 7: Correlations of Self-Esteem with Selected Religious Measures Reporting Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths Separately.....	89
Table 8: A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measures for Total Sociopath Population Sample.....	91

CHAPTER 1

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Within the realm of the prison systems there arises a problem which confronts therapists, clergy, the parole board, and other social and mental health professionals. That is the question of the meaning of the antisocial offender's religious claims. Should there be, for example, differential treatment for religious and non-religious persons with antisocial personality? Should their claims be considered irrelevant or can a deviant person's religious experience be incorporated positively as a motivating force in achieving treatment goals?

Do the religious and non-religious sociopaths differ in any meaningful way other than their level of religious commitment? If they differ, then further research can be suggested to determine whether these differences can influence behavioral predictions.

While these are the questions which motivated this study, a review of the literature has made it clear that relevant research is extremely scant. There is a great deal of interest in the deviant personality as

well as in religion as separate areas of study; but there is very little research on the religious life of the deviant personality.

This study focuses specifically on the sociopathic personality. "Sociopathic personality" refers generally to the antisocial personality disorder as described by the American Psychiatric Association DSM-III (in appendix A). "Sociopathy" is an older term than "Antisocial Personality Disorder", but it is generally the term of choice in this research, first, because it is semantically more concise when talking about the person with the disorder as opposed to the disorder, and secondly, because in general it describes the same disorder. There are important distinctions between these two terms and they are discussed in the subsequent main section.

A recent survey of the research (Knudten & Knudten, 1971) pertaining to religion and the deviant points to the neglect of this field. They state, "Empirical research is especially lacking in the areas of religion and corrections, and the role of religion in prevention" (p.147). To their credit, sociologists have recently contributed a body of research which shows some consensus in concluding that high

religiosity deters antisocial behavior in youth. Several researchers have found negative relationships between delinquency and religious involvement (Albrecht, Chadwick, & Alcorn, 1977; Burkett, 1977; Burkett & White, 1974; Higgins & Albrecht, 1977; Jensen & Erikson, 1979; Peek, Curry & Chafant, 1985; Rhodes & Reiss, 1970). An exception is Hirschi and Stark (1969), where no relationship was found.

Currently the research tends to be cross-sectional and demographic in emphasis, with the research bent being that of a sociologist rather than a psychologist. However, psychiatrist Jerome Begun (1976) recently has reported religious experience to be a psychologically profound but rare element of behavior change in the sociopath; so apparently those who work with individual cases have observed a positive influence of religion on sociopathy.

Knudten and Knudten (1971) recognized a need to go beyond identifying a person's religious preference and explore the quality of religious commitment in the deviant personality although their emphasis was primarily sociological. They encouraged future studies to evaluate the relationship of religion to such

variables as culture, social class, and the quality of an individual's religious commitment.

The present study goes beyond this to look at the sociopath's religious commitment as it relates to quality of religious experience and personality characteristics. The objective here is to describe more adequately the sociopath's religious experience specifically in these three areas: 1) the internal or external quality of that experience, 2) his concept of God, and 3) spiritual well-being. In addition to these "religious quality" variables are three personality variables: self-concept, guilt, and locus of control. Those sociopaths with religious commitment claims will be compared to those with no religious commitment claims to determine whether there are differences with respect to the above personality variables, God-concept, and spiritual well-being.

This study limits itself to the religious claims of the sociopath espousing the Christian faith, particularly those more conservative and evangelical in doctrine. While the religious experience of sociopaths of other religious preferences are worthy of study, this choice was made primarily because it expresses this author's interest and secondly, because it is

these conservative Christian groups that appear to be the most active in prison and, therefore, are most readily sampled. Theoretical definitions and operational definitions are discussed later in this chapter and in chapter 2.

As observed already by Knudten and Knudten (1971), there is little or no research comparing "religious" and "non-religious" sociopaths. However, each variable was selected with a degree of reasoning suggested by their relatedness to both sociopathic character disorder and the nature of religious belief. For example, a typical sociopath could be predicted to have a low sense of internalized guilt (Cleckley, 1955). Both Christian Protestantism and Catholicism speak thematically on issues pertaining to guilt from behavior which transgresses a moral code. Therefore, it is possible that if a sociopath is responding to some aspect of religion which offers forgiveness, then religion may appeal to sociopaths with a more well developed sense of guilt than other sociopaths.

This researcher wondered whether religious sociopaths is a measureably different population from the non-religious and more typical criminal sociopath in relation to guilt, locus of control and self-concept

personality variables. Essentially, the study asked whether the religious sociopath is less sociopathic than the non-religious sociopath. Or, is the religious experience possibly an irrelevant variable as suggested by the silence of the research? Related to this is the quality of religious experience the religious sociopath has as compared to religious normals on instruments where data on normals are available. A secondary level of inquiry explored intercorrelations among the three religious quality variables and the three personality characteristic variables. These relationships were also compared to intercorrelations of these variables found among normals where data are available.

The population sample of sociopaths in this study was drawn from the Oregon State Penitentiary. This study limits itself specifically to the criminal sociopath.

In this introductory chapter, literature is reviewed pertaining to sociopathy in general, and its relationship to research findings on guilt, self-concept and locus of control research. Next, the quality of religious experience variables is discussed in terms of God concept, spiritual well being, and internal/external religious orientation. In the final

section, the working hypotheses which this study tests are formulated.

Sociopathic Personality Disorder

Historically, persons having symptoms similar to the current antisocial personality disorder have been identified as early as the fourth century B.C. when Plato analyzed the nature of the "tyrant" (Plato, 1952). Early psychiatry termed this "problem" personality as "moral insanity," first by J. C. Prichard (Prichard, 1837), and then Koch introduced the term "psychopathic inferiority" (Koch, 1891). Adolph Meyer used the term "constitutional psychopathic inferior" in 1905, not to imply genetic etiology but to convey the idea that the traits involved were acquired early in life and were very ingrained in the personality (Begun, 1976). The most recent terms which are somewhat interchangeable in the research and to be used interchangeably in this research review as well are psychopathy, sociopathy, and antisocial personality.

Descriptive Symptomatology of Sociopathy

Descriptions have varied somewhat over the last century culminating in a now classic description by H. Cleckley (1955). In a scientific monograph, he listed the following characteristics of a sociopath:

1. Superficial charm and good intelligence
2. Absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking
3. Absence of "nervousness" or psychoneurotic thinking
4. Unreliability
5. Untruthfulness and insincerity
6. Lack of nervousness or shame
7. Inadequately motivated antisocial behavior
8. Poor judgment and failure to learn from experience
9. Pathological egocentricity for love
10. General poverty in major affective relations
11. Specific loss of insight
12. Unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations

13. Fantastic and uninviting behavior with
drink sometimes without
14. Suicide attempts, rarely successful
15. Sex life impersonal, trivial, and poorly
integrated
16. Failure to follow any life plan (p.380)

While the above list is descriptive of the sociopathic personality, not all of the above characteristics would necessarily pertain to one person but typically many of the characteristics would be involved.

The most recent description of this disorder has been termed "antisocial personality disorder" by the DSM-III (in appendix A). A review of the DSM-III reveals objectively behavioral criteria. For example, criteria include a lack of steady employment, being in and out of trouble with the law, et cetera. If one compares this to Cleckley's above list of characteristics of the sociopath, one will notice the need for a "clinical impression" in Cleckley's description versus the lack of a need for it in the DSM-III. Hare (1980) reports his earlier research in

which 146 prison inmates were diagnosed for both the DSM-III Antisocial Personality Disorder and psychopathy "in the strictest sense of the term." Hare found that while 76 percent met the DSM-III criteria, only 33 percent were considered by Hare to be true psychopaths. "In essence, the DSM-III is too liberal" (Hare, 1980, p. 112). Hare complained that while reasonable objectivity was achieved by the DSM-III, the criteria are too close to being synonymous with criminality. While there are different sets of descriptions of the same general deviant population, the most comprehensive and clinically useful is a description that assesses both antisocial behavior as well as the sociopath's feelings and thoughts toward his behavior, self and others.

The sociopath's sometimes charming, manipulative intelligence, externalized values, extreme narcissism, and inability to form meaningful emotional attachments to significant others usually means that where there is a sociopath, there is also a trail of used and discarded people in his past. Essentially, when a "victim" has something to offer which the sociopath wants or needs, the sociopath manipulates the relationship to get what he wants but gives little or

nothing in return. Indeed, he cannot give what he does not have to give, and because of his narcissism, lack of empathy, and inability to form a close emotional bond he leaves the other person in the relationship emotionally frustrated. When the sociopath has taken all there is to take or when the relationship is terminated, the sociopath can move to another situation with little emotional loss or guilt. If there is a display of remorse, it is usually sourced in the inconvenience and loss of face to the sociopath. The pain of the other person is not felt; although the sociopath may be truly sorry the relationship is over, he is not really aware of his role in its demise. This scenario can be played in marriage, business, politics, and religion or anywhere interpersonal relationships thrive.

Jerome Begun (1976), in a review of Karpman's psychoanalytic portrait of the psychopath states in rather vivid terms:

The patient views the world as a huge breast which gives only bad milk, and himself as the starved child. The people who succumb with pity to his appeals are "suckers;" the ones who don't are

"bastards" and the world is made up entirely of suckers, bastards and himself. (p. 28)

While most of these characteristics are present in varying degrees in neurotic, drug dependent or other maladaptive behavior patterns, in the sociopath these characteristics are very pronounced and do not usually involve other psychopathology such as delusions, hallucinations, high anxiety or withdrawal. The sociopath tends to act out anxiety-free, impulsively, and without regard to consequences.

While these are characteristics that tend to be shared in common, there is a wide range of behavior patterns involved. Behavior can include serial bigamy, imposture, gambling, drug addiction, and violent crime. Sociopaths can be found in criminal occupations as well as more socially desirable roles such as politicians, corporate executives or religious evangelists (Begun, 1976; Bluemel, 1948; Coleman, 1976; Crighton, 1959).

Self-Concept, Guilt, Locus of Control and the Sociopath

Self-concept. Bursten (1973) discusses one of the essential features of the manipulator, "putting

something over." In the impulsive sociopath, "putting something over" gives a sense of exhilaration which functions as its central focus to maintain self-esteem. Self-esteem is also enhanced by feelings of contempt and devaluation of others "while putting something over." Thus, low self-esteem creates a need state which is met through manipulating others. This contempt and devaluation of others also supports the sociopaths self-concept of omnipotence. He must be omnipotent, unable to depend upon or invest in others. The consequence is superficiality, lack of loyalty, ruthlessness and manipulateness. "His inner world of objects is that of dark shadowy persecutors, a world of danger and paranoid fears where...if he is not actively 'screwing,' he knows he is 'being screwed'" (Leaff, 1978). Thus, the manipulateness, the emotional distance and the narcissism act to maintain an omnipotent self-concept.

While a self-concept of omnipotence has not, to this author's knowledge, been measured with a psychological instrument, low self-esteem in the sociopath has empirical support. It is generally accepted that sociopaths have low self-esteem primarily from studies using delinquent juveniles (Szurek, 1949)

or prisoners (Clarke & Hasler, 1967; Cohen, 1964; Fichtler, Zimmerman and Moore, 1973; Fitts & Hamner, 1969). Other studies have used diagnosed sociopaths (Gudjonsson & Roberts, 1983; Marks, 1965). Interestingly, a study by Fichtler, Zimmerman and Moore (1973) compared self-concept of prisoners to self-esteem of a white Protestant rural church group and also to college students. They found that the inmates had significantly lower self-esteem than the church members. The church members also had higher self-esteem than college students (a finding supported by others such as Coopersmith, 1967). Their study measured self-esteem by a discrepancy between "ideal self" and "actual self" measures. As the discrepancy increases, self-esteem decreases and vice-versa. Fichtler et al. (1973) speculated that self-esteem was high in the Protestant group because of a controlled and self-imposed Christian ethic. They attributed inmates' low self-esteem not to character disorder but to the effect of the prison environment.

Thus low self-esteem creates a need state which is associated with manipulation and devaluation of others. Both are characteristics of sociopathy. Self-esteem levels among sociopaths then may be a

narrow indication of sociopathy. Further, it appears that if high self-esteem is to be found among sub-groups of sociopaths it, it would be likely to be found among those who have experienced Christianity.

Guilt. That a lack of guilt is a characteristic of sociopaths has already been observed (Cleckley, 1955). For Freud (1930) the constructs of fear and guilt were key to the acquisition of internalized standards of conduct. (Of course, they were also central to the development of psychopathology). Guilt was viewed by Freud to be both a nucleus of neurosis and an inhibitor of unacceptable behavior.

Actually, Freud (1926) postulated that there are three types of anxiety: reality anxiety, neurotic anxiety, and moral anxiety or feelings of guilt. Reality anxiety, or fear of real dangers, is always evoked by some real danger external to the person. From reality anxiety are derived the other two types. Neurotic anxiety is the fear that the instincts will get out of control and cause the person to do something for which he will be punished. Neurotic anxiety is not so much a fear of instincts themselves as it is a fear of the punishment which is likely to result from instinctual gratification. Neurotic anxiety is based

upon reality because the world as represented by parents and other authorities does punish the child for impulsive actions.

Moral anxiety, of course, has its roots in the super-ego. A person with a well developed super-ego tends to feel guilty when he does something or thinks of doing something which is contrary to the moral code which he has internalized. Moral anxiety also has a reality base. The person has been punished in the past for violating the moral code.

The internalization of the parental moral code in the normal person was postulated to take place during the height of the Oedipus Conflict between four and six years of age. In order to resolve the Oedipal conflict, the child identifies with the threatening parent's values and also represses threatening impulses which violate those values.

In the sociopath, however, this internalization does not occur normally. This is due primarily to rejecting inconsistent parenting as discussed in subsequent sections. However, super-ego development is best described as a matter of degree. Leaff (1978) asserts along with Fenichel (1945) that the super-ego in the sociopath is not non-existent but incomplete.

This leaves open the possibility that some sociopaths would have better developed guilt systems than others be it that those systems are dysfunctional.

That sociopaths have guilt deficiencies has received some empirical support (Cudrin, 1970), but there has yet to be an instrument developed which can differentiate sociopaths from normals on the basis of guilt levels represented by scores. However, other differentiations have been found using a scale developed by Mosher (1966). Using this scale, Mosher and Mosher (1966) found that inmates who committed property offenses had higher guilt than those who committed offenses against people. Another study has shown that sex guilt and sex offenses are negatively related (Persons, 1970a). The same study found that violence and guilt from hostility were related in the predicted direction. There was also a negative relationship between the number of crimes committed and guilt levels.

This evidence seems to indicate that guilt as a personality construct does act as a restraining force. One would also expect that among sociopaths guilt may be considered a viable index of degree of sociopathy,

and may have the potential of predicting antisocial behavior.

Locus of Control. Locus of control is another personality construct which has been shown to be related to sociopathy. A person with internal locus of control attributes the cause of life events to personal behavior or to relatively permanent personal characteristics. The person with an external locus of control attributes life events to unpredictable forces such as powerful others, fate or chance (Rotter, 1966).

External locus of control has been related to antisocial behavior in delinquents (Duke & Fenhagen, 1975; Martin, 1975; Martinez, Hays & Solway, 1977). Locus of control theory is consistent with these findings, because delinquents do not easily connect their antisocial behavior to the consequences of that behavior. Thus, they continue to attribute unpleasant consequences to making mistakes in getting caught, or bad luck. Imprisoned sociopaths frequently blame external circumstances beyond their control such as the unexpected arrival of the police as the cause of their imprisonment, rather than their illegal behavior. This external orientation fits conceptually well with

the sociopath's described failure to learn from experience.

It would appear at first that a person with external locus of control would not be manipulative also, because manipulation seems to assume a belief that one can control his environment by manipulative behavior. However, research with Machivellianism, a conglomerate personality measure, indicates otherwise. In their book Studies in Machiavellianism, Christie and Geis (1970) describe the machiavellian as much like the sociopath: emotionally detached, low in empathy, viewing people as objects, skeptical of others, behaviorally manipulative, utilitarian morality, and more interested in tactics to an end rather than inflexible striving for an idealistic goal. While the sociopath appears to be more disorganized and more impulsive in general than Christie and Geis' description of the machiavellian, they share the same world view. Machiavellianism has been found to be moderately correlated ($r = .33$ to $.44$) with external locus of control on the Rotter Locus of Control Scale (I.E.) (Christie & Geis, 1970; Solar & Bruehl, 1971). They account for this positive correlation by arguing that high "machs" manipulate others from a position of

powerlessness, an external orientation. In further examining these two conceptions of power, it has been reported that both internals and high "machs" attempt to control the environment. However, internals seem to prefer to control the objective environment (Seeman & Evans, 1962; Strickland, 1965) or their own lives (Julian & Katz, 1968; MacDonald, 1970) whereas "Machs" prefer to manipulate others (Christie & Geis, 1970; Rim, 1966).

Sociopaths with an external locus of control attempt to control others out of a perceived position of powerlessness. A sociopath with a more internal locus of control is probably more likely to learn from experience, and less likely to view people as objects to manipulate, hence to be less sociopathic. In short, locus of control theory and research provides a basis with which to measure another dimension of sociopathy.

Etiology of Sociopathic Personality Disorder

Research investigating causes of antisocial personality has focused on two broad fronts. One is the genetic component and the other is familial dysfunctions. One reason there is a focus on the genetic component is because symptoms are evident as

early as age 5 or 6 and always before age 15 (Robins, 1977). Support for this has come from research showing that sociopaths experience low level arousal and, therefore, are actively in search of a thrill or stimulus as an end in itself (Fenz, 1971; Hare, 1968; Quay, 1965). Complementing this is also a low level of arousal of emotions such as fear, anxiety and guilt, when in similar situations a normal person would be highly aroused (Hare, 1970). This has led many to conclude that this low level of anxiety arousal impairs the sociopath's ability to avoid behaviors which lead to negative consequences, and, therefore, he does not learn normal inhibitions (Chesno & Kilmann, 1975; Eysenck, 1960; Hare, 1970; Lykken, 1957; Schmank, 1970). This is further supported by Hare's (1970) review of EEG research which shows a relatively high incidence of EEG abnormalities among psychopaths. Hare concluded that the location of the abnormalities in the temporal lobe are indications of impulse inhibition abnormalities, the dysfunction of which impairs inhibition learning. One researcher has concluded that there is some kind of genetic component in some or all cases of the disorder (Crowe, 1975).

The other primary focus of research is familial patterns. Wolman (1973) studied the families of sociopathic patients and found lack of affection to be a significantly present characteristic. Because most of these sociopaths were brought up in low socioeconomic families and left to fend for themselves, Wolman reasons that they develop a selfish, narcissistic stance which includes a distrust for others. They grow up viewing themselves as poor, innocent, rejected, and lonely. Lack of affection and parental neglect, rejection, and inconsistent discipline are considered to be primary contributions in development of the antisocial personality by most authorities (Halleck, 1972; Karpman, 1959; McCord & McCord, 1956; Wolman, 1966, 1973). Interestingly, overindulgence in middle and upper income classes has also been observed to predict sociopathy (Levy, 1951; Wolman, 1973). Early studies paired an overindulgent pleasure-loving mother with a successful, critical, distant father (Greenacre, 1945; Heaver, 1943). Robins' (1966) study also points to the modeling impact of an antisocial father. When there was a combination of a sociopathic or alcoholic father with ten or more antisocial symptoms in childhood, almost 50 percent of

the children Robins studied turned out to have antisocial personality, and the other 50 percent were not well but had a variety of other illnesses or personality defects. This prediction Robins found to be true with the same frequency in lower socioeconomic strata as in the middle class when controlling for class ratios in the general population.

Treatment

The treatment of antisocial personality has included psychotherapy, behavior therapy, drug therapy, electroconvulsive therapy, lobotomy and imprisonment. "None of these has been shown to be effective and the illness still does not have an effective treatment" (Robins, 1977). With the onset prior to age 15, Robins (1966) and others have found no improvement until age 40, when about 40 percent of the patients improved. This does not imply recovery, unfortunately, and most who improved are still hostile and asocial.

To summarize the discussion thus far, sociopaths have many characteristics in common, and have a diverse mix of behaviors and stations in life. The cause of this disorder is attributed in some degree or other to a combination of genetic components and rejecting,

affectionless and inconsistent parenting. Guilt, locus of control, and self-esteem have been theoretically and empirically related to sociopathic symptoms. These constructs have significance in sociopathy studies pertaining to diagnosis and etiology.

Crime and the Sociopath

There is a definite relationship between the sociopath and criminal behavior as is suggested by the DSM-III diagnostic criteria (in appendix A). However, it is important to distinguish between criminal behavior and sociopathic behavior. Coleman (1976) observes that "repeated legal or social offenses is not sufficient justification for labeling an individual a psychopath" (p. 370). The great majority of sociopaths, although in constant conflict with authority, are not incarcerated in correctional institutions (Coleman, 1976). Personality variables are significantly differentiated along many dimensions from the normal population by criminal behavior alone (Schuessler & Cressey, 1950; Tennenbaum, 1977; Waldo & Dinitz, 1967). Most sociopaths are not found in prison, and criminal behavior does not require sociopathy. However, the prison population is in fact proportionally

overrepresented by the antisocial personality. One study estimates that 80 percent of the prison population has antisocial personality (Guze, Goodwin & Crane, 1969). Others report estimates that range from 31 percent to 85 percent (Bach-y-Rita, 1974; Hare, 1980; Roth & Erwin, 1971).

Theological Considerations and the Sociopath

Having described general diagnosis and etiology of sociopathy, the discussion now addresses how these personality characteristics interact with a sociopath's religious experience. This section discusses how the high narcissism, low guilt, low empathy and distorted self-concept may interact as personality variables with the Christian concepts of love and forgiveness. Then the discussion moves to Christian theological concepts which consider the possibility for the sociopath to have a genuine Christian experience. It is then argued that Christianity can accommodate the sociopath's unique position either as complete "fake" or as a genuine convert who is slow to change.

It would appear that the term "Christian sociopath" is a conceptual contradiction. The sociopath is described as unempathic, markedly

narcissistic and is concerned about "what is in it for me." Conversely, the Christian faith espouses willingness to meet another's need before one's own, motivated by the desire to see another person benefit. The sociopath does not form close emotional attachments, yet Christian love seems to be impossible to perform without this ability. The sociopath does not seem to experience internal guilt. Conversely, the Christian faith seems to assume the presence of an inner sense of guilt in the individual. Thus, while Christianity and sociopathy seem incongruent, the fact that they seem to coexist is worthy of some explanation, both in terms of how the sociopath is viewing his Christianity and in terms of how Christianity views the sociopath theologically.

First, it is appropriate to examine the sociopathic and the Christian view of "love." Love is demonstrated both by the actions and teachings of Jesus and the writings of Paul in the New Testament. Love is generally framed as being a genuine concern for another's welfare. An example is in Jesus's teaching "love your neighbor as yourself" (Matthew 22:39) and "whoever wishes to be great among you shall be your servant...just as the Son of Man did not come to be

served, but to give His life a ransom for many" (Matthew 20:26,28). The prospect of "walking an extra mile" as taught by Jesus (Matthew 5:41) is an act which points to performing for another beyond what is required in an attitude of selfless servitude. A quick perusal of the Pauline description of Christian love in I Corinthians 13 impresses one of the immediate need for empathy and an ability to form emotional attachments. Philippians 2:3-4 states "Do nothing out of selfish ambition or vain conceit, but in humility consider others better than yourselves. Each of you should look not only to your own interests, but also to the interests of others."

Knowing sociopathy as described in the previous sections one can make some speculations of what being a loving Christian may mean to the sociopath. Since the sociopath's thematic motive is self-service, from the sociopath's perspective service to others would usually be a necessary trade off for achieving an ultimately higher self-service. Thus, a sociopath may be truthful or caring toward a woman with calculations of gaining her confidence, but be thinking about exploiting her

sexually or financially. Genuine service appears to be an elusive activity for the sociopath to fully grasp.

Another kind of act with no tangible strings attached has been identified as "sentimentality", but is perceived to be an act of love by the recipient. While in general the sociopath is narcissistic and unempathic, there are dozens of examples where a criminal sociopath performs an act of service to another out of compassion. For example, at Lorton Prison, a group of prisoners established a fund to help a one and a half year old baby abandoned in freezing weather on a doorstep (Inmates Help, 1973). Sociopaths are capable of showing compassion to the handicapped, the underprivileged, and anyone who is helpless.

This apparent paradox has been examined by Yochelson and Samenow (1976) who reviewed hundreds of case studies. They found that the nature of sentimentality is very transient, and very compartmentalized in the mind of the sociopath. In fact, sentimentality frequently coexists temporarily with exploitation. For example, a sociopath (i.e. criminal) in a moment of pity can give a dollar to a beggar, and rob him later. Or, he can help an elderly lady across the street on the way to an equally unknown

elderly lady's house to rob and steal. What sentimentality there is, it is not consistent or pervasive enough to prevent extremely self-serving predatory acts. What is the motive for these apparently loving compassionate behaviors which are inconsistent with the sociopath's general unempathic predatory style? In the view of Yochelson and Samenow (1976), a "sentimental" act is not for the receiving person, but to build up an opinion for the sociopath that he is actually a good person, which gives him permission to continue antisocial behavior and avoid serious behavior changing self-confrontation. Love as a non-sociopathic Christian may experience it is something which looks out for the needs of others, is trusting, seems to require empathy, and an ability to form close emotional ties. However, the sociopath would appear very handicapped in performance of Christian love given his inability to empathize or feel genuine compassion as a pervasive consistent emotion.

A second religious theme worth consideration is the experience and theology of guilt and forgiveness. If conceptions of sociopathy are applied to religious experience of guilt and forgiveness, one at once may wonder why forgiveness may be related to the

sociopath's religious experience. The criminal sociopath would not feel a violation of internal values and, therefore, experiences a low level of genuine guilt (Cleckley, 1955). He might be sorry for performing a crime because he is now being punished, but has little feeling for how the crime has impacted the victim. Neither would he feel guilty as a result of inward pain derived from the conflict between his internal values of goodness and his own behavior. In one study, 37 of 45 hardened criminals did not consider themselves as bad persons (Cudrin, 1970), an impossible conclusion for a person who violates an internalized value of "good" behavior. Why then would a sociopath pursue a religion (Christianity) which emphasises forgiveness? If one presumes that all sociopaths do not experience high guilt, some other explanation must be sought than one which involves a need to reduce guilt; this study will test this presumption. One reasonable explanation is that the condemnation of society has assaulted his own distorted high view of self, and forgiveness from God offers hope of restoring or maintaining a sense of well-being. If this is the case, the religion could actually act to support his own sociopathy, especially with a hasty focus on God's

unconditional forgiveness. Yochelson & Samenow (1976) have stated:

Religion allows the criminal to cloak himself in respectability. He shows others that he is a good person by observing formalities of religion...all this enhances his own self image. Religious observance and sentiment reinforce his idea that he is basically decent, and this gives him further license for crime. (p. 302)

If the religious sociopath avoids the true hurt inflicted upon the victim, this, of course, is not the fault of the Christian religion, but the sociopath's use of it. Christian conscience offers a sensitivity for injustice, and, due to the just nature of God, Christianity offers compassion for victims of injustice. However, if the individual views himself as the victim of injustice by minimizing his own antisocial behavior, this aspect of the Christian faith will be missed completely and forgiveness will be claimed without the genuine remorse normally experienced by the well adjusted individual.

Can this kind of religious experience be considered that of genuine Christian experience? An answer to this may become evident after a glance at the nature of what the Christian community generally accepts as membership in the church, that is, salvation. Salvation is generally viewed to be offered to all who seek it with no exceptions made. Christ even offered salvation to a thief who was being executed with him (Luke 23:43). Paul notes that although adulterers, thieves, drunkards, et cetera, will not inherit the Kingdom of God, "such were some of you, but you were washed, you were sanctified" (I Corinthians 6:9-11). So salvation has been offered to anyone who seeks it, regardless of past behavior.

Salvation is conceptualized as an instant event in II Corinthians 5:17, "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things have passed away; behold new things have come." Thus one would postulate instant behavior change, something that psychologists do not expect or experience with the sociopath. But behavior change after salvation is also conceptualized as growth process in the New Testament as in the process of putting aside the "old self" and putting on the "new self" (Ephesians 4:22-24). The Apostle Paul

also complained of the difficulty of controlling old behavior patterns with good intentions, "For the good that I wish, I do not do; but I practice the very evil that I do not wish" (Romans 7:19). The concept that behavior changes as a function of growth leaves open the possibility that growth will occur more slowly with some individuals than others. Furthermore, the salvation process must conceptually accommodate individuals who, due to environment or other reasons, have more required change than most to approximate the new behavioral code.

Apparently, God's judgement of the believer rests not with how close he comes to perfections, but how well the believer does with the opportunities and abilities afforded him. A parable in Luke 12:41-48 depicts a slave who knew what was expected and one who did not know: neither met the master's expectations. Jesus depicted a God who was harsh on the knowledgeable and easy on the ignorant. "From everyone to whom much has been given, much shall much be required" (Luke 12:48). With the antisocial personality disorder having incredibly cold and inconsistent parental experiences and possibly physiological abnormalities as probable etiology (see previous discussion), it would appear

that these individuals, like the man in the parable, are at an extreme disadvantage at the outset. Thus, the New Testament leaves open the possibility of being "saved," leaving behavior change to occur as a function of Christian maturity. Salvation, then, is conceptualized from the Protestant Christian's standpoint as an instantaneous event and also as a growth process by which behavior change occurs with maturity in the faith.

How does the New Testament address the possibility of "phonies" in the church? First, the possibility of a person fooling everyone exists, and this charade may even be a shock to the participant himself on judgement day. Jesus taught that a man could be so involved in religious activity that he could perform miracles, and call "Lord, Lord." Jesus's response was "I never knew you, depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness" (Matthew 7:22-23). Secondly, it appears that the responsibility of determining who is "saved" in God's eyes and who is a phony is left to God. In the meanwhile, God permits the genuine believers and the imposters to remain undisturbed together until judgement day as illustrated in the parable of the tares in Matthew 13:24-30. In this parable the workers

ask permission to pull out the weeds (phonies) from among the wheat (genuine believers). The landowner declines and instructs the workers to wait until harvest (Judgment Day) to cull out the tares, so as not to uproot the wheat in the process. Thirdly, the New Testament teaches that the natural outcome of being indwelt by the Spirit of God is Godly behavior and attitudes. If a sociopath, or anyone else wishes to evaluate his own progress, "the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control..."

(Galations 5:22-23). It is made clear that continued "immorality, impurity, sensuality, ..., strife, jealousy, outbursts of anger, ..., drunkenness, carousings and things like these" (Galations 5:19-21) are behavioral indications of a genuine spiritual problem endangering one's position of perceived salvation.

To summarize, the quality of the sociopath's religious experience is by conceptual definition a very different and more limited experience compared to the well-adjusted. Christian doctrine does not exclude him from membership in the Body of Christ on that basis alone, but holds forth hope of genuine change. The

change, if genuine, must eventually evidence itself in behavioral and attitudinal changes. From a theological viewpoint this determination can only be speculative as the final responsibility rests with the Divine. The term "Christian sociopath," then, is not conceptually a psychological nor a theological contradiction, but perhaps more accurately describes either a genuine impostor or a genuinely religious person.

God Concept

God Concept Formation

The formation of the God-concept has been of interest to psychologists for over fifty years. Freud's (1938, 1957) works hypothesize that the male child both loves and fears his father, a conflict which is sourced in the Oedipus complex in which he must compete for the mother's affections . Freud (1938) stated:

Psychoanalytic investigation of the individual teaches with special emphasis that God is in every case modeled after the father, and that our personal relation to God is dependent upon our

relation to our physical father, fluctuating and changing with him, and that God at the bottom is nothing but an exalted father. (pp. 919-920)

Eventually this ambivalence toward the father is transferred to the God-image. Presumably this transference takes place in Freud's view because the child discovered that survival depended upon protection against mysterious powers, thus man created gods whom he both feared and trusted to protect him.

That the God relationship is related to one's paternal image is confirmed somewhat by Vergote's (1969) study. He concluded that the God image is closer to the paternal image than the maternal image in an sample of 180 American students and 178 Belgian students. This has not been a general finding by others however.

Adler's (1924) formulation was "the idea of God...as concretization and interpretation of the human recognition of greatness and perfection" (p. 276). Adler's theory leaves open the possibility that whichever parent is the example of perfection would be the same parent to have the most impact upon the formation of the God image. Although there are other theoretical underpinnings which are capable of

explaining this, the general research trend confirms that the preferred parental image correlates positively with the God concept.

Nelson and Jones (1957) were the first to use a Q-sort technique to research the parent/God concept relationship. This study using only 16 protestant subjects found a high correlation of maternal and God images. Nelson used a much larger sample of 37 men and 47 women in a 1981 study using the same Q-sort techniques and referring to his 1957 research as a "pilot study". He found that when there was no preferred parent, the God/father and God/mother correlations were equal, but when there was a preferred parent indicated, the God-concept and preferred parent correlated significantly higher than the God-concept and non-preferred parent, regardless of the subject's sex. This preferred parent/God concept relationship he took to support Adlerian theory.

The Nelson-Jones Q-sort technique was also used by Strunk (1959) and Godin and Hallez (1964). Strunk found that both the concepts of father and mother were significantly correlated with the concept of God. Catholic Father Andre Godin and Monique Hallez (1964) translated the Q-sort into French for 30 men and 40

women in Belgium. They reported that in general the correlations of the God concept were "stronger and more frequent with the maternal image among men, and the paternal image among women" (pp. 102-103). They also reported that when there is a preferred parent indicated the God concept correlated highly with the preferred parent concept.

Although there is some disagreement as to which parent has the most influence, the research cited above supports the notion that the God concept is formed in relation to parent-child relationships, and that the person's perceptions of his parents is related to the person's perception of God.

God Concept and Self-Concept

Recently, self-concept has been found to correlate with God concept by several researchers. The primary impetus for this research was in response to the work of Benson and Spilka (1973). They hypothesized that self-concept, specifically self-esteem, would be directly related to God images based upon cognitive consistency theory. This theory states that a person experiences dissonance when one perceives that others, God included, have a view of this person which is

contrary to the view this person has of him or herself. Thus, "a theology predicated on a loving, accepting God is cognitively compatible with high self-esteem, but would be a source of discomfort for a believer low in self-esteem" (p. 298). Using a highly homogeneous sample, 128 Catholic high school boys were given half of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Scale and a semantic differential scale to measure loving and controlling God images. (They also hypothesized a controlling God image would correspond to an external locus of control but this did not correlate). A loving God score was obtained from semantics such as rejecting-accepting, loving-hating, unforgiving-forgiving. Other God image measures were derived from a Q-sort. Benson and Spilka found that when self-esteem was high, God concepts were that of a loving, accepting, personal and forgiving God. When self-esteem was low, God was perceived as being vindictive, restricting, impersonal and controlling.

This research has led to other attempts to correlate God and self-concepts in other populations and using other instruments. No relationship between God concept and self-concept has been found with children (Ahrendt, 1975; Williams, 1975). However, a

God and self-image correlation was found in male alcoholics who evaluated themselves and God as good or bad along social, emotional and moral dimensions (Hearon, 1977). Psychiatric patients viewed themselves to be much less similar to God than non-patients (Morgan, 1979).

Corzo (1981) studied God, self and also parent concepts among a Christian and non-Christian psychiatric population, but limited the study to 128 non-psychotic depressives. She found that depressives were higher in self devaluating and self punitive qualities than nonpatients. She also found that the self-concept of the depressive was significantly less identified with parents and God concepts than nonpatients. Surprisingly, this pattern was true for Christian patients and nonpatients only, but among non-Christians there were no significant relationships present among these variables. She concludes from this that religious orientation variables must be considered when choosing subjects in research which measures concepts of self and significant others.

The importance of the religious component in self and God concept research also seems to be emphasized by the fact that in research with non-psychiatric adults

which found a significant relationship between God and self-concepts, three out of four studies disqualified the subject if he did not consider religion to be personally important, and three of four studies employed subjects from religious settings (Benson & Spilka, 1973; Bixler, 1979; Luther, 1980). The one exception is the male alcoholic study (Hearon, 1977), but a case could be made that God was important to these men when considering the emphasis placed upon power from "God as you know Him" in most alcohol and drug rehabilitation treatment.

The only study which did not find significant correlations between God concept and self-concept did not control for religious commitment and was in a setting generally unresponsive to religion (Jolley, 1975). Jolley studied inmates who when asked if they had ever felt close to God or a divine source, 69 percent checked "no", or "undecided", even though most "believed in God". Although the data were apparently available, Jolley, unfortunately, did not analyze that data to compare those inmates who were more religiously committed to those who were not so inclined. If he had done so, it is possible that those inmates with higher religious identification had a significant relationship

between God concept and self-concept. This speculation seems reasonable considering the research findings of Corzo (1981) wherein God concept and self-concept was related for religious but not related for non-religious persons. Also, the God concept and self-concept relationship has been established primarily among religious subjects and conversely not found in Jolley's (1975) study which did not analyze for religious involvement. These findings seem to support the notion that religious orientation is a discriminating variable when measuring God concept and self-concept relationships.

God Concept and Prison Population

Studies of how a person thinks about or describes God, or God concept, contributes to a large body of research which explores the quality of religious life. As discussed, how these concepts of God emerge has also been linked to the early parent-child relationship and the self-concept as well. Because of the nature of the typical early childhood experiences found with the sociopath, these studies become of interest in the present study because of their predictive value for the sociopath's God concept. Although there has been

virtually no research which has attempted to measure the sociopath's concept of God, there have been studies which examine the inmate population of state penitentiaries. Because the prison population typically has a high representation of sociopathic personalities (Guze et al., 1969), it is relevant to report these findings with regard to God concept.

In the earliest study, Wenger (1945) asked one thousand prisoners at Southern Michigan State Prison one question: "What does God mean to you"? Thirty five percent expressed no idea of God (i.e. "I don't know" or "someone I heard about"). Forty two percent expressed the idea of God as a Supreme Being, and 20 percent confused God and Jesus. Wenger (1945) summarized responses of those who answered in the Supreme Being category as, "God is to be feared and worshipped."

Jolley (1975), in a more elaborate study, found that a large portion of the inmate population was undecided about God's description even when it recognized His existence. Jolley's study used a semantic differential technique so the response was not totally generated by the inmate as in Wenger's (1945) study. Jolley summarized the conglomerate descriptions

to be, "God, whatever He is like, should be recognized, and He should be worshipped by private devotion and doing good to others" (p. 80). Jolley also noted that frequently an inmate could feel in harmony with God and therefore not be threatened by a condemning God. Conversely, he noted that a person could profess beliefs and practices, but not feel in harmony with God, therefore God is to be feared. In Jolley's study the "harmony with God" variable was suspected to cause some additional complexity to one's God concept but was uncontrolled.

Spiritual Well-Being

Another concept which offers insight into the quality of religious experience is spiritual well-being. The concept itself is an outgrowth of life satisfaction research in the tradition of Bradburn (1969), and Campbell (1976, 1981). Campbell proposed that life satisfaction depends upon meeting three types of need: need for having, need for relating, and need for being. Ellison (1983) proposed a fourth need which he termed "need for transcendence". In essence, this refers the "sense of well-being that we experience when we find purposes to commit ourselves to which involve

ultimate meaning for life. It refers to a non-physical dimension of awareness which can best be described as spiritual" (p. 330). Spiritual well-being has been defined by the National Interfaith Coalition on Aging (1975). "Spiritual well-being is the affirmation of life in a relationship with God, self, community and environment which nurtures and celebrates wholeness" (p. 1). This definition is vague but points to the general interest in this concept and the need for more precision.

Moberg (1971) conceptualized spiritual well-being having two dimensions, vertical and horizontal. The vertical dimension refers to a sense of well-being in relation to God. The horizontal dimension refers to a sense of well-being derived from a purpose of life.

Ellison (1983) supports Moberg's (1971) view and further conceptualizes spiritual well-being as being something describing spiritual health, an expression of health but not identical to it. Further, Ellison (1983) notes that the concept is not dichotomous, that is, either present or absent. Rather, it is something which is a matter of degree which reflects the notion that spiritual well-being is pervasive throughout humankind.

To measure spiritual well-being, Paloutzian and Ellison (1979) developed a Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWB). To those who argue that spiritual well-being is impossible to operationalize, Ellison (1983) argues that it has the same validity problem which is involved in any phenomenon which cannot be directly observed, which puts spiritual well-being into the same category as emotion, intelligence, attitudes, et cetera. The scale is multidimensional and taps two factors. One is on relation to God and the other is a sense of purpose and life satisfaction. The scale itself is described further in chapter 2.

Research in the area of spiritual well-being has included many psycho-social factors. More directly to the point of this study are high positive correlations with self-esteem (Marto, 1983; Campise, Ellison & Kinsmen, 1979). Other research indicates positive correlation of spiritual well-being with other indices of quality of spiritual experience. Ellison and Economos (1981) correlated the SWB scale to religious beliefs and practices "which encourage a sense of personal acceptance by an intimate, positive communion with God and others in the Christian community" (Ellison, 1983, p. 336). These correlates include

doctrinal beliefs, devotional practices and worship styles. Spiritual well-being was correlated positively to a person's self evaluation of God's acceptance as well (Ellison & Economos, 1981).

In another study, SWB positively correlated with intrinsic religious orientation (Ellison & Paloutzian, 1979). The Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale was devised by Allport and Ross (1967) to determine the degree of internal motivation in membership to religious groups. (As this instrument is also used in this study, further discussion is found in chapter 2.) Spiritual well-being, then, may be conceptually very useful in describing the quality of religious experience in the sociopath.

Religious/Non-Religious Assumptions

Some authors have assumed that any ideas about God are "religious" and, therefore, everyone is religious to some degree or another. Some have even accepted a definition of religion so general that it precludes the need for a supernatural (e.g. Jolley, 1975). For the purposes of the present study the notion that everyone is religious by degree is not acceptable, as the comparison of "religious" and "non-religious" persons

would indicate. This is not an effort to compare religious beliefs primarily, but to compare religious experience. Malony (1981) has set a theoretical framework for the presence of religious experience using the stimulus response model:

All three components (the S, the O, and the R) are necessary for an "experience" to occur. Just an S-O perceptual attitude event is not enough. A response (R) must result to complete the approach. Nor will a response be called an experience if it is not grounded in an S-O occurrence. In religious terms, revelation, faith, and work go together. (p. 333)

For the purposes of this study then, the "religious" person has 1) a component of religious belief, specifically Christian beliefs, 2) some degree of relatedness to the Christian God, indicated by a self report of having been "saved," and 3) a current behavioral response to the belief and relationship as manifested by attendance of worship meetings. The specifics of these qualifications as applied to the present sample are delineated in chapter 2.

Hypotheses Stated

This study comparing religious and non-religious sociopaths on several personality and religious variables examines the following hypotheses. Significance will be at the $p < .05$ level.

Hypothesis 1: Guilt

Christian sociopaths will have a significantly higher sensitivity to guilt than non-religious sociopaths as measured by the Mosher Guilt Scale (Mosher, 1966).

Hypothesis 2: Self-concept

(a) Christian sociopaths will have significantly higher self-concept than non-religious sociopaths as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Total Positive Scale (Fitts, 1965) and each of the following subscales: identity, behavior, self-satisfaction, moral/ethical self, personal self, family self, social self, and physical self.

(b) Self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Total Positive Scale (Fitts, 1965) will be

positively related to loving God concept as measured by the God Concept Scale and the Loving God Concept subscale (Benson & Spilka, 1973).

(c) Self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Total Positive Scale (Fitts, 1965) will be positively related to spiritual well-being as measured by the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1979) in Christian sociopaths.

Hypothesis 3: Locus of Control

(a) Christian sociopaths will have significantly more internal locus of control than non-religious sociopaths as measured by the Rotter Internal/External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966).

(b) There will be a positive relationship between spiritual well-being (existential) and internal locus of control in both the religious and non-religious sociopaths.

(c) There will be a positive relationship between external locus of control and controlling God concept in both the religious and non-religious sociopaths.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the subjects and how they were selected for the study; the second section describes the study method and procedures; and the third section is a review of the measures used.

Subjects

This study was conducted from January 1985 to April 1985. The subjects were 52 male anti-social personality disordered inmates at Oregon State Penitentiary in Salem, Oregon. The subjects consisted of 27 Christian sociopaths and 25 non-religious sociopaths. The rationale for using inmates is the high availability of persons with anti-social personality disorder (estimates are as high as 80 percent of prison populations [Guze et al., 1969]). The average age of the subjects was 34 years, with primarily skilled and unskilled blue collar trade prior to imprisonment. All of the subjects were male, and race was predominately caucasian except for three

Table 1

Selection and Testing Procedure

A. CHRISTIAN GROUP	A. NON-RELIGIOUS GROUP
Group selection:	Group selection:
Christian clubs	General prison
chapel attendance	population not
rosters	listed on any
	religious roster
B. SOCIOPATHY ESTABLISHED?	B. SOCIOPATHY ESTABLISHED?
C. INTERVIEW:	C. INTERVIEW:
1. Consent to	1. Consent to
participate?	participate?
2. Religious Opinion	2. Religious Opinion
3. Questionnaire given	3. Questionnaire given
4. Christian belief	4. No religious
established?	claim affirmed?
D. TEST BATTERY	D. TEST BATTERY
ADMINISTERED	ADMINISTERED

blacks (one black in the Christian group and two in the non-religious group). All of the subjects had been imprisoned at least six months.

The method by which Christian and non-religious sociopaths were selected is shown in Table 1. The prospective "Christian" subjects were initially selected from attendance and membership lists of Christian clubs, Bible studies, and chapel meetings. Names were randomly selected from this list until 27 inmates qualified for this group. Sociopathy was determined by the prison psychology department from previous diagnosis in psychological or psychiatric evaluations and case histories. If no previous diagnosis was present in the records, sociopathy was determined from records and/or department diagnosis of the subject using the criteria provided by Cleckley (1955) listed in chapter One. Any subject with a known I.Q. of 85 or less was excluded.

To be considered "Christian", the subject must have attended religious meetings at least twice per month for the previous two months; this was determined by prison "call out" sheets and confirmed by self report. On the "Religious Opinion Questionnaire" he must also consider himself to be a Christian and score

at three of four points on a modified Orthodoxy Index from Glock and Stark's Dimensions of Religious Commitment Questionnaire (1966). This index is part of the Religious Opinion Questionnaire and is shown in Appendix I. He also must agree to participate in the study. If any of these conditions were not met, the personality and religious experience test batteries were not administered and the person was not included in the study.

The non-religious subjects were selected randomly from the larger prison population. Sociopathy was determined in the same way described above for the "Christian" subjects. Non-religious status was established first by non-attendance at any religious functions, and by interview in which the subject must have scored two or less on the above mentioned modified Orthodoxy Index. The subject may have answered either "yes" or "no" to whether or not he is a Christian to qualify in this non-religious category. The subject must also have agreed to participate in the study. If any of these conditions were not met, the test battery was not administered and the subject was not included in the study.

Procedure

Once a list of prospective non-religious and Christian inmates who had been diagnosed sociopathic was compiled, they were called out one at a time to the conference area. The interviewer (the author) invited the subject into the office cubicle and introduced himself as a student wishing to do research and that he was not associated with the prison in any official way. He explained that the research involved personal opinions about religious beliefs and other subjects and was conducted by use of questionnaires. It was further stated that the subject was not required to participate in the study, that the questionnaire would only take a total of 60 to 90 minutes, and that all his responses were guaranteed to be confidential. The interviewer said the same thing to each subject memorized from a text provided in Appendix B.

If the inmate agreed to participate, he was given the Biographical Data and Religious Opinion Questionnaire, which he filled out in about five minutes out in the hall. (Some made appointments to return if they did not have time.) The inmate then returned to the office cubicle and the examiner looked

the responses over to see whether all answers were completed and to make sure the consent-to-participate form was signed. At a glance the examiner determined whether the inmate was qualified for the predicted non-religious or Christian group by checking the Orthodoxy Index questions (items 4, 5, 6 and 7), the attendance question (item two) and question eight, which asks if the inmate claims to be a Christian. If the inmate was scored as non-religious (two or less) on the "Orthodoxy Index" and yet attended religious functions more than twice per month, the inmate was not asked to participate further in the study; if the inmate scored "religious" (score of three or four) on the Orthodoxy Index but did not attend two or more religious functions per month then the inmate was not asked to participate in the study.

The inmate was then given the test battery packet which included the following personality tests and religious experience questionnaires: Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1964), the Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Inventory (Mosher, 1966), the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966), God Concept Semantic Differential Scale (Benson & Spilka, 1973), the Spiritual Well-Being

Inventory (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982), and the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (Allport & Ross, 1967).

They were instructed how to take the test by explaining the content on the Mosher face sheet to cover for both the MGS and the Rotter I/E scale since they are both "forced choice". The brief instructions written on each questionnaire were explained. The TSCS was then explained according to the TSCS manual. The Christian and non-religious inmate were given identical packets with the exception that only the Christian group's packet contained an additional scale, the I/E Religious Orientation Scale. The inmate was then directed to a quiet conference room, or the hall if the conference room was unavailable. When the battery was completed the inmate was thanked for his help and dismissed in a friendly manner.

Description of Criterion Measures

The Orthodoxy Index (Glock & Stark, 1966)

This scale was devised by Glock and Stark in 1966 as a subscale in the Dimensions of Religious Commitment

scale. They proposed that religious commitment had four dimensions: belief, practice, experience, and knowledge. They then devised their scale to measure these four aspects of religiosity. While these dimensions were found to be essentially separate (uncorrelated), Glock and Stark's investigations found that belief was the best predictor of all other aspects of religiosity. This implies that belief is the most significant component of religiosity. Therefore, the Orthodoxy Index was employed in this study as a measure of religious belief and as a measure of general religiosity.

The Orthodoxy Index itself has only four questions. In this study it was placed in the "Religious Opinion Questionnaire" as items four through seven. It is scored by giving one point for each of these four questions on which the respondent expressed his certainty of the most orthodox Christian position (4a, 5a, 6d, and 7a). Any other answer is scored zero, thus the Orthodoxy Index score has a possible range of zero to four.

Reliability is not well-substantiated for this scale. Validity is supported by a correlation of orthodoxy scores with other items designed to measure

the same belief dimension. Patterns of belief for individual scores were comparable with denominational ties. Unitarians would be predicted to be low in orthodoxy and Southern Baptist should be high, and this expectation was substantiated by Glock and Stark (1966). Furthermore, Glock and Stark's study demonstrated that other attitudes and behaviors could be predicted from positions on these dimensions.

The Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Scale (MGS) (Mosher, 1966)

The Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Scale was devised to measure "trait guilt." That is guilt which acts as a personality predisposition to inhibit improper behavior rather than feelings a person has following a violation of his moral standards ("state guilt"). This is based upon the theoretical assumptions of Freud (1930) in which guilt and fear are central constructs in developing internalized moral standards.

The scale itself consists of 79 forced choice items designed to measure three types of guilt: sex guilt (MSG), morality/conscience guilt (MCG), and hostility guilt (MHG). A newer simpler present-absent (0,1) system was used to score the test instead of the original more time consuming weighted scheme developed

by Mosher. This was proposed by O'Grady and Janda (1979) and correlates with the original scoring method in excess of .99 on each scale. This procedure has the advantage of comparing results to more recent norms, but also has the disadvantage of incompatibility with norms scored by the older method. It was also the only scoring method made available to the researcher by Donald Mosher.

Persons' (1970) research describes the MGS as "reliable and has shown convergent, discriminant and construct validity." While reliability co-efficients were not provided, Persons offered several research findings which support construct validity. For example, guilt was positively correlated with MMPI subscales associated with inhibition and negatively correlated with those associated with acting out (Mosher & Oliver, 1968; Persons, 1970). Persons (1970) also found that the MHG was correlated highly with violent crime and the MSG was negatively correlated with sex offenses. Another study (Persons & Marks, 1971) found that the MGS measures both "trait" and "state" guilt. A factor analysis indicates that the Mosher scales have complex factor structure (O'Grady & Janda, 1979). They also report internal consistency K-R

20s=.89, .81, and .80 for MSG, MHG, and MCG respectively for males. Interitem correlations were average (male $r_s = .23, .13, .16$).

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1965)

Self-concept was measured by the TSCS. This instrument consists of 100 items which can be answered one of five ways ranging from completely true (5) to completely false (1). Each choice is scored with a numerical value of one to five and added to its respective category.

There are five categories generated by 90 items. They are physical self, moral/ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self. There is also an overall self-esteem measure level which includes all five categories. The items are balanced evenly for positivity-negativity to avoid response sets. There are also ten items from the MMPI lie scale, making a total of 100 items.

Test-retest reliability over two weeks was .92, from an original sample of 62 people aged 12 to 68. This sample also provides norms contained in the test manual. Convergent validity is supported by a $-.70$ correlation with the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, and

discriminant validity is reported with a weak correlation with the F scale (Robinson and Shaver, 1973). Robinson and Shaver also reported good predictive validity, and after a review of 25 self-concept scales, they rated the TSCS as the first in overall quality.

The Rotter Internal/External Locus of Control Scale (I/E)

(Rotter, 1966)

This scale was intended by Rotter (1966) to measure the degree to which a person perceives the events of his life as contingent upon his own behaviors or his own relatively permanent personal characteristics. If this perception is high, one is said to have an internal locus of control. If one perceives the events of his life as due to factors other than his control, such as fate, chance, or powerful others, then he is said to have an external locus of control.

The I/E has a forced choice format with twenty-three question pairs, each question pair having one internal and one external statement in addition to six filler questions, making it a twenty-nine question test. Scores range from zero (internal) to 23

(external). Norms (n=4,433) are available in Robinson and Shaver (1973).

Robinson and Shaver (1973) also report an internal consistency co-efficient of .70 (n=400). Test-retest reliability was .72 after one month. Convergent validity is supported by several literature reviews (Robinson and Shaver, 1973), and almost half of all internal-external locus of control studies have used the Rotter I/E scale. Correlations with social desirability are as a whole quite low.

The Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWB)

(Paloutzian & Ellison, 1979)

The SWB scale is intended to measure two dimensions of human transcendence. One is the person's sense of well-being in relation to God. The other is one's sense of life purpose with no reference to anything specifically religious (Ellison, 1983). These two dimensions correspond to two subscales of the SWB scale, the Religious Well-Being subscale (RWB), and the Existential Well-Being subscale (EWB) respectively.

The scale itself consists of 20 items responded to on a six point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree with no neutral point. Each item is

scored with a numerical value of one to six. Ten items sum to produce the EWB score and the sum of the remaining ten produce the RWB score. A third score includes all 20 items for the overall Spiritual Well-Being score. A factor analysis reported by Ellison (1983) obtained loadings on one factor by all the RWB items. All existential items loaded on two sub-factors, life direction and life satisfaction (n=206 college students).

Test-retest reliability was very high on all three scales as was internal consistency (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982). The scale seems to have good face validity, and Ellison (1983) reports studies done by others which correlate the SWB to other conceptually related scales such as the Purpose in Life Test, Intrinsic Religious Orientation, and self-esteem. The SWB also correlated negatively with the UCLA Loneliness Scale, a measurement which is conceptually opposed to what the SWB scale measures.

The Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale
(ROS) (Allport & Ross, 1967)

This scale was developed by Allport and Ross (1967) to measure the extent to which religious

motivation comes from either external sources such as social benefits and/or relief from personal problems, or from "internal" sources such as pursuit of more specifically religious meanings. In summarizing the results of a study using the ROS, Luther (1980) considered the ROS to be a measure which indicates the extent to which a person either "has internalized his religious values or merely acts on cues from his religious environment" (p.i.).

The scale itself is comprised of twenty items each responded to with a range of one to five from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Each response is given a corresponding numerical value of 1 - 5 and summed to produce a total score. A high score indicates extrinsic orientation, and a low score indicates intrinsic orientation. However, Robinson and Shaver (1973) recommend scoring two separate subscales which are comprised of the internal (IROS) and external (EROS) questions because they are empirically independent by factor analysis.

Construct validity is supported well by Robinson and Shaver's (1973) literature reviews. EROS has been correlated with racial prejudice while persons with

high IROS scores are lower on prejudice than those with low IROS scores.

The God Concept Semantic Differential Scale (GCS)

(Benson & Spilka, 1973)

The intent of this instrument is to measure a person's concept of who God is and how He is thought of by use of a semantic differential. Each item has two conceptually contrary objectives at opposite ends of seven points. A response requires circling one point near the word which best describes one idea of God. The option of several points allows a response to correspond to how strongly one feels this word describes God.

These are thirteen items total. Two subscales were devised by Benson and Spilka (1973), one composed of five items for a Loving God scale and the other, a Controlling God scale, was comprised of five items also. In this study the scoring was zero to six on each continuum, with a lower score indicating a more positive total God concept on the GCS, more loving concept on the LGS and a more lenient permissive concept on the GCS. Benson and Spilka (1973)

report scale homogeneity to be .72 for the Loving God scale and .60 for the Controlling God measure.

Religious Opinion Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed for this study to serve two purposes. One purpose was to gather brief data about the inmate religious background, the perceived importance of their relationship to God, and their religious experience. The other purpose was to gather data by which to ascertain whether the inmate qualified for either non-religious or Christian comparison groups. These criterion measures included questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Question 8 confirmed identification with the Christian faith for the Christian group ("Do you consider yourself to be a Christian?"). Questions 4 through 7 contained the Orthodoxy Index described above. Question 2 confirmed that the inmates attendance habits of religious meetings were the same as expected from prison call out sheets. A biographical data sheet along with the consent form was attached to the face of the Religious Opinion Questionnaire.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This chapter is presented in three sections. The first section reports descriptive data which includes general demographic and biographic data from the sample population including religious experience and crimes committed. In the second section the descriptive results for each scale administered in the study are reported. The third section reports the results concerning the three primary hypotheses which predict differences between means on self-concept, guilt, and locus of control measures. The third section also reports the results concerning secondary hypotheses which predict correlations between variables. The significance level for all statistical analysis is at the .05 level. Unless otherwise indicated, t-tests are two tailed.

Biographical DataGeneral Demographics

The average age of the inmates in this study was 34 years. They were primarily caucasian with the exception of three blacks. Fifty-four percent had served six months or more, 23 percent had served more than three years, and 23 percent had served eight years or more. Seventy-nine percent were skilled or unskilled blue collar laborers prior to imprisonment, 13 percent were white collar, and eight percent were unemployed. Sixty-two percent held jobs in the prison, 29 percent were enrolled in college programs, and 10 percent were in the labor pool. The labor pool is a classification for those who are "unassigned", or essentially unemployed in the prison system. These above statistics were nearly identical for each comparison group, and no significant differences were found between the two groups studied.

Twenty-five percent of the total sample were never married, 54 percent were married, and 21 percent were divorced or separated. Present church affiliation was 89 percent Protestant, seven percent "other" and four

percent "none" for the Christian comparison group. The non-religious group had 48 percent "no affiliation", 32 percent Protestant, 4 percent Catholic, 12 percent Jewish, and 4 percent "other."

Religious Beliefs and Experiences

The Religious Opinion Questionnaire showed that a predominance of the total sample (n=52) was raised with a Protestant affiliation (56 percent), 23 percent Catholic, 10 percent other and 12 percent with none. These percentages are roughly the same for both comparison groups (see Table 2).

The responses to other questions were different between the two comparison groups. To the question "Do you think inmates who participate in religious activities are sincere?", the Christian group answered 66 percent "yes", 15 percent "no", and 19 percent "don't know." The non-religious group answered the opposite way with 20 percent "yes", 56 percent "no", 24 percent "don't know." All subjects in the Christian group claimed to be a Christian. This, of course, was required as this was a criterion for being included in the Christian comparison group in the first place. Eleven non-religious subjects also endorsed this claim

Table 2

Sociopaths Responses to Religious OpinionQuestionnaire Reported in Percentages

	Christian (n=27)	Non-religious (n=25)
Religion raised:		
Protestant	59	52
Catholic	15	32
Jewish	0	0
Other	15	4
None	11	12
Are religious others sincere?		
Yes	67	20
No	15	56
Undecided	19	24
Attendance frequency:		
Twice weekly (or more)	56	0
Once weekly	37	0
Monthly once or twice	7	4
Several times yearly	0	20
Hardly ever	0	32
Never	0	4

Note: Table paraphrases questionnaire items.

Table 2 (cont.)

Sociopaths Responses to Religious OpinionQuestionnaire Reported in Percentages

	Christian (n=27)	Non-religious (n=25)
Belief in God:		
Believe, no doubts	100	32
Believe, have doubts	0	28
Sometimes, yes & no	0	4
No God, but higher power	0	20
No God, can't verify	0	8
Don't believe in God	0	4
Other	0	0
Belief in Jesus:		
Son of God, no doubts	100	32
Devine, have doubts	0	24
Great man, not Devine	0	16
Only man	0	8
Doubt he existed	0	16
Other	0	4

Note: Table paraphrases questionnaire items.

Table 2 (cont.)

Sociopaths Responses to Religious OpinionQuestionnaire Reported in Percentages

	Christian (n=27)	Non-religious (n=25)
Bible miracles:		
Not sure they occurred	0	32
Didn't happen	0	4
Happened by natural causes	0	24
Happened as Bible says	100	40
Belief about Devil		
Exists	100	36
Probably exists	0	44
Probably dosn't exist	0	16
Does not exist	0	4

Note: Table paraphrases questionnaire items.

Table 2 (cont.)

Sociopaths Responses to Religious Opinion
Questionnaire Reported in Percentages

	Christian (n=27)	Non-religious (n=25)
Claim to be a Christian?		
Yes	100	44
No	0	56
(If Yes)		
Ethical Christian	15	36
Personal Christian	70	4
Both above	11	0
Have felt close to God, Devine Source		
Yes	93	40
No	0	24
Undeceeded	7	36
Importance of knowing God		
1 (very important)	96	24
2	4	4
3	0	28
4	0	12
5 (not at all important)	0	32

Note: Table paraphrases questionnaire items.

(44 percent). Of these, nine endorsed an "ethical" definition of Christianity, "I respect and attempt to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Christ," and one endorsed a personal definition, "I have received Jesus Christ into my life as my personal Savior and Lord." Of the Christian group 70 percent endorsed ethical Christian, 15 percent endorsed personal Christian, and two subjects endorsed both items although it was against the given directions.

Christian subjects had been "Christian" for an average of 7.8 years, with a range of one to 38 years. The "non-religious" who claimed Christianity claimed to have been "Christian" for an average of 31 years with range of 20 to 38 years. An examination of individual non-religious responses showed that most of these considered their "conversion" to be at birth or shortly after. By comparing time served in prison to time since conversion, it was possible to determine that 17 Christian sociopaths were converted after or just prior to entering prison. Seven other Christian sociopaths were already Christians prior to imprisonment. It was not possible to compute this for three of these subjects because they did not complete the item.

Table 3

The Percentage of Christian and Non-Religious Sociopaths
Who were Convicted of Crimes as Classified

Crime Category	Percentage of Subjects Convicted	
	Christian (N=27)	Non-Religious (N=24)
Class S -Rape, sodomy, sex abuse	44	33
Class M -Murder, attempted murder and manslaughter	44	8
Class R -Robbery, theft, burglary	22	70
Class K -Kidnap	7	4
Class D -Driving while suspended	7	4
Class A -Assault	7	8
Misc. -Other crimes, i.e. "habitual criminal"	3	8

Crimes Committed

An analysis of the crimes committed by each group for comparison purposes was done (see Table 3). For expediency, crimes were classified logically. Rape, sodomy, and sex abuse were grouped as sex crimes category labeled "Class S." Class M included crime which involved the death of another human such as murder, manslaughter, and attempted murder. Attempted murder was included in this class because the intention was murder and frequently the victim was shot or otherwise wounded but just did not happen to die. Class R included theft, robbery, and burglary convictions. The logic in grouping Class R is that in general the crime involved property with a de-emphasis upon violence. Kidnap (Class K), driving while suspended (Class D), assault (Class A) and other miscellaneous were other infrequent classifications that seemed to stand by themselves.

Once the crimes were classified, the Christian and non-religious groups were compared as shown in Table 3. This was done in terms of the percentage of subjects who were convicted of a crime in a certain category. The percentages add to over 100 percent because some

subjects were convicted of more than one crime. Of special interest is that 44 percent of the Christians had been convicted of sex crimes compared to only 33 percent of the non-religious. Further, 44 percent of the Christians had been convicted of murder, attempted murder or manslaughter, compared to only 8 percent of the non-religious. The non-religious had heavy representation by those convicted of robbery, theft, or burglary (70 percent) compared to 22 percent of the Christian sample.

Correspondingly, the Christians were sentenced to more time in prison than the non-religious group. While the average time sentenced for the Christian group was 31 years, the non-religious were sentenced to an average of 23 years. This was not a significant difference. The difficulty in computing this is that life sentences have no numerical value. For purposes of this study, a life sentence was given a 60 year value. Consecutive sentences were added together, but no subject was allowed more than 80 years.

Test Results

Personality Measures

The norms for personality measures employed to measure self-esteem, guilt, and locus of control are reported in this section. While normative data for both Christian and non-religious sociopaths are reported for purposes of comparison, inferential and correlational statistics are reported in the subsequent hypotheses section.

Self-concept. The TSCS Total Positive Scale mean results are reported in Table 4 along with all other TSCS sub-scales. The Total Positive scale is the best overall measure of self-esteem. Means for Christian and non-religious sociopaths were 49.2 (SD=16.1) and 46.4 (SD=10.6) respectively. A score of 50 is the standardized mean for the TSCS on all scales. The three most important sub-scales are Identity, Self-satisfaction, and Behavior. The means for Christian sociopaths were 47.1, 49.2, and 51.2; for non-religious sociopaths the means were 41.4, 52.0, and 43.0 respectively.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Christian
and Non-Religious Sociopaths on the
Tennessee Self-Concept Scales

	Christian (n=26)		Non-religious (n=24)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Total Positive	49.2	16.1	46.4	10.6
Identity	47.1	17.8	41.4	13.9
Self-Satisfaction	49.2	14.1	52.0	10.2
Behavior	51.2	16.3	43.0	11.3
Physical Self	48.0	14.4	48.7	10.6
Moral/Ethical Self	47.3	14.5	41.8	12.3
Personal Self	53.1	16.0	51.0	12.4
Family Self	47.4	17.9	43.8	13.4
Social Self	49.7	14.4	45.6	13.3
Self-Criticism	42.1	10.1	47.7	8.4

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Christian
and Non-Religious Sociopaths on Guilt
and Locus of Control Measures

	Christian (n=27)	Non-Religious (n=25)
Mosher Morality/Conscience Guilt		
Mean	18.1	12.6
S.D.	2.8	5.7
Mosher Hostility Guilt		
Mean	24.46	19.24
S.D.	3.8	7.2
Mosher Sex Guilt		
Mean	22.4	12.28
S.D.	3.5	7.22
Rotter I/E Locus of Control		
Mean	5.6	9.2
S.D.	3.3	3.1

Guilt. Means for the MCG, MHG, and MSG were 18.1, 24.46, and 22.4 respectively for the Christian sociopaths (n=26). Non-religious sociopaths (n=25) obtained means of 12.6, 19.24, and 12.28 for the same scales. These results are shown on Table 5.

Locus of control. Results for the Rotter I/E Locus of Control Scale are reported on Table 5. The mean for Christian sociopaths was 5.6 compared to 9.2 for non-religious sociopaths.

Religious Quality Measures

The results of the measures employed to measure the quality of religious experience are reported in this section. While the purpose of this portion of the research was not to compare the religious experience of Christian to non-religious sociopaths, t-tests were nevertheless performed for the purposes of thorough statistical analysis. Of primary import is the gathering of norms for this subgroup of the Christian community and subgroup of the sociopathic population for possible use in future research.

God-concept. The Total God Concept Scale results, along with Loving God and Controlling God concept sub-scales are reported in Table 6. The means for the

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for Christian
and Non-Religious Sociopaths on
Religious Quality Measures

	Christian		Non-Religious	
	(N=27)		(N=25)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Total God Concept	17.2	5.4	31.5	13.9
Loving God Concept	1.9	2.4	9.3	6.9
Controlling God Concept	14.2	4.2	16.0	7.2
Spiritual Well Being	101.2	13.5	76.3	16.3
Religious Well Being	51.1	10.4	35.6	9.2
Existential Well Being	50.1	10.4	40.7	9.2
Religious Orientation I/E	43.1	7.2	--	--
Intrinsic Religious Or.	17.3	4.3	--	--
Extrinsic Religious Or.	26.0	6.7	--	--

GSC, LGS, and CGS were 17.2, 1.8, 14.1 respectively for the Christian group (n=27) and 31.5, 9.3, 16.0 for the non-religious group (n=22). There was no difference between the two groups' concepts regarding the restrictive or controlling nature of God. The Christians, however, saw God as much more loving, and generally more positive than the non-religious group. Non-religious sociopaths, however, did view God in a fairly positive light with a mean of 31.5 relative to a possible negative score of 91 on the Total God Concept Scale.

Spiritual well-being. The Spiritual Well-Being Scale results along with the EWB and RWB subscales are reported in Table 6. The means for the SWB, EWB, and RWB were 101.2, 50.1, 51.1 respectively for the Christian group (n=27) and 76.3, 40.7, 35.6 for the non-religious group (n=25). Not surprisingly the Christian sociopaths scored significantly higher than the non-religious sociopaths on the Religious Well-Being scale. However, the Christians also scored higher ($p < .001$) than non-religious on the Existential Well-Being scale, a scale containing items which make no direct religious references. This also indicates that the Christian sociopaths report a stronger sense of well-being,

purpose in life, and inner direction than the non-religious sociopaths.

Religious orientation (intrinsic/extrinsic). The ROS was administered only to the Christian group (n=26). The mean for the ROSIE was 43.1 with a SD of 6.7. The IROS mean was 17.2 with a SD of 4.3. The mean for the EROS was 26 with a SD of 6.7. The EROS did not correlate with any other scale in the study. However, the IROS correlated at a significant level with spiritual well being, sex guilt, and every self concept scale. The IROS also correlated highly with CGS, so the more intrinsic the subject's religious orientation was, the more permissive was his concept of God (see Table 8).

Using Allport & Ross' formulations (1967), it was possible to classify responses as "extrinsic," "intrinsic," and "indiscriminately pro-religious." In our sample of 26 Christian inmates, 38% (n=10) were extrinsic, 27% (n=7) were intrinsic, 35% (n=9) were indiscriminately pro-religious.

Hypotheses Results

Primary Hypotheses

Guilt (H1). This hypothesis stated that Christian sociopaths would have higher guilt than the non-religious sociopaths as measured by the Mosher Guilt Scales. A one-tailed t-test for the differences between means confirms this hypothesis, as Christian sociopaths scored higher than the non-religious sociopaths on the Morality-Conscience Guilt Scale ($t=4.38$; $d.f.=49$; $p<.001$), on the Hostility Guilt Scale ($t=3.21$; $d.f.=36.16$; $p<.01$), as well as the Sex Guilt Scale ($t=6.32$; $d.f.=34.62$; $p<.001$). Means are shown on Table 5.

Self-concept (H2a). This hypothesis stated that Christian sociopaths will have significantly higher self-esteem as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Total Positive Scale and on eight sub-scales including Identity, Self-Satisfaction, Behavior, Physical Self, Moral Ethical Self, Personal Self, Family Self, and Social Self. This hypothesis was not supported on the Total Positive Scale, the most comprehensive and important of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scales.

However, Christian sociopaths scored significantly higher than non-religious sociopaths on the Behavior Scale ($t=2.05$; $d.f.=48$; $p<.05$), which indicated how a person perceives his own behavior or the way he functions in the present. The score comes from 30 questions which say "This is the way I act" or "This is what I do."

There was no significant difference between groups on any of the other above mentioned Tennessee Self-Concept Scales. Means are reported on Table 4. The Christian group scored significantly lower than the non-religious group ($t=-2.2$; $d.f.=48$; $p<.05$) on the Self-Criticism Scale.

Locus of control (H3a). This hypothesis stated that Christian sociopaths would have significantly more internal locus of control than non-religious sociopaths as measured by the Rotter I/E Locus of Control Scale. This hypothesis was confirmed ($t=-4.13$; $d.f.=50$; $p<.001$). Means are reported on Table 5.

Secondary Hypothesis

Self-concept and God-concept (H2b). This hypothesis stated that self-concept (TSCS Total Positive) would be positively related to God-concept as

Table 7

Correlations of Self-Esteem with Selected
Religious Measures Reporting Christian and
Non-Religious Sociopaths Separately

Religious Measures	TSCS Total Positive	
	Christian (N=27)	Non-Religious (N=25)
Total God Concept ¹	-.35*	-.56*
Controlling God Concept	-.48**	-.33
Loving God Concept ¹	-.05	-.32
Spiritual Well-Being	.55**	.58***
Existential Well-Being	.33*	.51**
Religious Well-Being	-.03	.50**
Religious Orientation I/E ²	-.33*	--
Intrinsic Religious Orient. ²	-.61***	--
Extrinsic Religious Orient. ²	.03	--

¹The lower the score, the more positive
is one's God concept

²The lower the score, the more intrinsic
is religious orientation

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

measured by the Total God-Concept Scale and the Loving God-Concept Subscale. This hypothesis was confirmed when Total God-Concept was correlated with TSCS Total Positive for Christians ($r=-.35$; $n=27$; $p<.05$) as well as for non-religious ($r=-.56$; $n=25$; $p<.01$). (A low Total God-Concept score indicates a positive God concept, hence a negative correlation.) The loving God (LGS) was not significantly correlated with TSCS Total Positive for either group. Controlling God (CGS) was significantly correlated with self-esteem ($r=-.48$; $n=27$; $p>.01$) in the negative direction for the Christian sociopathy. Correlations are reported in Table 7.

Self-concept and spiritual well-being (H2c). This hypothesis stated that self-concept would be related to the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWB) for Christian sociopaths. No hypothesis was made for non-religious sociopaths. Overall self-concept was measured by the TSCS Total Positive Scale. This hypothesis was confirmed (see Table 7) as self-concept unexpectedly correlated with spiritual well-being for both Christian ($r=.55$; $n=27$; $p<.01$) and non-religious sociopaths ($r=.58$; $n=25$; $p<.001$). Self-concept correlated highly with SWB subscales Existential Well-Being (EWB)

Table 8

A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measuresfor Total Sociopath Population Sample (n=52)

	11	12	13	14
1 Ttl. Positive TSCS	-.27*	.19	.26*	.34**
2 Identity TSCS	-.25*	.22	.29*	.33**
3 Self-Satis. TSCS	-.13	-.03	.07	.11
4 Behavior TSCS	-.43***	.29*	.39**	.41**
5 Physical TSCS	-.15	.10	.10	.31*
6 Moral/Ethical TSCS	-.29*	.22	.31*	.28*
7 Personal TSCS	-.20	.04	.08	.24
8 Family TSCS	-.23*	.16	.32*	.24*
9 Social TSCS	-.31*	.14	.25*	.28*
10 Self-Criticism TSCS	.29*	-.24*	-.40**	-.28*

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8 (Cont.)

A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measures
for Total Sociopath Population Sample (n=52)

	11	12	13	14
11 Rotter I/E		-.35**	-.45***	-.38**
12 Mosher M/C Guilt			.71***	.79***
13 Mosher Sex Guilt				.63***
14 Mosher Hostility Guilt				
15 Loving God Concept				
16 Controlling God Concept				
17 Total God Concept				
18 Religious Well-Being				
19 Existential Well-Being				
20 Spiritual Well-Being				
21 Intrinsic Religious Orient. ¹				
22 Extrinsic Religious Orient. ¹				
23 I/E Religious Orient. ¹				

¹Christian Sociopaths Only n=26

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8 (Cont.)

A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measuresfor Total Sociopath Population Sample (n=52)

	15	16	17	18
1 Total Positive TSCS	-.20	-.37**	-.38**	.18
2 Identity TSCS	-.27*	-.31*	-.38**	.20
3 Self-Satis. TSCS	-.04	-.28*	-.20	.08
4 Behavior TSCS	-.27*	-.43***	-.49***	.24*
5 Physical TSCS	-.06	-.30*	.21	.12
6 Moral/Ethical TSCS	-.28*	-.42*	-.46***	.20
7 Personal TSCS	-.11	-.33*	-.33**	.09
8 Family TSCS	-.32*	-.39**	-.41**	.15
9 Social TSCS	-.09	-.26*	-.53**	.20
10 Self-Criticism TSCS	.37**	.23	.32*	-.29*

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8 (Cont.)

A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measures
for Total Sociopath Population Sample (n=52)

	15	16	17	18
11 Rotter I/E	.43***	.22	.48***	-.46***
12 Mosher M/C Guilt	-.31*	-.18	-.35**	.36**
13 Mosher Sex Guilt	-.56***	-.20	-.51***	.50***
14 Mosher Hostl. Glt.	-.26*	-.20	-.27*	.27*
15 Loving God Concept		.25*	.76***	-.50***
16 Controlling God Concept			.67***	-.23*
17 Total God Concept				-.64***
18 Religious Well-Being				
19 Existential Well-Being				
20 Spiritual Well-Being				
21 Intrinsic Religious Orient. ¹				
22 Extrinsic Religious Orient. ¹				
23 I/E Religious Orient. ¹				

¹Christian Sociopaths Only n=26

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8 (Cont.)

A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measures
for Total Sociopath Population Sample (n=52)

	19	20	21
1 Total Positive TSCS	.39**	.44***	-.61***
2 Identity TSCS	.41***	.47***	-.57***
3 Self-Satisfaction TSCS	.38**	.25*	-.51**
4 Behavior TSCS	.39**	.55***	-.56**
5 Physical TSCS	.28*	.35**	-.37*
6 Moral/Ethical TSCS	.40*	.38**	-.45*
7 Personal TSCS	.34**	.31**	-.61***
8 Family TSCS	.42***	.43***	-.61***
9 Social TSCS	.33**	.39**	-.53**
10 Self-Criticism TSCS	-.34**	-.48***	.38*

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8 (Cont.)

A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measures
for Total Sociopath Population Sample (n=52)

	19	20	21
11 Rotter I/E	-.41***	-.60***	.28
12 Mosher M/C Guilt	.35**	.49***	-.05
13 Mosher Sex Guilt	.48***	.66***	-.49**
14 Mosher Hostility Guilt	.29*	.40**	-.31
15 Loving God Concept	-.50***	.65***	-.14
16 Controlling God Concept	-.49***	.46***	.43*
17 Total God Concept	-.64***	-.79***	.30
18 Religious Well-Being	.62***	.78***	-.10
19 Existential Well-Being		.80***	-.27
20 Spiritual Well-Being			-.60***
21 Intrinsic Religious Orient. ¹			
22 Extrinsic Religious Orient. ¹			
23 I/E Religious Orient. ¹			

¹Christian Sociopaths Only n=26

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8 (Cont.)

A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measures
for Total Sociopath Population Sample (n=52)

	22	23
1 Total Positive TSCS	.03	-.33
2 Identity TSCS	.003	-.34*
3 Self-Satisfaction TSCS	.19	-.13
4 Behavior TSCS	-.15	-.46**
5 Physical TSCS	-.17	-.39*
6 Moral/Ethical TSCS	.04	-.23
7 Personal TSCS	.17	-.19
8 Family TSCS	.07	-.30
9 Social TSCS	-.005	.32
10 Self-Criticism TSCS	-.03	.20

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8 (Cont.)

A Correlational Matrix of Criterion Measures
for Total Sociopath Population Sample (n=52)

	22	23
11 Rotter I/E	.15	.31
12 Mosher M/C Guilt	-.13	-.15
13 Mosher Sex Guilt	-.04	-.33
14 Mosher Hostility Guilt	.13	-.08
15 Loving God Concept	.32	.17
16 Controlling God Concept	.16	.40*
17 Total God Concept	.22	.37*
18 Religious Well-Being	.22	.13
19 Existential Well-Being	.001	-.16
20 Spiritual Well-Being	-.09	-.45*
21 Intrinsic Religious Orient. ¹	-.20	.41*
22 Extrinsic Religious Orient. ¹		.81***
23 I/E Religious Orient. ¹		

¹Christian Sociopaths Only n=26

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

($r=.51$; $n=25$; $p<.01$) and Religious Well-Being (RWB) ($r=.50$; $n=25$; $p<.01$) for non-religious sociopaths. For Christian sociopaths, self-esteem was related to existential well-being $r=.33$; $n=27$; $p<.05$], but self-concept was not related to religious well-being. Apparently the Christians endorsed religious well-being items on the SWB scale regardless of self-concept.

Locus of control and spiritual well-being (H3b).

This hypothesis is states that there would be a positive relationship between internal locus of control as measured by the Rotter I/E scale and spiritual well-being, specifically the EWB. This hypothesis was confirmed where internal locus was correlated with existential well-being ($r=-.41$; $n=52$; $p<.001$) (see Table 8). Internal locus of control was also highly correlated with religious well-being ($r=-.46$; $n=52$; $p<.001$) as well as overall spiritual well-being ($r=-.60$; $n=52$; $p<.001$). An internal locus is indicated by a low I/E score, hence negative correlations.

Locus of control and God-concept (H3c). This hypothesis stated that external locus of control and a controlling God concept would be related. This hypothesis was not confirmed (see Table 8). However, Loving God-Concept (LGC) was highly correlated with

internal locus of control ($r=.43$; $n=52$; $p<.001$). A correlation also was found with Total God-Concept and internal locus of control ($r=.48$; $n=52$; $p>.001$).

Other statistical analysis. To determine whether there were some other meaningful way to divide the total sample into two or more groups, a cluster analysis was performed. The cluster analysis produced only two meaningfully different groups, inspection of which found that all of one group were also assigned to the Christian group with the exception of one subject who was non-religious. The other group which the cluster analysis identified all belonged to the non-religious group with the exception of four subjects who were Christians. This evidence indicates that, considering the total study responses to the test battery, the Christian and non-religious sociopaths are distinctly different populations.

The attrition rate in the selection process indicates that 60% of the prison population at Oregon State Penitentiary could be diagnosed as having a sociopathic personality disorder. Of these, 80% of the inmates who did not attend religious activities qualified for the non-religious group. Of those sociopaths who were on "call out" sheets to attend

religious meetings, 80% qualified for the Christian group. This indicates that the sample is representative of the 80% of all the Christian sociopaths and 80% of all the non-religious sociopaths in the prison.

Results Summary

In summary, the Christian sociopaths had higher guilt, and had a more internal locus of control than the non-religious sociopaths. There was no difference between the two groups on overall self-concept, although the Christian group's behavior self concept was higher than the non-religious group. God concept and existential well being were related to self-concept for both sample groups. Religious well being was related to self-concept for the non-religious sociopaths, but the Christian sociopaths reported high RWB regardless of self-esteem. Internal control locus was also related to spiritual well being, existential well being, and religious well being. External control locus was not related to a controlling God concept. A cluster analysis confirmed that the religious classification was the most meaningful way to account for group differences. The results seem to indicate

that among sociopaths, those who are Christian are distinctly different in important ways.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

In this chapter section are discussed the findings which compared Christian and non-religious sociopath's guilt, self-concept, and locus of control, respectively. Then these personality constructs are discussed in relationship to religious quality. Subsequent treatment compiles a religious profile for both religious and non-religious inmates, interprets salient findings, and offers implications for rehabilitation and recommendations for future research.

Guilt

The finding that Christian sociopaths have significantly higher guilt than non-religious seems to support the notion that the religious sociopath is a "different" population than his non-religious associate. Because a lack of guilt is generally accepted as a major characteristic of sociopathy (Cleckley, 1955; Hare, 1980), it appears that the

Christian inmates in this sample were less sociopathic with regards to guilt than the non-religious inmates.

This, of course, is assuming that what is being measured by the Mosher is actually guilt. Although the construct validity of this scale has been convincingly documented by Persons (1970), more research needs to be done with the Mosher scale to determine the influence of social desirability. Among groups of sociopaths one might assume social desirability to be an equal given; however, the Christian subjects in this study may have been trying to answer "like a Christian." They were very aware that many others in the prison, both inmates and corrections staff, are skeptical that their faith is anything meaningful.

This guarded attitude was displayed in the interview by spontaneous remarks. "You know, not everybody who says they are Christians really are Christians." "There are very few real Christians inside." "Just me and the few of us in my group are real Christians. The rest of these groups are phonies." While this may in fact have some validity, these statements indicate that there are suspicions that professed faith is not genuine even among other Christian groups, and that some inmates may have been

trying to bend over backwards to "prove" that their faith was valid. Because of the above, this may have emerged in the questionnaires if the Christian subjects were more apt to answer the questions looking for the most "correct" answer, rather than what they really felt (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964).

Precautions to avoid this included statements informing the subjects of confidentiality and that there are no right or wrong answers. However, the obviously religious nature of the screening questionnaire, and the fact that the subject was informed that the author was from a seminary may have heightened a "best foot forward" stance especially for Christians. Neither of these procedures were practicably avoidable however.

Therefore it is possible that social desirability may influence the responses on the Mosher Guilt Scale. In fact, the MHG, MSG, and MCG were highly negatively correlated to the TSCS self-criticism scale. However, due to a lack of research with this scale in this area, this is difficult to determine.

While the Mosher Guilt scale is not standardized, the means obtained in this study can be compared to those in another study by Gudjonsson and Roberts (1983)

which compared normals with "secondary psychopaths." They found that the male secondary psychopaths had significantly higher guilt scores ($m=29.53$) than male normals ($m=22.46$) in their study. They explained the higher scores of the secondary psychopaths by noting the correspondingly higher trait anxiety. They also observed that the secondary psychopaths in their study were quite neurotic, better termed "acting out neurotic." They acknowledged that "the results are unlikely to be applicable to primary psychopaths" (p. 69). This, in fact, seems to be the case. In comparing the findings of this present study to that of Gudjonsson and Roberts (1983), it was found that the mean for the Christian sociopath was 18.1 and was more comparable to Gudjonsson's and Robert's normal males ($m=22.46$) than to their secondary sociopaths ($m=29.53$). (Gudjonsson et al. used only the Morality Conscience Scale.) The non-religious sociopaths' mean ($m=12.6$) in this study was much lower than Gudjonsson's groups. This could indicate less guilt, which would be expected of "primary" psychopaths. However, until the MGS is standardized, this interpretation cannot be made with confidence.

Another study by O'Grady and Janda (1979) found the means of 148 college males to be lower than either of the two groups of sociopaths in this study for all their scales. Their means were 10.51, 17.37, 11.68 for the MSG, MHG, and MCG respectively; the non-religious sociopaths' mean scores correspond quite closely with means of 12.28, 19.24, and 12.6 respectively.

Christian groups' means were higher than either of these means with 18.1, 24.46, and 22.4. This may lead one to wonder if the MGS is a better measure of religiosity than of sociopathy. However, because of lack of standardization it is difficult to determine what is a "normal" guilt score. Thus these issues must rest until further research with the MGS is done.

Another interesting finding in this study relates to previous research with the MGS. Mosher and Mosher (1966) found that prisoners who had committed offenses against property had higher guilt than prisoners who had committed crimes against people. In the present study most of those in the non-religious group committed property crimes (70 percent) compared to only 22 percent in the Christian group. The situation is reversed from the Mosher research, since the group higher in offenses against property (non-religious) had

less guilt than the group high in crimes against people (Christian). This inconsistency in findings has three possible resolutions. One possibility is that one of the studies is flawed. Another is that the generality of findings is limited by unknown factors. A third possibility is that Christianity has an even greater relationship to guilt than the relationship between type of crime committed and guilt.

The question which remains to be answered is why the Christian sociopaths have higher guilt than the non-religious sociopaths. The explanation above that the Mosher Guilt Scale may actually be measuring social desirability has already been examined. Another explanation is that the inmate may be attracted to Christian beliefs and the religious community because it offers resolution for guilt issues. Christianity may attract those sociopaths who are more remorseful for their crimes than other sociopaths. Indeed, the Christian sample was over-represented by both Class M and Class S offenses (see Table 10). Because Class M and Class S crimes are more heavily sanctioned by society, they are likely to cause a higher guilt reaction. If so this would presumably be "state" guilt not "trait" guilt, because higher trait guilt would

result theoretically in less likelihood of more serious crime initially. If the Christian group had a higher level of "state" guilt, then it follows that they would have a higher need to reduce this to less painful levels. Forgiveness, accompanied by a resolve to adhere to a new code of ethics and behavior, could reasonably meet this need.

Self-Concept

The hypothesis that the Christian sociopath would have higher self-esteem than the non-religious was not confirmed. The reasoning was based upon reports that sociopaths have lower self-esteem than normals (Fichtler et al., 1973; Gudjonsson & Roberts, 1983; Marks, 1964). If the Christian group were less sociopathic than the non-religious, they would have higher self-esteem than the non-religious.

Self-esteem by itself has never been considered a good measure of sociopathy, but rather as one symptom of it. Therefore, this finding does not seem to have great import with regards to discriminating sociopathy. In this study the comparison of self-esteem between Christian and non-religious inmates does however illumine possible motives for pursuing

Christianity. There were no differences between means in this study, so indications are that a need for self-esteem probably does not draw sociopaths to religion. This assumption is further supported by the finding that the means for both groups on the TSCS Total Positive scale (self-esteem measure) approximated the standardized norm. Means were 49.2 and 46.4 for Christian and non-religious sociopaths respectively; a score of 50 was the standardized norm. Thus, this sample does not take on the appearance of having an esteem deficit, something that theoretically motivates acting out (Bursten, 1973).

There was a significant difference ($p < .05$) between non-religious and Christian sociopaths in their self-concepts of present behavior on the TSCS Behavior scale. This scale is intended to measure what the individual perceives of his own actions in the present, and it is derived from one third of the 90 questions. The Christian group had a higher behavior self-concept than the non-religious. The religious group's mean was 51.2 and the non-religious mean was 43.0, well below the standardized norm. This is consistent with findings that the active religious person actually does act out less than the non-religious (Peek, Curry &

Chafiant, 1985). Whereas this sample of Christians actually had committed as a group more serious crimes than the non-religious group (see Table 10), they also as a group became committed to Christianity after the crimes were committed, shortly before or after beginning the prison term. Thus, it seems likely that their scores reflecting a high behavior self-concept must be based upon behavior subsequent to conversion.

There is another possible explanation for the Christian group of inmates with more violent convictions having a higher behavior self-concept than the non-religious group. The possibility must be considered that the Christian group may have been answering the questions with higher denial. The TSCS self-criticism scale was significantly lower for the Christians than the non-religious. The Christian sociopath's mean score was 42.4, whereas the non-religious mean score was 47.7, both below the standardized average. A low score indicates defensiveness, an unwillingness to endorse negative self-descriptions. As a group the Christian scores were not low enough to adjust the interpretation of the scores much (Fitts, 1965); as a group the score would indicate "mild defensiveness."

The self-criticism scale is the only measure used in the study to measure defensiveness. Because the defensiveness issue has ramifications for tests other than just the TSCS, it deserves further discussion. The scale itself is comprised of ten items from the "lie" scale from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The MMPI Lie scale is typically higher for religious persons and should, therefore, not necessarily be interpreted as high denial or deliberately trying to "look good." Therefore, when interpreting the meaning of the lower TSCS Self-Criticism scale for the Christian sociopath, it is likely that it is more of a symptom of religious commitment than a deliberate attempt to present a favorable picture of himself. However, this is stated cautiously, because the very nature of the sociopathic personality disorder makes it unwise to rule out defensiveness or even deliberate manipulation.

It is also interesting to note that both sociopathic groups had a profile feature which Fitts (1965, p.21) identifies when contrasting other psychiatric groups. He states that sociopathic personality disorders have a group profile in which Personal Self is well above Moral/Ethical Self. This

feature is true of both sociopathic populations sampled in this study (see Table 3), as might be expected if the sociopaths selected for this study were representative of others with the same diagnosis.

Locus of Control

This study found that Christian sociopaths had significantly more internal locus of control than the non-religious sociopaths. This is taken to mean that the Christian group felt more personally in charge of their destiny and less powerless in the face of circumstance. This is also an indication of personal responsibility. Personal responsibility fits conceptually well with the higher guilt the Christian group reported.

According to theory, external locus of control found in delinquents relates to their delinquency because they are not connecting their own actions to the consequences that befall them. They have not learned the extent to which they can choose their destiny. But considering the manipulateness found in sociopathy, it is possible to wonder if manipulation actually may be a sign of internal locus of control, i.e., does the person manipulate because he

believes he can control his destiny by his manipulative actions? In this study, does the Christian sociopath's more internal locus mean that he is just more manipulative than the non-religious sociopath?

Research indicates this is not the case.

Manipulative behavior (machiavellianism) and external locus of control are positively correlated (Christie & Geis, 1970; Solar & Bruehl, 1971; Vada, 1977). This is consistent with locus of control theory if manipulation of others is motivated from a position of powerlessness, an external orientation. If so, then conversely, a person with an internal locus of control would be less likely to be manipulative of people because the need for power would not be present. Also, internals prefer to control the objective environment or their own lives (Julian & Katz, 1968; Mac Donald, 1970; Seeman & Evans, 1962; Strickland, 1965) whereas those who have a machiavellian outlook prefer to manipulate others (Christie & Geis, 1970; Rim, 1966).

Further evidence that internal locus of control is beneficial comes from the bulk of locus of control research (Joe, 1971). "All the research points to the same conclusion: people are handicapped by external locus of control orientations" (Robinson & Shaver,

1973, p. 171). In this research, it appears that the Christian sociopath is internally oriented in a healthy way. In comparison to his non-religious counterpart, he appears to be less pathological with respect to locus of control. He is likely to be less machiavillian in his approach to people (Christie & Geis, 1970; Solar & Bruehl, 1971). The Christian sociopath with an internal locus of control would probably also be more likely to engage in instrumental goal-directed activity whereas externals more often manifest emotional, impulsive, non-goal directed responses (Robinson & Shaver, 1973). Further, because they are more able to make connections between their behavior and consequences, it seems that Christian sociopaths are more likely to learn from experience.

Unlike the MGS, the Rotter I.E. has been normed, which offers opportunity to compare sociopaths in this sample to normal populations. In research reported by Robinson and Shaver (1973) using means from a variety of studies (n=4,433) the overall mean computed to 8.2 (SD=4.0) in males. In this research the non-religious group's mean was, not surprisingly, above the mean at 9.2 indicating tendency toward external locus of control, and the Christian sociopaths were below the

mean at 5.6, indicating internality. While social desirability should not be ruled out as an explanation for the Christians low mean scores, Robinson and Shaver (1973) comment, "the correlations with measures of social desirability are typically low" (p.229).

Self-Concept and God-Concept

This study found that self-concept (TSCS Total Positive) was positively related to a favorable God concept for both Christian and non-religious sociopaths. Conversely, self-concept was negatively related to controlling God images for the Christians but not for the non-religious. These findings are similar to Benson and Spilka's (1973) findings with Catholic high school students. They found that self-esteem was positively related to loving-accepting God images and negatively related to negative God images. Benson and Spilka demonstrated that God images are probably derived from self-concept, rather than self-concept being derived from God images. They established this by using subjects who had nearly identical religious training, so if there was diversity in God images, it must be from some other source than what was learned by instruction.

Benson and Spilka explained the relationship between self-concept and God concept in terms of cognitive consistency theory. If a person believes he is a failure and is unlikeable, then he will find success and social approval unpleasant. If distortion, selective perception and denial are used to make information about oneself from outside sources consistent with self image, then the person is likely to do the same with how he perceives God to view him. A theology based upon a loving, accepting God is compatible with a person with high self-esteem. But a loving, accepting God would be uncomfortable to the person low in self-esteem.

Given the results of the present study, support for a relationship between self-esteem and God concept can be extended to include a sociopathic population. It can be further stated that the relationship holds true regardless of the relationship between God and the subject; self-esteem was positively related to favorable God concept for both the non-religious and the religious groups.

Self-Concept and Spiritual Well-Being

This research found that self-concept was positively related to spiritual well-being for both the Christian and non-religious sociopaths, consistent with other research (Campise, Ellison & Kinsman, 1979; Marto, 1983) which has correlated the Spiritual Well-Being scales to self-esteem. The relationship between self-concept and spiritual well-being found in religious populations can be extended to include sociopathic populations on the basis of these findings.

A closer examination of the data indicates that the self-esteem and spiritual well-being relationship held for both the EWB scale and the RWB scale in the non-religious group. Self-esteem was not expected to be related to religious well-being in this group because the "non-religious" sociopaths were considered to be behaviorally and cognitively unrelated to God. As such, they were not expected to endorse religious items in a predictable way (Corzo, 1981). An explanation for this may lie in the concept that religiosity (spiritual well-being) is still a continuum even among the non-religious regardless of spirituality. This is

consistent with Ellison's (1983) concept that SWB is not dichotomous but a matter of degree pervasive throughout mankind. More explanation emerges with some help from the Christian sociopaths. They endorsed high RWB regardless of self-esteem. Perhaps the non-religious sociopath perceives himself to be religiously satisfied or dissatisfied in much the same way God concept is thought to be derived. That is, religious satisfaction to be cognitively consistent must be an extension of self satisfaction. For the behavioral and cognitive Christian, however, religious well-being may not be as much an extension of self-satisfaction as it is a position to take. Cognitive consistency theory can explain both results. The non-religious is remaining cognitively consistent with self-satisfaction, while the active Christian is remaining consistent with the cognitive and behavioral position of acting happily religious.

Locus of Control and Existential Well-Being

This study confirmed that existential well-being is related to locus of control, a finding consistent with locus of control theory. If a person with internal locus of control by definition views himself

to be in control of his destiny and is goal oriented (Robinson & Shaver, 1973), then it follows he may also have developed a sense of purpose in life. This relationship has been established in this study with a sociopathic population, and also in another study with fathers of Catholic school children (Marto, 1983), but should not be generalized to other populations without further research.

Locus of Control and God-Concept

This hypothesis predicted that external locus of control would be positively correlated with a controlling God concept. The reasoning behind this prediction again incorporated dissonance theory. If a person perceives himself as in control of his destiny (internal locus), belief in a God who controls him by manipulating circumstances would create cognitive dissonance. Internal locus of control is more consistent with a view of God who is freeing, unrestricting, and undemanding. This study did not find this hypothesis supported with significance, but a trend was found in the predicted direction ($p < .06$).

Support for this finding was also predicted by Benson and Spilka (1973), but they did not obtain any

correlation whatsoever in their study. That a correlation was found in this study probably due to sample differences, because the test instruments used in both studies were identical. Benson and Spilka used religious high school students whereas this study used sociopaths, an entirely different population sample.

A Religious Profile

One purpose of the study was to gather data which describes the religious experience of the sociopath. From this group data a religious group profile can be summarized for religious and non-religious sociopaths.

Non-religious. The non-religious sociopaths by definition do not participate in religious activities except very sporadically. In fact half had no affiliation whatsoever. Most of them suspect those inmates who are involved in religious activities to be insincere. However, even the non-religious have religious beliefs and do not seem to be anti-religious.

Responses of the non-religious inmates on the Orthodoxy Index are difficult to interpret by comparing to national norms. First, Glock & Stark's (1966) study using these particular questions was conducted nearly

twenty years prior to this study, and what were then viewed as typical religious beliefs have probably changed. Also, Glock & Stark's national study did not include those with no religious affiliation, and about half of these non-religious subjects claimed no religious affiliation. Finally, there was a ten percent attrition in the selection process because the subject was too orthodox to be included in the non-religious category. Thus it is not surprising that these subjects were much less certain of their beliefs than the national norms.

In the national (church and non-church) study (Glock & Stark, 1968), 79% had no doubts about God's existence compared to 32% among non-religious sociopaths in the present study. While most do not claim to be Christians, some do, and those who claim Christianity conceptualize it in an ethical sense. That is, they call themselves Christians because they identify with the ethical teachings of Christ, not because of a perceived relationship or commitment. Most of the non-religious cannot say they have ever had an experience wherein they felt close to God or a divine source. In general, the non-religious

predictably appear alienated from God and as a group felt such a relationship to be of little importance.

Christian. The Christian sociopaths selected for study were of the most orthodox in belief. As such, they were more orthodox in their beliefs than typical church members reported in Glock & Stark's study. However, it may be said that they are typical of those attending religious functions within the prison. Again, selection was a factor; there was about a ten percent attrition in the selection process because of less than orthodox Christian beliefs.

As Allport (1967) has said, "...to know that a person is in some sense 'religious' is not as important as to know what economy religion plays in his life" (p.442). The one measure used in this study which offered the most in understanding the role of religion in the life of the Christian sociopath was the Religious Orientation scale. An extrinsic orientation indicates a person is using his religious views to provide security, comfort, status, or social support for himself. "Religion is not a value in it's own right, it serves other needs, and is a purely utilitarian formation" (1967, p.441). This orientation was held by 35% (n=8) of the Christian sociopaths.

One might say that whereas the extrinsically motivated person uses his religion, the intrinsically motivated person lives his religion. Intrinsic orientation is a pursuit of religion which goes beyond use as an instrumental device. An intrinsic orientation submits personal needs to a religious commitment, to the teachings and concepts espoused by the creed. These values are internalized to bring forth attitudes and behaviors in the Christian faith that reflect compassion, humility, and love etc. This study found 27% (n=7) of the Christian inmates in this category.

A third category described by Allport & Ross was indiscriminately pro-religious. This was represented by 35% (n=9) of religious inmates in this study. This category reflects a superficial "all religion is good" stance, endorsing both intrinsic and extrinsic items. For example, these individuals are likely to endorse items which are intrinsic, like "My religious beliefs are really what lie behind my whole life." They also endorse extrinsic items like, "Although I believe religion is important, there are many more important things in my life." They may also endorse both "Religion is especially important to me because it

answers many important questions about the meaning of life" and "The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships."

Whereas it is fairly easy to interpret scores of individuals who are consistently intrinsically or extrinsically oriented, it is more difficult to make sense of the indiscriminately pro-religious responses. The indiscriminately pro-religious seem to have more in common with the extrinsically oriented in other measures such as higher prejudice and lower education compared to the intrinsically oriented (Allport & Ross 1967). It can be postulated that they are somewhat cognitively confused or unable to make finer discriminations.

This is supported by Allport & Ross' research in prejudice, also a product of cognitive indiscrimination. Allport's research indicates that prejudice is significantly higher for extrinsic Christians than for intrinsic, and that the indiscriminately pro-religious are significantly more prejudiced than the extrinsically oriented. Thus, while the indiscriminately pro-religious may be cognitively confused, it is still somewhat vague what economy religion is in their life, and what motivates

their religious commitment. This seems to make their motives even more suspect. Whereas the extrinsic at least know why they are religious, the indiscriminately pro-religious are likened unto the mindless party crasher who knows no one at the party, but seems to be having the most fun.

The distribution of extrinsic, intrinsic, and pro-religious orientations were roughly in equal thirds. This is consistent with Allport & Ross' findings with other church attenders. However, it must be noted that this was based upon the author's interpretation of the scoring method as described in the Allport & Ross study. The instructions given indicate that the extrinsic were those above (and the intrinsic below) the median of both IROS & EROS scales. However, it was unclear whether this referred to the median of the combined scales or to the median of each scale. If this referred to the latter, a new class of undifferentiated orientation would arise, because there would be those above the IROS median, who could be below the EROS median and vice versa. This study used the first method to avoid creation of an additional class of scores. However, if the latter method had been used the distribution reported would

have been 30% (n=8) extrinsic, 15% (n=4) intrinsic, 34% (n=9) indiscriminately pro-religious, and 19% (n=5) undifferentiated.

This latter scoring method has the disadvantage of not being able to use some scores, however, it has the advantage of identifying only those who are intrinsic and not extrinsic, and vice versa; in other words, they are consistent on both scales. Most of the subjects moved to the "undifferentiated" group came from the intrinsically oriented group. Thus we would find very few consistently intrinsic, something that one may expect from a group of people who have a history of using others to meet a personal end.

Profile summary. A religious profile then can be summarized for both non-religious and Christian sociopaths. The non-religious feel alienated from God and religious involvement. Only a few are really hostile to religion, and most of them have religious beliefs. However, religion seems irrelevant and unimportant; almost none indicated an experience wherein they felt close to God, or any "divine source" for that matter.

The Christian sociopath's group profile describes not their beliefs or religious behavior, as this was

predetermined in the selection process, but rather the role religious involvement plays in their lives. This is found to be mixed, much like that found among church members nationally and with similar distribution. Roughly a third used religious involvement primarily to meet social or personal needs. One third were indiscriminantly pro-religious and quite involved in the activity but seemed to be confused about why they were involved and to what the process was leading. Another group was the intrinsically oriented, and constituted either 27% or 15% of the Christian group depending upon the scoring method used. This group appeared to have a grasp of religious values and concepts which they embrace as a framework around which to make life decisions and to evaluate their behavior. They were the most likely to "live" their religion.

Limitations

One limitation of the study involves the selection of sociopaths. The diagnosis of sociopathy was made by a variety of different psychologists and psychiatrists each using somewhat different criteria to assess diagnosis. Some may have used the recent more behavioral DSM-III criteria; some may have used a more

clinically intuitive diagnosis in the tradition of Cleckley (1955). That important personality differences were found in this study using varying diagnostic criteria may actually increase it's generalization potential to a wider spectrum of sociopaths, rather than limiting the results to this reseacher's special selection biases. However, it remains unclear whether the individuals studied here were primarily sociopathic, or just "criminal," so the results are limited to criminal sociopaths who are also incarcerated; and until the major findings of this study are replicated in other prisons, generalization to other prison populations should be exercised cautiously. While diagnosis using the DSM-III criteria remains controversial, a uniform diagnostic procedure is needed to ensure that research can be generalized to the appropriate population. One such measure which has this potential has been developed by Hare (1980).

Another important limitation is the designation of what is "Christian." The selection process utilized here identified a group who claimed to be a "Christian," who were the most orthodox in Christian belief, and who were frequently and consistently involved in religious activities. While not selection

criteria, they also identified with a "born again" styled definition of "Christian," and considered a relationship with God to be very important. The results of this study pertaining to Christian sociopaths should not be generalized to include those with religious ideas only, as even "non-religious" in this study had religious ideas, some even identifying themselves as "Christian." Obviously, attendance at religious activities alone did not qualify a person as a Christian, as many of these did not profess Christian belief. Therefore, generalization to other religious populations depends upon a comparable definition of "Christian".

Future research needs to be done with criterion measures, especially guilt measures. As important as guilt is conceptually to theories of motivation as well as understanding character disorders, well developed methods for the assessment of guilt do not exist. While the Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Scale appears to have promise, it has not been used enough to obtain correlates to other measures. Further, it has not been normed, which impairs interpretation. Another test which has been reported by Gudjonsson and Roberts

(1973) to have promise is the G-State scale by Otterbacher and Munz (1973).

Interpretation and Application of Salient Findings

From both theoretical and applied points of view, the most important findings of this research are differences between the non-religious sociopath and Christian sociopath groups. These differences go beyond religious beliefs and practice to extend to personality traits such as locus of control, trait guilt and state guilt. The Christian sociopaths were significantly more internal in their locus of control, and had significantly higher levels of guilt.

The massive body of locus of control research indicates in every instance that the more internal is one's locus of control, the more healthy is his psychological constitution. Internal locus is viewed as a better position from which to cope or from which to obtain good psychological adjustment in every one of hundreds of research applications. With regard to the sociopath, the more internal an individual is, the less likely he is to have a utilitarian view of other people (Christie & Gies, 1970; Solar & Bruehl, 1971). He is also by definition more likely to view himself as the

primary cause of social consequences connected to his behavior, rather than place blame on bad luck or circumstances. In this narrow respect, the Christian sociopath may be said to be less sociopathic than the non-religious sociopath.

In the case of the anti-social personality disorder, a low level of both state and trait guilt is descriptively typical, and theoretically allows the person to do harmful things to other people. Without an internalized guilt system, empathy is diminished, which in turn makes it easy to victimize others. This study found the Christian sociopaths to have higher levels of guilt than the non-religious sociopaths. Therefore, it would seem logical to conclude that this is another indication that the Christian sociopath is less extreme in sociopathy than the non-religious sociopath.

Therapists in the corrections field often hold the view (Yockleson & Samenow, 1976) that religious conversion is irrelevant to the therapy process. Solid evidence has not yet emerged other than in individual case studies (Begun, 1976) that religious conversion is an important element for change away from criminality. (This quality of evidence is rarely produced as a

prerequisite for use of therapeutic attempts to change criminal behavior, so it does not seem necessary to discount the relevance of religious commitment on this account.) However, religion is initially relevant by the mere evidence that the Christian group is indeed distinct in two important personality measures from the more common non-religious criminal sociopath. If the present interpretation of these findings has warrant, there are several possible implications.

One possible implication for therapy is the use of higher levels of guilt to help challenge depersonalization. If the Christian inmate is experiencing guilt or is more sensitive to it he may be more likely to be empathic toward those he has victimized. Another is the possibility that the higher guilt levels and more internal locus of control may make it easier for the sociopath to take responsibility for his behavior. This ability is required to be able to learn from experience.

A third implication relates to the use of religion in the therapy process. It seems that in the case of the Christian sociopath, there is already a cognitive acceptance of conservative societal values, so the challenge is to transform these values into behavior.

It seems that the fact that biblical values are accepted by the Christian sociopath brings rehabilitation at least one step closer compared to one who embraces criminal values outright. From this position the therapist can better challenge thinking errors which permit depersonalization, minimizing, etc., which are behind most sociopathic behaviors. In the case of those with intrinsic religious orientation, this transition could be made by an appeal to live out one's beliefs. For the extrinsically oriented Christian, one may expect that correction by the religious community when behavior is not appropriate may appeal to his need for security, status, "forgiveness," companionship, or other social need. At the same time, it seems incumbent upon the Christian community to be accepting of these unique converts yet communicating clearly what behaviors are expected. If church leadership is cognizant of how sociopaths think, and is responsive to their inappropriate behavior, the church may be able to broaden its role as an effective agent of change.

If religious commitment lends itself to the therapy process, it should be noted by those in the corrections field. Prison administrators have been

tolerant of religious activities because it is an exercise of constitutional rights. This research leaves open the possibility that religious commitment has a rehabilitative value. If so, parole officers could be of rehabilitative service by encouraging those inmates who have made religious commitments to involve themselves in the religious community after release.

Implications and Recommendations for Future Research

Considering the differences found between non-religious and Christian sociopaths with guilt and locus of control measures, several questions arise. The first is "Why were the Christians higher in guilt and in internal locus of control than the non-religious?" It has already been suggested that the Christian faith may attract those who have higher pain from guilt because Christianity addresses the guilt issues by nature of its theological foundations. This is supported by the fact that the Christians in this sample committed more heavily sanctioned crimes. However, it is also feasible that the religious activities themselves such as worship, discussion, Bible study, and prayer can act to cognitively reinterpret past and present behaviors to higher levels

of awareness, resulting in higher trait and/or state guilt. The same type of religious involvement could shape beliefs toward an internal locus of control. More research is needed to test the possibility that a causal relationship exists between religion and guilt and/or locus of control.

A second question follows. Since the Christians look less sociopathic on guilt measures and on locus of control measures, then can one expect behavior to also be less sociopathic? Further, will there be a measureable difference between non-religious and Christian sociopaths in behavior after release from confinement? One frustrating aspect of predicting success on the "outside" is that it may be unrelated to behavior on the "inside". Sociopaths may do very well within prison because the structure that is lacking internally is imposed externally. Therefore, the most meaningful research would have to measure behavior after release, where external structures are lifted.

It may be possible to construct a new longitudinal study which could help answer both questions posed here. Measures taken pre and post religious experience may help clarify the role of religious experience

either as an agent of change or as a selector for persons with certain personality characteristics.

A study which follows both Christian and non-religious sociopaths after release from prison could help determine whether differences in guilt and control locus are also predictors of behavior. A follow up study of this nature is even conceivable with the inmates who participated in this study. If such a study were undertaken, predictions about behavior after release could be made. One prediction is that non-religious sociopaths will be more likely to reoffend than Christian sociopaths. This postulation is based upon the assumption that guilt acts as a restraining force upon acting out and also upon this study's finding that Christian sociopaths have higher guilt than non-religious sociopaths. Further support for this postulation is rendered by other research which found religion to be a significant restraining force with delinquent behavior among youth (Albrecht et al., 1977; Burkett, 1977; Burkett & White, 1974; Higgins & Albrecht, 1977; Jensen & Erikson, 1979; Peek et al., 1985; Rhodes & Riess, 1970; Tittle & Welsh, 1983). This prediction is also supported by Begun (1976) who observed that religious experience can have

a rare but profound effect upon behavior in the psychopath.

Another factor which probably would be related to success after release is whether the Christian inmate continues to remain in the Christian community. Since the inmate usually relies upon an external structure to provide constraint, the Christian community may offer enough structure for those who find a social foothold (Albrecht et al., 1977; Burkett, 1977; Burkett & White, 1974; Higgins & Albrecht, 1977; Jensen & Erikson, 1979; Peek et al., 1985; Rhodes & Riess, 1970). Therefore, it follows that those who have this structure may find success on the "outside" more frequently than those who do not have it.

If continued religious involvement is related to the quality of the inmate's religious experience, then it may be possible that continued involvement can be predicted by the Religious Orientation Scale. One possible outcome is that those Christian inmates who are confused about the role of religion in their life (indiscriminately pro-religious) will be less likely to remain in the Christian community after release. In contrast to those with either an external or internal religious orientation, the indiscriminately

pro-religious do not appear to know why they are involved or what their involvement means; thus they may be good candidates for attrition. The externally oriented would probably stay in the Christian community while the benefits of such involvement are desirable and available. It seems logical to predict that the internally oriented would have the highest likelihood of remaining in the Christian community because they appear to have motivation which could endure inconvenient or adverse circumstances should the community be slow to accept them or exert conforming limits upon their behavior.

Another implication of this study is the possibility that other differences exist between Christian and non-religious sociopaths. If the Christians are found to be less sociopathic in guilt and locus of control, perhaps there are other meaningful personality measures which should be explored. For example, low empathy, machiavellianism, and impulsivity are characteristic of sociopathy and should also be researched in order to explore the parameters of differences between Christian and non-religious groups.

A final recommendation is replication of the study. The possibility that these results can be generalized to include other prison populations in other states depends upon the replication of these results in those settings.

Summary

Criminal sociopaths frequently claim commitment to Christianity, a religion which philosophically is counter to a sociopath's world view. Ascertaining whether or not religious commitment is relevant to corrections is difficult in light of a lack of research which addresses this problem. In this study 25 non-religious and 27 orthodox Christian male sociopaths, inmates from Oregon State Prison, were administered the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Rotter Internal/External Locus of Control Scale, and the Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Scales. It was hypothesized that the Christian sociopaths would have higher guilt, higher self-esteem, and more internal locus of control than the non-religious. To gather data on the religious experience of the sociopath, the Spiritual Well-Being Scale, the Intrinsic/Extrinsic

Religious Orientation Scale, and the God Concept Semantic Differential Scale were also given.

Primary findings were that Christian sociopaths had significantly higher guilt and had significantly more internal locus of control than non-religious sociopaths. There were no self-esteem differences, but Christian sociopaths had higher behavior self-concept. It was concluded that the Christian and non-religious sociopaths were distinct populations; assuming higher guilt and more internal locus of control are signs in the direction of psychological health, Christian sociopaths show greater psychological health and more promise of future adherence to societal standards.

Secondary findings were that self-concept and God concept were significantly related as predicted by cognitive consistency theory. External locus of control and controlling God concept were not significantly related as predicted by cognitive consistency theory. Locus of control and existential well being were positively correlated, which was predicted by locus of control theory.

The use of religion by Christian sociopaths was described as intrinsic, extrinsic, or indiscriminantly pro-religious. One third were living their religion,

one third were using their religion for secondary gain, and another third were confused about the role of religion in their lives, but they were very involved in religious activities.

Since sociopaths who converted to Christianity were less sociopathic in two important personality variables, there may be other variables such as empathy, or machiavillianism. Further, those who remain in a Christian community after release may be less likely to reoffend than the non-religious. It is recommended that these possibilities be explored in future research.

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (1924). The Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Ahrendt, C. (1975). Relationships between the self-concepts of children and their concepts of God. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Albrecht, S., Chadwick, B., & Alcorn, D. (1977). Religiosity and deviance: application of an attitude-behavior contingent consistency model. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 16, 263-274.
- Allport, G., & Ross, J. (1967). Personal orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 432-443.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (3rd ed.). Washington, D. C.: Author.
- Bach-y-Rita, G. (1974). Personality disorders in prisons. In J. R. Lion (Ed.), Personality Disorders: Diagnosis and Management (pp.308-317). Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.

- Begun, J. H. (1976). The sociopathic or psychopathic personality. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 22(1), 25-46.
- Benson, P., & Spilka, B. (1973). God image as a function of self-esteem and locus of control. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12, 297-310.
- Bixler, W. G. (1979). Self-concept/God-concept congruency as a function of differential need for self-esteem and consistency (Doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40(4-B), 1877-1878.
- Bluemel, C. S. (1948). War, Politics, and Insanity. Denver: World Press.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). The Structure of Psychological Well-Being. Chicago: Aldine.
- Burkett, S. (1977). Religion, parental influence and adolescent alcohol and marijuana use. Journal of Drug Issues, 7, 263-273.
- Burkett, S., & White, M. (1974). Hellfire and delinquency: another look. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 13, 455-462.

- Bursten, B. (1973). The Manipulator. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Campbell, A. (1976). Subjective measures of well-being. American Psychologist, 31, 117-124.
- Campbell, A. (1981). The Sense of Well-Being in America: Recent Patterns and Trends. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Campise, R., Ellison, C., & Kinsman, R. (1979). Spiritual well-being: some exploratory relationships. In R. F. Pauloutzian (Chair), Spiritual Well-Being, Loneliness, and Perceived Quality of Life. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Chesno, F. A., & Kilmann, P. R. (1975). Effects of stimulation on sociopathic avoidance learning. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 84(2), 144-150.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). Studies in Machiavillianism. New York: Academic Press.
- Clarke, W. V., & Hasler, K. R. (1967). Differentiation of criminals and non-criminals with a self-concept measure. Psychological Reports, 20, 623-632.
- Cleckley, H. (1955). The Mask of Sanity. St. Louis: Mosby.

- Cohen, H. M. (1964). The relationship of the prison program to changes in the attitudes and self-concepts in inmates. Doctoral dissertation, New York University, Ann Arbor. (University Microfilms No. 58-445)
- Coleman, J. C. (1976). Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life (5th ed.). Dallas: Scott & Foresman.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Corzo, D. M. (1981). Perceptions of God, parents, and self as a function of depression and Christian faith. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(3-B). (University Microfilms No. 81-18193)
- Crichton, R. (1959). The Great Imposter. New York: Random House.
- Crowe, R. (1975). Adoption studies in psychiatry. Biological Psychiatry, 1975, 10, 353-371.
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The Approval Motive. New York: Wiley.
- Cudrin, J. M. (1970) Self-concepts of prison inmates. Journal of Religion and Health, 9(1), 60-70.
- Duke, M. P., & Fenhagen, E. (1975). Self-parental alienation and locus of control in

delinquent girls. Journal of Genetic Psychology,
127, 103-107.

Ellison, C. W. (1983). Spiritual well-being:
conceptualization and measurement. Journal of
Psychology and Theology, 11(4), 330-340.

Ellison, C. W., & Economos, T. (1981). Religious
Orientation and Quality of Life. Paper presented
at the annual meeting of the Christian Association
of Psychological Studies, San Diego.

Ellison, C. W., & Paloutzian, R. (1979). Religious
experience and quality of life. In R. F.
Paloutzian (Chair), Spiritual Well-Being,
Loneliness, and Quality of Life. Symposium
presented at the annual meeting of the American
Psychological Association, New York.

Eysenck, H. J. (1960). Behavior Therapy and the
Neuroses. London: Pergamon Press.

Fenichel, O. (1945). The Psychoanalytic Theory of
Neurosis. New York: Norton.

Fenz, W. D. (1971). Heart rate responses to a stressor:
a comparison between primary and secondary
psychopaths and normal controls. Journal of
Experimental Research and Personality, 5(1), 7-13.

- Fichtler, H., Zimmermann, R., & Moore, R. T. (1973).
Comparison of self-esteem of prison and non-prison
groups. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 36, 39-44.
- Fitts, W. (1965). Manual: Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.
Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests.
- Fitts, W. H., & Hamner, W. T. (1969). The Self-Concept
and Delinquency. Nashville: Counselor Recording
and Tests.
- Freud, S. (1926). The Ego and the Id. London: Hogarth
Press.
- Freud, S. (1930). Civilization and its Miscontents. New
York: Norton.
- Freud, S. (1938). Totem and taboo. In A. A. Brill
(ed.), The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud. New
York: The Modern Library.
- Freud, S. (1957). The Future of an Illusion. New York:
Doubleday, 1957.
- Glock, C., & Stark, R. (1968). American Piety. Los
Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.
- Glock, C., & Stark, R. (1966). Christian Beliefs and
Anti-Semitism. New York: Harper and Row.
- Godin, A., & Hallez, M. (1964). Parental images and
divine paternity. In A. Godin (Ed.), From

Religious Experience to a Religious Attitude

(pp. 79-110). Brussels: Lumen Vitae Press.

Greenacre, P. (1945). Conscience in the psychopath.

American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 15, 495-509.

Gudjonsson, G. H., & Roberts, J. C. (1983). Guilt and self-concept in secondary psychopaths, Personality and Individual Differences, 4, 65-70.

Guze, S. B., Goodwin, D. S., & Crane, J. B. (1969).

Criminality and psychiatric disorders. Archives of General Psychiatry, 20, 592-597.

Halleck, S. L. (1972). Delinquency. In B. B. Wolman

(Ed.), Manual of Child Psychopathology

(pp.541-562). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hare, R. D. (1968). Psychopathy, autonomic functioning and the orienting response. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 73(3, Pt. 2), 1-24.

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. (1970). Psychopathy: Theory and Research.

New York: Wiley.

Hearon, E. H. (1977). Self-image and god-image in male alcoholics (Doctoral dissertation, University of

South Carolina, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37(10-A), 6275.

Heaver, W. L. (1943). A study of forty male psychopathic personalities before, during, and after hospitalization. American Journal of Psychiatry, 100, 342-346.

Higgins, P. C., & Albrecht, G. L. (1977). Hellfire and delinquency revisited. Social Forces, 55, 952-58.

Hirschi, T., & Stark, R. (1969). Hellfire and delinquency. Social Problems, 17, 202-13.

Inmates help abandoned child. (1973, January 29). The Evening Star and Washington Daily News, p. C5.

Jensen, G. F., & Erikson, M. L. (1979). The religious factor and delinquency: another look at the hellfire hypothesis. In R. Wuthnow (Ed.), The Religious Dimension. New Directions in Quantitative Research (pp.157-177). New York: Academic Press.

Joe, V. C. (1971). Review of the internal-external locus of control construct as a personality variable [Monograph Supplement]. Psychological Reports. 3-V28, 619-640.

Jolley, J. C. (1975). A study of religious backgrounds and beliefs of Utah state prisoners and the

relationship of inmates' self-concepts to conceptions of God. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36(5-A), 3153-3154. (University Microfilms No. 75-25,792)

Julian, J. W., & Katz, S. B. (1968). Internal vs. external control and the value of reinforcement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 89-94.

Karpman, B. (Ed.). (1959). Symposia on Child and Juvenile Delinquency. Washington D.C.: Psychodynamic Monograph Series.

Knudten R., & Knudten, M. (1971). Juvenile delinquency, crime, and religion. Review of Religious Research, 12, 130-152.

Koch, J. L. (1891). The Psychopathic Inferiorities. Ravensburg Maier.

Leaff, L. A. (1978). Antisocial personality: psychodynamic implications. In W. H. Reid (Ed.), The Psychopath (pp. 79-117). New York: Brunner Mazel.

Levy, D. S. (1951). The deprived and indulged forms of psychopathic personality. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 21, 250-254.

- Luther, D. L. (1980). A comparative study of self-concepts and God-concepts among selected groups of graduate students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40(9-B), 4462-4463. (University Microfilms No. 80-061,53)
- Lykken, D. T. (1957). A study of anxiety in the sociopathic personality. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 55(1), 6-10.
- Malony, H. N. (1981). Religious experiencing: a phenomenological analysis of a unique behavioral event, Journal of Psychology and Theology, 9(4), 326-334.
- Marks, I. M. (1965). Patterns of Meaning in Psychiatric Patients Semantic Differential Responses in Obsessives and Psychopaths. London: Oxford Press.
- MacDonald, A. P. (1970). Internal-external locus of control, personal control and the practice of birth control. Psychology Report, 27, 206.
- Martin, F. (1975). Internal-external control among pre-delinquent and delinquent middle school pupils. Psychology, 12, 24-26.
- Martinez, M., & Hays, J. R. & Solway, K. S. (1977). Comparative study of delinquent and non-delinquent

Mexican-American youths. Psychological Reports,
44, 215-221.

Marto, R. (1983). A father's locus of control,
spiritual well-being, and self-esteem and their
relationship to the child's self-esteem in a
Catholic parochial high school population.
Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, Western
Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland.

McCord, W., & McCord, E. (1956). Psychopathy and
Delinquency. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Moberg, D. O. (1971). Spiritual well-being: background
and issues, Washington D.C.: White House
Conference on Aging.

Morgan, R. L. (1979). Interpersonal perceptions of
self, parents, and God among psychiatric patients
and non-patients. Dissertation Abstracts
International, 40(4-B), 1962-1963. (University
Microfilms No. 79-21,463)

Mosher, D. (1966). The development of
multitrait-multimethod matrix analysis of the
measures of three aspects of guilt. Journal of
Consulting Psychology, 30, 25-29.

- Mosher, D. L., & Mosher, J. B. (1966). Built in prisoners. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 23, 171-173.
- Mosher, D. L., & Oliver, W.A. (1968). Psychopathology and guilt in heterosexual and subgroups of homosexual reformatory inmates. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 73, 323-29.
- National Interfaith Coalition on Aging. (1975). Spiritual Well-Being: A Definition. Athens, GA: Author.
- Nelson, M., & Jones, E. M. (1957). An application of the Q-technique to the study of religious concepts. Psychological Reports, 3, 293-297.
- O'Grady, K., & Janda, L. (1979). Factor analysis of the Mosher Forced Choice guilt inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47, 6, 1131-33.
- Otterbacher, J.R., & Munz, D. C. (1973). State-trait measure of experiential guilt. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40, 115-121.
- Paloutzian, R. & Ellison, C. W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being and quality of life. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), Loneliness: A

Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research and Therapy. New York: Wiley Interscience.

Peek, C. W., Curry, E. W., & Chafant, H. P. (1985).

Social Science Quarterly, 66(1), 121-131.

Persons, R. (1970). Intermittant reinforcement, guilt, and crime. Psychological Reports, 26, 421-422 (a).

Persons, R. (1970) The Mosher guilt scale: theoretical formulations, research review and normative data, Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 34, 266-70 (b).

Persons, R. & Marks, P. A. (1971). The violent 4-3 MMPI personality type. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36(2), 189-196.

Plato. (1952). The Republic IX. In R. M. Hutchins (Ed.), Great Books of the Western World (Vol. 7) (pp.571-577). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Prichard, J. C. (1837). A Treatise on Insanity and Other Disorders Affecting the Mind. Philadelphia: Haswell, Barrington, and Haswell.

Quay, H. C. (1965). Psychopathic personality as pathological stimulation seeking. American Journal of Psychiatry, 122(2), 180-183.

- Rhodes, A. L., & Reiss, A. J. (1970). The "religious factor" and delinquent behavior. Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquent Behavior, 7, 83-98.
- Rim, Y. (1966). Machiavellianism and decisions involving risks. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 5, 36-50.
- Robins, E. (1977). Sociopathy. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Psychiatry, Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and Neurology Vol.10 (pp.364-368). New York: Aesculepius.
- Robins, L. N. (1966) Deviant Children Grow Up. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1966.
- Robinson, J., & Shaver, P.(1973). Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Roth, L., & Erwin, R. (1971). Psychiatric care of Federal prisoners. American Journal of Psychiatry. 128, 424-470.
- Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80(1, Whole No. 609).

- Schmank, F. J. (1970). Punishment, arousal, and avoidance learning in sociopaths. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 76(3), 325-335.
- Schuessler, K. F., & Cressey, D. B. (1950). Personality characteristics of criminals. American Journal of Sociology, 55, 476-84.
- Seeman, M. & Evans, J. (1962). Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. American Sociological Review, 27, 772-782.
- Solar, S., & Bruehl, D. (1971). Machiavillianism and locus of control: two conceptions of interpersonal power. Psychological Reports, 29, 1079-1082.
- Strickland, B. (1965). The prediction of social action from a dimension of internal-external control. Journal of Social Psychology, 66, 353-358.
- Szurek, S. A. (1957). Some impressions from clinical experience with delinquents. In K. Eissler (Ed.), Searchlights on Delinquency (pp. 115-127). New York: International University Press.
- Strunk, O. (1959). Perceived relationships between parental and deity concepts. Psychological Newsletter, 10, 222-226.

- Tennenbaum, D. L. (1977). Personality and criminality: a summary and implication of the literature. Journal of Criminal Justice, 5, 225-236.
- Tittle, C. R., & Welch, M. R. (1983). Religiosity and deviance: Toward a contingency theory of constraining effects. Social Forces, 61(3), 653-82.
- Vada, A. (1977). The relationship of locus of control to manipulative attitudes and behavior of imprisoned sociopaths. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38(6-B), 2892. (University Microfilms No. 77-25, 962)
- Vergote, A. (1969). Concept of god and parental images. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 8, 79-87.
- Waldo, G. P., & Dinitz, S. (1967). Personality attributes of the criminal: an analysis of research studies, 1950-1965. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 4, 185-202.
- Wenger, S. (1945). What prison inmates think of God. Religious Education, 40, 39-43.
- Williams, M. L. (1975). Children's concepts of God and self: developmental sequences. Dissertation

Abstracts International, 35(8-A), 5144.

(University Microfilms No. 75-4481)

Wolman, B. B. (1966). Classification of mental disorders. Psychotherapy and Psychosemantics, 14, 50-65.

Wolman, B. B. (1973). Call No Man Normal. New York: International Universities Press.

Yochelson, S., & Samenow, S. (1976). The Criminal Personality Vol. 1. New York: Arenson.

Appendix A

DSM-III Antisocial Personality Disorder
(American Psychiatric Association, 1980)

APPENDIX A

Diagnostic Criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder

A. Current age at least 18.

B. Onset before age 15 as indicated by a history of three or more of the following before that age:

- 1) truancy (positive if it amounted to at least five days per year for at least two years, not including the last year of school)
- 2) expulsion or suspension from school for misbehavior
- 3) delinquency (arrested or referred to juvenile court because of behavior)
- 4) running away from home overnight at least twice while living in parental or parental surrogate home
- 5) persistent lying
- 6) repeated sexual intercourse in a casual relationship
- 7) repeated drunkenness or substance abuse
- 8) thefts
- 9) vandalism
- 10) school grades markedly below expectations in relation estimated or known IQ (may have resulted in repeating a year)
- 11) chronic violations of rules at home and/or at school (other than truancy)
- 12) initiation of fights

C. At least four of the following manifestations of the disorder since age 18:

- 1) inability to sustain consistent work behavior, as indicated by any of the following: (a) too frequent job changes (e.g., three or more jobs in five years not accounted for by nature of job or economic or seasonal fluctuation), (b) significant unemployment (e.g., six months or more in five years when expected to work), (c) serious absenteeism from work (e.g., average three days or more of lateness or absence per month, (d) walking off several jobs without other jobs in sight (Note: similar behavior in an academic setting during the last few years of school may substitute for this criterion in individuals who by reason of their age or circumstances have not had an opportunity to demonstrate occupational adjustment)
- 2) lack of ability to function as a responsible parent as evidenced by one or more of the following: (a) child's malnutrition, (b) child's illness resulting from lack of minimal hygiene standards, (c) failure to obtain medical care for a seriously ill child, (d) child's dependence on neighbors or nonresident relatives for food or shelter, (e) failure to arrange for

- a caretaker for a child under six when parent is away from home, (f) repeated squandering, on personal items, of money required for household necessities
- 3) failure to accept social norms with respect to lawful behavior, as indicated by any of the following: repeated thefts, illegal occupation (pimping, prostitution, fencing, selling drugs), multiple arrests, a felony conviction
 - 4) inability to maintain enduring attachment to a sexual partner as indicated by two or more divorces and/or separations (whether legally married or not), desertion of spouse, promiscuity (ten or more sexual partners within one year)
 - 5) irritability and aggressiveness as indicated by repeated physical fights or assault (not required by one's job or to defend someone or oneself), including spouse or child beating
 - 6) failure to honor financial obligations, as indicated by repeated defaulting on debts, failure to provide child support, failure to support other dependents on a regular basis
 - 7) failure to plan ahead, or impulsivity, as indicated by traveling from place to place without a prearranged job or clear goal for the period of travel or clear idea about when the travel would terminate, or lack of a fixed address for a month or more
 - 8) disregard for the truth as indicated by repeated lying, use of aliases, "conning" others for personal profit
 - 9) recklessness, as indicated by driving while intoxicated or recurrent speeding

D. A pattern of continuous antisocial behavior in which the rights of others are violated, with no intervening period of at least five years without antisocial behavior between age 15 and the present time (except when the individual was bedridden or confined in a hospital or penal institution).

E. Antisocial behavior is not due to either Severe Mental Retardation, Schizophrenia or manic episodes.

Appendix B
Interview Text

APPENDIX B

Interview Text

I'm sure you'd like to know why you were called out, so I'll introduce myself. My name is David Agnor, and I'm a student at Western Conservative Baptist Seminary in Portland. I am conducting a study of opinions about religious ideas and also of personal opinions about yourself, and it's part of research I have to do to complete my dissertation. I am not connected with the psychology department, except that they are letting me use their offices.

Are you wondering how your name was chosen? (yes)
Well, I went down to the vocation desk and picked every seventh name on the list of men available for work. Your name happened to be one of those chosen....

Now, the first part of the study is a questionnaire which is made up of some personal information questions. The second part is seeking your viewpoints about religious practices and beliefs. As you know, you don't have to consider yourself religious to have religious ideas or beliefs. The third part and longest part of the study asks your opinions on many other subjects.

This information is completely confidential. No

names will be used on any data that is collected. All that anyone will know about you in the study is what the inmates said on the survey as a group. The results of the study may be placed in the prison library for you to read if you wish. Participation is also voluntary. Do you have any questions about this? It takes most people about an hour and a half to fillout. Can I make an appointment for you today, or do you have time now?

Appendix C

The Mosher Forced Choice Guilt Scale

(Mosher, 1966)

Sociopaths Compared

167

This questionnaire consists of a number of pairs of statements or opinions which have been given by college men in response to the "Moshier Incomplete Sentences Test." These men were asked to complete phrases such as "When I tell a lie. . ." and "To kill in war. . ." to make a sentence which expressed their real feelings about the stem. This questionnaire consists of the stems to which they responded and a pair of their responses which are lettered A and B.

You are to read the stem and the pair of completions and decide which you most agree with or which is most characteristic of you. Your choice, in each instance, should be in terms of what you believe, how you feel, or how you would react, and not in terms of how you think you should believe, feel, or respond. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Your choices should be a description of your own personal beliefs, feelings, or reactions.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both completions or neither completion to be characteristic of you. In such cases select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Do not omit an item even though it is very difficult for you to decide, just select the more characteristic member of the pair. Encircle the letter, A or B, which you most agree with.

1.

1. When I tell a lie . . .
A. it hurts.
B. I make it a good one.
2. To kill in war. . .
A. is a job to be done.
B. is a shame but sometimes a necessity.
3. Women who curse. . .
A. are normal.
B. make me sick.
4. When anger builds inside me. . .
A. I usually explode.
B. I keep my mouth shut.
5. If I killed someone in self-defense, I. . .
A. would feel no anguish.
B. think it would trouble me the rest of my life.
6. I punish myself. . .
A. for the evil I do.
B. very seldom for other people do it for me.
7. If in the future I committed adultery. . .
A. I won't feel bad about it.
B. it would be sinful.
8. Obscene literature. . .
A. is a sinful and corrupt business.
B. is fascinating reading.
9. "Dirty" jokes in mixed company. . .
A. are common in our town.
B. should be avoided.
10. As a child, sex play. . .
A. never entered my mind.
B. is quite wide spread.
11. I detest myself for. . .
A. my sins and failures.
B. for not having more exciting sexual experiences.
12. Sex relations before marriage. . . .
A. ruin many a happy couple.
B. are good in my opinion.
13. If in the future I committed adultery. . .
A. I wouldn't tell anyone.
B. I would probably feel bad about it.
14. When I have sexual desires. . .
A. I usually try to curb them.
B. I generally satisfy them.

15. If I killed someone in self-defense, I. . .
 - A. wouldn't enjoy it.
 - B. I'd be glad to be alive.
16. Unusual sex practices. . .
 - A. might be interesting.
 - B. don't interest me.
17. If I felt like murdering someone. . .
 - A. I would be ashamed of myself.
 - B. I would try to commit the perfect crime.
18. If I hated my parents. . .
 - A. I would hate myself.
 - B. I would rebel at their every wish.
19. After an outburst of anger. . .
 - A. I usually feel quite a bit better.
 - B. I am sorry and say so.
20. I punish myself. . .
 - A. never.
 - B. by feeling nervous and depressed.
21. Prostitution. . .
 - A. is a must.
 - B. breeds only evil.
22. If I killed someone in self-defense, I. . .
 - A. would still be troubled by my conscience.
 - B. would consider myself lucky.
23. When I tell a lie. . .
 - A. I'm angry with myself.
 - B. I mix it with truth and serve it like a Martini.
24. As a child, sex play. . .
 - A. is not good for mental and emotional well being.
 - B. is natural and innocent.
25. When someone swears at me. . .
 - A. I swear back.
 - B. it usually bothers me even if I don't show it.
26. When I was younger, fighting. . .
 - A. was always a thrill.
 - B. disgusted me.

Sociopaths Compared

170

27. As a child, sex play. . .
 - A. was a big taboo and I was deathly afraid of it.
 - B. was common without guilt feelings.
28. After an argument. . .
 - A. I feel mean.
 - B. I am sorry for my actions.
29. "Dirty" jokes in mixed company. . .
 - A. are not proper.
 - B. are exciting and amusing.
30. Unusual sex practices. . .
 - A. are awful and unthinkable.
 - B. are not so unusual to me.
31. When I have sex dreams. . .
 - A. I cannot remember them in the morning.
 - B. I wake up happy.
32. When I was younger, fighting. . .
 - A. never appealed to me.
 - B. was fun and frequent.
33. One should not. . .
 - A. knowingly sin.
 - B. try to follow absolutes.
34. To kill in war. . .
 - A. is good and meritable.
 - B. would be sickening to me.
35. I detest myself for . . .
 - A. nothing, I love life.
 - B. not being more nearly perfect.
36. "Dirty" jokes in mixed company. . .
 - A. are lots of fun.
 - B. are coarse to say the least.
37. Petting. . .
 - A. is something that should be controlled.
 - B. is a form of education.
38. After an argument. . .
 - A. I usually feel better.
 - B. I am disgusted that I allowed myself to become involved.
39. Obscene literature. . .
 - A. should be freely published.
 - B. helps people become sexual perverts.
40. I regret. . .
 - A. my sexual experiences.
 - B. nothing I've ever done.

41. A guilty conscience. . .
 - A. does not bother me too much.
 - B. is worse than a sickness to me.
42. If I felt like murdering someone. . .
 - A. it would be for good reason.
 - B. I'd think I was crazy.
43. Arguments leave me feeling. . .
 - A. That it was a waste of time.
 - B. smarter.
44. After a childhood fight, I felt. . .
 - A. miserable and made up afterwards.
 - B. like a hero.
45. When anger builds inside me. . .
 - A. I do my best to suppress it.
 - B. I have to blow off some steam.
46. Unusual sex practices. . .
 - A. are O.K. as long as they're heterosexual.
 - B. usually aren't pleasurable because you have preconceived feelings about their being wrong.
47. I regret. . .
 - A. getting caught, but nothing else.
 - B. all of my sins.
48. When I tell a lie. . .
 - A. my conscience bothers me.
 - B. I wonder whether I'll get away with it.
49. Sex relations before marriage. . .
 - A. are practiced too much to be wrong.
 - B. in my opinion, should not be practiced.
50. As a child, sex play. . .
 - A. is dangerous.
 - B. is not harmful but does create sexual pleasure.
51. When caught in the act. . .
 - A. I try to bluff my way out.
 - B. truth is the best policy.
52. As a child sex play. . .
 - A. was indulged in.
 - B. is immature and ridiculous.
53. When I tell a lie. . .
 - A. it is an exception or rather an odd occurrence.
 - B. I tell a lie.
54. If I hated my parents. . .
 - A. I would be wrong, foolish, and feel guilty.
 - B. they would know it that's for sure!

55. If I robbed a bank. . .
A. I would give up I suppose.
B. I probably would get away with it.
56. Arguments leave me feeling. . .
A. proud, they certainly are worthwhile.
B. depressed and disgusted.
57. When I have sexual desires. . .
A. they are quite strong.
B. I attempt to repress them.
58. Sin and failure. . .
A. are two situations we try to avoid.
B. do not depress me for long.
59. Sex relations before marriage. . .
A. help people to adjust.
B. should not be recommended.
60. When anger builds inside me. . .
A. I feel like killing somebody.
B. I get sick.
61. If I robbed a bank. . .
A. I would live like a king.
B. I should get caught.
62. Masturbation. . .
A. is a habit that should be controlled.
B. is very common.
63. After an argument. . .
A. I feel proud in victory and understanding in defeat.
B. I am sorry and see no reason to stay mad.
64. Sin and failure. . .
A. are the works of the Devil.
B. have not bothered me yet.
65. If I committed a homosexual act. . .
A. it would be my business.
B. it would show weakness in me.
66. When anger builds inside me. . .
A. I always express it.
B. I usually take it out on myself.
67. Prostitution. . .
A. is a sign of moral decay in society.
B. is acceptable and needed by some people.
68. Capital punishment. . .
A. should be abolished.
B. is a necessity.

Sociopaths Compared

173

69. Sex relations before marriage. . .
 - A. are O.K. if both par
 - B. are dangerous.
70. I tried to make amends. . .
 - A. for all my misdeeds, but I can't forget them.
 - B. but not if I could help it.
71. After a childhood fight, I felt. . .
 - A. sorry.
 - B. mad and irritable.
72. I detest myself for . . .
 - A. nothing, and only rarely dislike myself.
 - B. thoughts I sometimes have.
73. Arguments leave me feeling. . .
 - A. satisfied usually.
 - B. exhausted.
74. Masturbation. . .
 - A. is all right.
 - B. should not be practiced.
75. After an argument. . .
 - A. I usually feel good if I won.
 - B. it is best to apologize to clear the air.
76. I hate. . .
 - A. sin.
 - B. moralists and "do gooders."
77. Sex
 - A. is a beautiful gift of God not to be cheapened.
 - B. is good and enjoyable.
78. Capital punishment. . .
 - A. is not used often enough.
 - B. is legal murder, it is inhuman.
79. Prostitution. . .
 - A. should be legalized
 - B. cannot really afford enjoyment.

Sociopaths Compared

174

Moshier F-C Invento

1. MC A 1 B 0	19. H A 0 D 1	37. S A 1 B 0
2. H A 0 B 1	20. MC A 0 B 1	38. H A 0 B 1
3. MC A 0 B 1	21. S A 0 B 1	39. MC A 0 E 1
4. H A 0 B 1	22. H A 1 B C	40. MC A 1 B 0
5. H A 0 B 1	23. MC A 1 B 0	41. MC A 0 B 1
6. MC A 1 B 0	24. S A 1 B 0	42. H A C E i
7. S A 0 B 1	25. H A 0 B 1	43. H A 1 B 0
8. MC A 1 B 0	26. H A 0 B 1	44. H A 1 E 0
9. S A 0 B 1	27. S A 1 B 0	45. H A 1 B 0
10. S A 1 B 0	28. H A 0 B 1	46. S A 0 B 1
11. MC A 1 B 0	29. S A 1 E 0	47. MC A 0 B 1
12. S A 1 B 0	30. S A 1 B 0	48. MC A 1 B 0
13. S A 0 B 1	31. S A 1 B 0	49. S A 0 B 1
14. S A 1 B 0	32. H A 1 B 0	50. S A 1 E 0
15. H A 1 B 0	33. MC A 1 B 0	51. MC A 0 E 1
16. S A 0 B 1	34. H A 0 B 1	52. S A 0 E 1
17. H A 1 B 0	35. MC A 0 B 1	53. MC A 1 E 0
18. H A 1 E 0	36. S A 0 E 1	54. H A 1 B 0

Sociopaths Compared

175

Mosher F-C Inventory

55.	MC	A	1	68.	H	A	1
		B	0			B	0
56.	H	A	0	69.	S	A	0
		B	1			B	1
57.	S	A	0	70.	MC	A	1
		B	1			D	0
58.	MC	A	1	71.	H	A	1
		B	0			B	0
59.	S	A	0	72.	MC	A	0
		B	1			B	1
60.	H	A	0	73.	H	A	0
		B	1			B	1
61.	MC	A	0	74.	S	A	0
		E	1			B	1
62.	S	A	1	75.	H	A	0
		B	0			E	1
63.	H	A	0	76.	H	A	1
		B	1			B	0
64.	MC	A	1	77.	S	A	1
		B	0			B	0
65.	S	A	0	78.	H	A	0
		B	1			B	1
66.	H	A	0	79.	S	A	0
		B	1			B	1
67.	S	A	1				
		B	0				

Appendix D

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scales

(Fitts, 1969)

Sociopaths Compared

177

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scales

Directions: Fill in your name and other information on the separate answer sheet.

The statements in this inventory are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please answer them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Read each item carefully; then select one of the five responses below and fill in the answer space on the separate answer sheet.

Don't skip any items. Answer each one. Use a soft lead pencil. Pens won't work. If you change an answer, you must erase the old answer completely and enter the new one.

	Completely False	Mostly False	Partly False and Partly True	Mostly True	Completely True
RESPONSES	C F 1	M F 2	PF-PT 3	M T 4	C T 5
1. I have a healthy body.1
2. I am an attractive person.2
3. I consider myself a sloppy person.3
4. I am a decent sort of person4
5. I am an honest person.5
6. I am a bad person.6
7. I am a cheerful person7
8. I am a calm and easy going person.8
9. I am a nobody.9
10. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.					10
11. I am a member of a happy family.					11
12. My friends have no confidence in me.					12
13. I am a friendly person					13
14. I am popular with men.					14
15. I am not interested in what other people do. . . .					15
16. I do not always tell the truth					16
17. I get angry sometimes.					17
18. I like to look nice and neat all the time.					18
19. I am full of aches and pains					19
20. I am a sick person					20

Sociopaths Compared

178

21.	I am a religious person21
22.	I am a moral failure.22
23.	I am a morally weak person.23
24.	I have a lot of self-control24
25.	I am a hateful person25
26.	I am losing my mind26
27.	I am an important person to my friends and family.27
28.	I am not loved by my family28
29.	I feel that my family doesn't trust me.29
30.	I am popular with women30
31.	I am mad at the whole world31
32.	I am hard to be friendly with32
33.	Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.33
34.	Sometimes when I am not feeling well, I am cross34
35.	I am neither too fat nor too thin35
36.	I like my looks just the way they are36
37.	I would like to change some parts of my body37
38.	I am satisfied with my moral behavior38
39.	I am satisfied with my relationship to God.39
40.	I ought to go to church more.40
41.	I am satisfied to be just what I am41
42.	I am just as nice as I should be.42
43.	I despise myself.43
44.	I am satisfied with my family relationships44
45.	I understand my family.45
46.	I should trust my family more46
47.	I am as sociable as I want to be.47
48.	I try to please others, but I don't overdo it48
49.	I am no good at all from a social standpoint.49
50.	I do not like everyone I know50
51.	Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.51
52.	I am neither too tall nor too short52
53.	I don't feel as well as I should.53
54.	I should have more sex appeal54
55.	I am as religious as I want to be55
56.	I wish I could be more trustworthy.56
57.	I shouldn't tell so many lies57
58.	I am as smart as I want to be58
59.	I am not the person I would like to be.59
60.	I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do60
61.	I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living).61
62.	I am too sensitive to things my family say.62
63.	I should love my family more.63
64.	I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.64
65.	I should be more polite to others65
66.	I ought to get along better with other people66
67.	I gossip a little at times.67
68.	At times I feel like swearing68

Sociopaths Compared

179

69.	I take good care of myself physically	69
70.	I try to be careful about my appearance.	70
71.	I often act like I am "all thumbs"	71
72.	I am true to my religion in my everyday life	72
73.	I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong	73
74.	I sometimes do very bad things	74
75.	I can always take care of myself in any situation.	75
76.	I take the blame for things without getting mad.	76
77.	I do things without thinking about them first.	77
78.	I try to play fair with my friends and family.	78
79.	I take a real interest in my family.	79
80.	I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living).	80
81.	I try to understand the others fellow's point of view.	81
82.	I get along well with other people	82
83.	I do not forgive others easily	83
84.	I would rather win than lose in a game	84
85.	I feel good most of the time	85
86.	I do poorly in sports and games.	86
87.	I am a poor sleeper.	87
88.	I do what is right most of the time.	88
89.	I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead.	89
90.	I have trouble doing the things that are right	90
91.	I solve my problems quite easily	91
92.	I change my mind a lot	92
93.	I try to run away from my problems	93
94.	I do my share of work at home.	94
95.	I quarrel with my family	95
96.	I do not act like my family thinks I should.	96
97.	I see good points in all the people I meet	97
98.	I do not feel at ease with other people.	98
99.	I find it hard to talk with strangers.	99
100.	Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.	100

Appendix E

The Rotter Internal/External Locus
of Control Scale
(Rotter, 1966)

- 1.a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
- b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
- 2.a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
- b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
- 3.a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
- b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
- 4.a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
- b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
- 5.a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
- b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
- 6.a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
- b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
- 7.a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
- b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
- 8.a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
- b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what one is like.
- 9.a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
- b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
- 10.a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
- b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

- 11.a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
- b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
- 12.a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
- b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
- 13.a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
- b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
- 14.a. There are certain people who are just no good.
- b. There is some good in everybody.
- 15.a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
- b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
- 16.a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
- b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
- 17.a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
- b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
- 18.a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
- b. There really is no such thing as "luck."
- 19.a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
- b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
- 20.a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
- b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

- 21.a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
- b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
- 22.a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
- b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23.a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
- b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
- 24.a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
- b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
- 25.a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
- b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26.a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
- b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
- 27.a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
- b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 28.a. What happens to me is my own doing.
- b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29.a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
- b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

Appendix F

The Spiritual Well-Being Scale

(Paloutzian & Ellison, 1979)

Sociopaths Compared

185

For each of the following statements circle the choice that best indicates the extent of your agreement or disagreement as it describes your personal experience:

SA = Strongly Agree D = Disagree
MA = Moderately Agree MD = Moderately Disagree
A = Agree SD = Strongly Disagree

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. I don't find much satisfaction in private prayer with God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 2. I don't know who I am, where I came from, or where I am going. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 3. I believe that God loves me and cares about me. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 4. I feel that life is a positive experience. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 5. I believe that God is impersonal and not interested in my daily situations. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 6. I feel unsettled about my future. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 7. I have a personally meaningful relationship with God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 8. I feel very fulfilled and satisfied with life. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 9. I don't get much personal strength and support from my God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 10. I feel a sense of well-being about the direction my life is headed in. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 11. I believe that God is concerned about my problems. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 12. I don't enjoy much about life. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 13. I don't have a personally satisfying relationship with God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 14. I feel good about my future. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 15. My relationship with God helps me not to feel lonely. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 16. I feel that life is full of conflict and unhappiness. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 17. I feel most fulfilled when I'm in close communion with God. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 18. Life doesn't have much meaning. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 19. My relation with God contributes to my sense of well-being. | SA MA A D MD SD |
| 20. I believe there is some real purpose for my life. | SA MA A D MD SD |

Appendix G

The Internal/External Religious

Orientation Scale

(Allport & Ross, 1967)

Sociopaths Compared

187

In each of the following statements circle the letter of the choice which best describes your personal experience.

1. What religion offers most is comfort when sorrow and misfortune strike.
 - a. I definitely disagree
 - b. I tend to disagree
 - c. I tend to agree
 - d. I definitely agree

2. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.
 - a. I definitely disagree
 - b. I tend to disagree
 - c. I tend to agree
 - d. I definitely agree

3. Religion helps to keep my life balanced and steady in exactly the same way as my citizenship, friendships, and other memberships do.
 - a. I definitely agree
 - b. I tend to agree
 - c. I tend to disagree
 - d. I definitely disagree

4. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.
 - a. Definitely not true
 - b. Tends not to be true
 - c. Tends to be true
 - d. Definitely true

5. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.
 - a. I definitely disagree
 - b. I tend to disagree
 - c. I tend to agree
 - d. I definitely agree

6. It doesn't matter so much what I believe as long as I lead a moral life.
 - a. I definitely disagree
 - b. I tend to disagree
 - c. I tend to agree
 - d. I definitely agree

Sociopaths Compared

188

7. Quite often I have been aware of the presence of God or of the Divine Being.
 - a. Definitely not true
 - b. Tends not to be true
 - c. Tends to be true
 - d. Definitely true
8. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.
 - a. This is definitely not so
 - b. Probably not so
 - c. Probably so
 - d. Definitely so
9. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.
 - a. Almost never
 - b. Sometimes
 - c. Usually
 - d. Almost always
10. Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
 - a. Definitely not true for me
 - b. Tends not to be true
 - c. Tends to be true
 - d. Clearly true in my case
11. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.
 - a. I definitely disagree
 - b. I tend to disagree
 - c. I tend to agree
 - d. I definitely agree
12. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in life.
 - a. I definitely disagree
 - b. I tend to disagree
 - c. I tend to agree
 - d. I definitely agree
13. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church:
 - a. more than once a week
 - b. about once a week
 - c. two or three times a month
 - d. less than once a month

Sociopaths Compared

189

14. If I were to join a church group, I would prefer to join (1) a Bible study group, or (2) a social fellowship.
 - a. I would prefer to join (1)
 - b. I probably would prefer (1)
 - c. I probably would prefer (2)
 - d. I would prefer to join (2)

15. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.
 - a. Definitely true of me
 - b. Tends to be true of me
 - c. Tends not to be true
 - d. Definitely not true of me

16. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.
 - a. Definitely disagree
 - b. Tend to disagree
 - c. Tend to agree
 - d. Definitely agree

17. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.
 - a. Definitely not true of me
 - b. Tends not to be true
 - c. Tends to be true
 - d. Definitely true of me

18. I read literature about my faith (or church):
 - a. Frequently
 - b. Occasionally
 - c. Rarely
 - d. Never

19. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.
 - a. Definitely disagree
 - b. Tend to disagree
 - c. Tend to agree
 - d. Definitely agree

20. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious activities and meditation.
 - a. Frequently true
 - b. Occasionally true
 - c. Rarely true
 - d. Never true

Sociopaths Compared

190

21. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.
- a. I definitely agree
 - b. I tend to agree
 - c. I tend to disagree
 - d. I definitely disagree

Appendix H

The God Concept Semantic

Differential Scale

(Benson & Spilka, 1973)

Sociopaths Compared

192

How Would You Describe God?

If you believe in God, please answer the following. For each of the following pairs of adjectives, check the space which best shows how you would describe God. (Mark only space for each pair of words.)

close	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	distant
rejecting	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	accepting
personal	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	impersonal
demanding	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	not demanding
loving	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	hating
damning	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	saving
freeing	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	restricting
strong	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	weak
unforgiving	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	forgiving
controlling	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	uncontrolling
approving	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	disapproving
strict	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	lenient
permissive	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	rigid

TGC KEY

How Would You Describe God?

If you believe in God, please answer the following. For each of the following pairs of adjectives, check the space which best shows how you would describe God. (Mark only space for each pair of words.)

close	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	distant
-rejecting	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	accepting
personal	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	impersonal
demanding	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	not demanding
-loving	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	hating
-damning	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	saving
freeing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	restricting
strong	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	weak
-unforgiving	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	forgiving
controlling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	uncontrolling
-approving	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	disapproving
strict	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	lenient
permissive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	rigid

Loving God Scale

Sociopaths Compared

194

How Would You Describe God?

If you believe in God, please answer the following. For each of the following pairs of adjectives, check the space which best shows how you would describe God. (Mark only space for each pair of words.)

close	_____	distant
rejecting	_____	accepting
personal	_____	impersonal
- demanding	<u>6</u> <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u>	not demanding
loving	_____	hating
damning	_____	saving
- freeing	<u>0</u> <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> <u>4</u> <u>5</u> <u>6</u>	restricting
strong	_____	weak
unforgiving	_____	forgiving
- controlling	<u>6</u> <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u>	uncontrolling
approving	_____	disapproving
- strict	<u>6</u> <u>5</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u>	lenient
- permissive	<u>0</u> <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> <u>4</u> <u>5</u> <u>6</u>	rigid

Controlling God Scale

Appendix I
Consent Form

Consent Form

I give consent to participate in a study conducted by
Dave Agnor from Western Conservative Baptist Seminary.

I realize this study involves filling out questionnaires,
and the information remains strictly confidential, with no
names used on any records.

Signed, _____ Date _____

Witness _____

Appendix J

The Biographic Data Sheet

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

PART I

AGE _____

SEX _____

Length of time inside Oregon State Prison served to date:

- _____ less than six months
- _____ more than six months
- _____ three years or more
- _____ eight years or more

OCCUPATION: a. prior to imprisonment? _____
b. present OSP job? _____

PRESENT CHURCH AFFILIATION: _____ Catholic
_____ Jewish
_____ Protestant - specify denomination _____
Other: specify _____
_____ None

MARITAL STATUS: _____ Never married
_____ Married _____ How many times?
_____ Divorced
_____ Widowed
_____ Separated
_____ Living as married

Appendix K

Religious Opinion Questionnaire

RELIGIOUS OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

PART II

1. In what religion were you raised:

1. Protestant (Which church or denomination?) _____
2. Catholic _____
3. Jewish _____
4. Other _____
5. None _____

2. How often do you attend religious activities, i.e., chapel or clubs, etc?

1. More than once a week _____
2. Once a week or so _____
3. Once or twice a month _____
4. Several times a year _____
5. Hardly ever _____
6. Never _____

3. Do you think that inmates who participate in religious activities are sincere?

1. Yes, most are sincere _____
2. No, most are not sincere _____
3. I don't know (undecided) _____

4. Which of the following statements comes closest to expressing what you believe about God? (Please check only one answer.)

1. I know God really exists and I have no doubts about it. _____
2. While I have doubts, I feel that I do believe in God. _____
3. I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at other times. _____
4. I don't believe in a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind. _____
5. I don't know whether there is a God and I don't believe there is any way to find out. _____
6. I don't believe in God. _____
7. None of the above represents what I believe. What I believe about God is _____

(Please specify)

Sociopaths Compared

201

5. Which of the following statements comes closest to expressing what you believe about Jesus? (Check only one answer.)
1. Jesus is the Divine Son of God and I have no doubts about it. _____
 2. While I have some doubts, I feel basically that Jesus is Divine. _____
 3. I feel that Jesus was a great man and very holy, but I don't feel Him to be the Son of God any more than all of us are children of God. _____
 4. I think that Jesus was only a man although an extraordinary one. _____
 5. Frankly, I'm not entirely sure there was such a person as Jesus. _____
 6. None of the above represents what I believe. What I believe about Jesus is _____
(Please specify)
6. The Bible tells of many miracles, some credited to Christ and some to other prophets and apostles. Generally speaking, which of the following statements comes closest to what you believe about Biblical miracles? (Check only one answer.)
1. I'm not sure whether these miracles really happened or not. _____
 2. I believe miracles are stories and never really happened. _____
 3. I believe the miracles happened, but can be explained by natural causes. _____
 4. I believe the miracles actually happened just as the Bible says they did. _____
7. The Devil actually exists. (Check how certain you are this is true.)
1. Completely true _____
 2. Probably true _____
 3. Probably not true _____
 4. Definitely not true _____
8. Do you consider yourself to be a Christian? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, which of the following best describes your views:
____ I respect and attempt to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Christ.
____ I have received Jesus Christ into my life as my personal Savior and Lord.
If you responded yes, how long have you been a Christian? _____ years _____ months
9. Estimate the extent to which you feel that your knowing about God or knowing God is important to you?
- Very important (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Not at all important
10. Have you ever felt close to God or a Divine source?
- Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

Appendix L

Raw Statistical Data

Sociopaths Compared

204

22 6 7 17 13 53 38 22 56 38 41 59 37 41 26 999 999 999 999
 999 999 30 28 58 37 4 1 3 5 1 1 6 2 5 6 3 3 2 999 999 5 1
 40 1 4 2
 23 16 26 10 11 48 47 19 25 28 34 25 26 23 20 9 19 39 999 999 999
 34 24 58 41 2 1 3 3 6 1 6 3 4 5 4 1 1 2 25 3 2 1 2 999 2
 24 14 18 4 10 64 55 46 59 55 57 46 71 35 64 24 16 24 999 999 999
 42 35 77 38 2 2 2 3 3 1 4 1 1 3 3 2 1 1 38 1 3 25 2 8 2
 25 21 29 24 8 50 58 61 58 54 65 38 51 67 63 10 14 33 999 999 999
 44 53 97 31 1 1 1 3 2 1 5 1 2 2 1 2 2 999 999 4 2 10 2 999 2
 26 6 9 5 9 36 34 23 46 33 45 27 34 41 34 15 12 40 999 999 999
 39 40 79 35 2 1 1 5 3 2 5 2 1 1 4 1 2 1 35 5 1 5 2 999 2
 27 14 21 4 11 46 35 35 43 31 37 34 50 39 32 11 19 38 999 999 999
 29 38 67 38 2 1 1 5 6 5 3 3 2 2 1 3 2 999 999 3 1 12 1 999
 2
 30 21 29 25 4 42 45 66 31 52 69 38 35 34 58 0 12 12 19 17 36 60
 49 109 29 4 3 1 3 1 5 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 3 1 1 60 3 2 1
 31 22 28 24 9 36 55 64 45 59 51 53 58 59 49 0 14 15 14 28 42 30
 57 117 28 4 1 1 4 2 4 1 2 1 1 4 1 1 1 8 1 1 60 3 999 1
 32 22 28 20 2 45 34 21 38 52 31 53 39 24 38 0 19 22 24 14 38 51
 38 89 44 2 1 1 3 4 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 38 1 1 20 1 999 1
 33 17 20 22 4 43 30 24 34 32 33 29 35 29 33 6 18 25 18 25 43 50
 37 87 30 2 1 3 3 2 2 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 1 1 1 15 1 999 1
 34 18 29 24 2 33 67 61 65 64 65 55 63 58 76 9 13 26 10 32 41 60
 58 118 28 2 2 3 3 3 2 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 1 1 1 30 6 7 1
 35 15 16 23 16 48 28 27 32 27 27 27 33 32 30 1 17 20 23 28 51 41
 40 81 20 2 1 1 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 4 1 1 2 1 2 3 60 3 4 1
 36 21 27 28 1 31 65 64 50 82 66 48 62 63 68 0 12 12 11 20 31 30
 22 115 31 3 1 1 3 8 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 16 1 1 60 3 2 1
 37 17 25 20 3 44 50 48 53 47 49 51 59 43 46 0 18 18 20 36 56 40
 40 080 46 2 1 3 3 6 1 1 2 1 1 4 1 1 2 999 1 1 60 3 999 1
 38 17 29 27 2 36 67 58 71 65 47 62 72 66 73 0 12 12 18 32 50 60
 60 120 40 2 1 1 3 3 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 3 1 1 15 3 999 1
 39 17 25 24 5 33 71 64 65 70 68 61 67 72 58 1 9 14 16 15 31 29
 58 117 25 2 1 3 3 1 5 2 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 2 1 1 18 2 8 1
 40 14 21 23 3 36 51 57 50 44 32 55 69 49 49 0 12 13 14 26 40 55
 60 115 34 2 1 3 3 5 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 3 2 1 1 3 5 999 1
 41 21 25 25 9 41 36 39 32 39 34 39 37 39 39 0 12 12 20 30 50 55
 49 104 36 3 1 1 3 1 1 2 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 5 1 1 20 7 999 1
 42 17 24 20 7 68 55 56 48 58 58 51 56 46 55 0 12 6 19 22 41 55
 60 115 30 2 1 2 3 1 1 3 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 2 1 1 20 2 999 1
 43 19 27 22 7 54 39 39 44 39 52 41 38 41 34 3 15 19 20 26 44 60
 44 104 31 2 3 1 3 1 1 2 1 1 1 4 1 1 3 19 1 1 5 1 999 1
 44 999 999 999 7 36 51 45 54 54 51 52 56 48 49 3 19 24 22 31
 53 50 39 89 32 2 2 1 3 6 5 2 3 1 1 4 999 1 999 2 1 3 20 1
 999 1
 45 19 28 22 10 37 39 35 47 39 52 36 50 32 42 0 12 13 14 24 38 55
 54 109 40 3 1 3 3 6 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 999 32 1 1 7 1 999 1

Sociopaths Compared

205

46 15 23 20 8 31 76 63 81 72 59 69 85 76 66 0 12 12 999 999
 999 60 55 115 44 2 1 3 4 6 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 29 1 1 20 1 999
 1
 47 12 21 10 9 44 40 40 45 37 41 49 56 51 48 2 15 20 21 26 47 36
 35 71 33 2 1 1 5 6 2 2 3 1 1 4 1 1 2 4 1 1 5 1 999 1
 48 13 24 23 5 60 36 33 38 44 38 29 46 39 46 3 15 18 14 37 51 52
 43 98 32 4 2 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 4 1 1 2 3 1 1 40 7 2 1
 49 18 25 24 5 33 75 74 73 72 61 75 81 77 61 0 16 17 10 22 32 60
 55 115 34 4 1 1 3 6 4 1 2 1 1 4 1 1 2 7 1 1 400 3 6 1
 50 21 26 20 2 60 47 51 44 51 58 38 42 45 58 3 18 22 23 21 44 55
 56 111 30 4 1 1 3 1 4 1 1 3 1 4 1 1 2 8 1 1 40 2 1 1
 51 15 14 24 5 51 26 18 32 31 22 27 31 21 38 0 18 18 19 17 36 55
 55 110 27 3 1 1 3 5 1 2 2 1 1 4 1 1 2 999 1 1 70 3 2 1
 52 21 26 20 8 36 71 67 71 72 67 69 76 66 62 3 18 22 14 35 49 60
 60 120 34 3 1 3 3 6 2 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 5 1 1 20 1 999 1
 53 19 24 26 3 38 55 50 52 66 54 49 55 66 51 3 6 9 12 24 36 60
 69 119 33 4 1 3 3 6 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 9 1 1 60 3 4 1
 54 21 27 26 3 49 50 55 46 46 29 57 52 51 53 5 9 16 12 37 49 60
 50 110 44 2 1 1 3 6 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 2 7 1 1 20 6 999 1
 55 20 24 18 7 29 19 5 39 17 35 17 28 6 12 3 24 27 21 31 52 60
 53 113 39 3 1 1 3 6 1 2 3 1 1 4 1 1 2 2 1 1 20 2 1 1
 56 19 21 23 5 999 999 999 999 999 999 999 999 999 999 999 999
 6 6 21 21 21 42 41 57 98 46 1 1 1 3 2 4 2 1 2 1 4 1 1 2
 999 1 1 5 1 999 1

RAW DATA KEY

- A. The first number is the subject I.D., 1-27=non-religious group;
30-56=Christian group.
- B. Tests are in same order presented on raw data table from left
to right: (999=no score)
MCG; MHG; MSG; Rotter I/E; Self-Critic; Total Pos; Identity;
Self Satis.; Behavior; Physical; Moral/Ethical; Personal;
Family; Social; IROS; EROS; ROSIE; LGS; CGS; TGCS; RWB; EWB;
SWB;
- C. Biographical Data Part I continuing in order:
Age; time served (1=6 mos. to 4=8 yrs. & up.); Prior
occupation (1=Blue Collar, 2=white collar, 3=unemployed); OSP
job (1=work, 2=labor pool, 3=college); church affiliation
(1=Catholic, 2=Jewish, 3=Protestant, 4=other, 5=none); marital
status (1=never married, 2=married, 3=divorced, 4=widowed,
5=separated, 6=married 2X, 7=married 3X, 8=married 4X,
9=married 5X)

D. Religious Orientation Questionnaire Part II continuing in order:

Question 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8 (1=yes, 2=no); Christian type (1=ethical, 2=personal, 3=both); years a Christian: 9; 10 (1=yes, 2=no, 3=undecided)

E. Crime Codes continuing in order:

Consecutive years sentenced; primary crime category (1=sex crimes, 2=theft, robbery, 3=murder, 4=kidnap, 5=DW suspended, 6=manslaughter, attempted murder, 7=assault, 8=other); secondary crime category same as primary

F. Group assignment:

Last digit is operational group assignment (1=Christian group, 2=non-religious group)

Appendix M

VITA

VITA

DAVID WAYNE AGNOR

Birthdate: 1 December 1953

Birthplace: Norman, Oklahoma

Marital Status: Married - 2 children

Home Address: 1302 N.W. 80th Street
Vancouver, WA 98665

EDUCATION

<u>PhD. Candidate, Clinical/Counseling Psychology Program,</u> Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon.	1980-Present
<u>Master of Art's Clinical/Counseling Psychology Degree,</u> Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon.	1977-1980
<u>Master of Education, Counseling/Education Program, University</u> of Portland, Portland, Oregon.	1976-1977
<u>Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, Seattle Pacific University,</u> Seattle, Washington.	1973-1975
<u>Undergraduate Coursework, Eastern Oregon State College.</u>	1971-1973

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

<u>Individual and Family Therapist, Montavilla Family Counseling</u> Center, Portland, Oregon. Individual, youth, adult, marriage and family counseling therapy.	1984-Present
<u>Clinical Psychology Intern, Oregon State Hospital, Salem,</u> Oregon. Internship rotated through Correctional Treatment Program Mentally/Emotionally Disturbed Unit, Forensic Psychiatric Service Sex Offender Unit and criminally insane wards, and the Community Psychiatric Service. Duties included written psychological evaluations with diagnosis and treatment recommendations; sat on the Forensic Disposition Board; co- therapist in group therapy; intake interviews; treatment team participation. Population was wide in range, such as character disordered sex offenders, schizophrenics, depressives, sociopaths, brain-damaged patients, etc. Experience included court testimony in defense of diagnosis. Thirty hours per week for nine months.	1982-1983

VITA
David Wayne Agnor
Page 2

Caseworker, Youth Outreach, Inc., Vancouver, Washington.
Individual youth, adult and family counseling. Supervised
group house parents in implementation of treatment programs
for incorrigible/delinquent youth. Developed individual
treatment programs, liaised communications between Juvenile
Court, Department of Social & Health Services, mental health
professionals, schools and families. Chaired staffings.
Administered finances.

1975-1979

Specific achievements:

- 1) Served on a task force comprised of high level supervisors from DSHS, Clark County Juvenile Court, which developed the first cooperative interim home program in Washington State for run-away youths in compliance with House Bill 371.
- 2) Developed and implemented a summer treatment work program for delinquent youth in conjunction with U.S. Forest Service at Wind River and CETA.

Businessman, Teasers Shirt Shops, Incorporated, Portland, Oregon.
Principal owner of two retail operations and one commercial
screen printing operation.

1976-1983