



60-341

## ABSTRACT

### A CLINICAL STUDY: RELATIONSHIPS OF ANGER AND FEAR TO AGGRESSION, IN MURDERERS AND IN NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS

By

Robert Railton McKie

This study investigated TAT fantasy levels of anger, fear, overt aggression, and modes of coping in murderers and non-violent offenders. The subjects were twenty prison inmates serving sentences for either first or second degree murder, and twenty inmates serving sentences for non-person oriented felonies. All inmates were from the prison population at the State Prison for Southern Michigan, at Jackson, Michigan.

The subject population was divided into four groups:

1. Psychotic murderers (PMur): inmates serving sentences for murder first, or second degree, having had a psychiatric history of a psychotic disorder.
2. Non-psychotic murderers (NPMur): inmates serving sentences for murder first, or second degree,

having had no psychiatric history of a psychotic disorder.

3. Psychotic non-murderers (PNMur): inmates serving sentences for non-person oriented felonies, having had a psychiatric history of a psychotic disorder.
4. Non-psychotic Non-Murderers (NPNMur): inmates serving sentences for non-person oriented felonies, having had no psychiatric history of a psychotic disorder.

The standard 20 Card TAT for males was administered, in two sittings, ten cards per sitting, by this investigator. A ten minute rest interval was instituted between the first ten and second ten cards of the test administration. Administration was standard Tomkins instructions, modified to a level commensurate with the prison population's comprehension. No interrogation was carried out on any of the Cards.

There was one major hypothesis and seven secondary hypotheses investigated. The hypotheses and results are listed below:

#### Major Hypothesis

- H<sub>1</sub>: Murderers TAT fantasy themes will contain less conscious affectual anger than non-murderers.  
Results: Supported p 0.02

Secondary Hypotheses

- H<sub>2</sub>: Murderers TAT fantasy themes will contain more conscious affectual fear than will TAT themes of non-murderers. Results: Significant p 0.02, but directionally opposite.
- H<sub>3</sub>: Murderers TAT fantasy themes will contain more overt aggressive behavior than will TAT themes of non-murderers. Results: Significant p 0.04, but directionally opposite.
- H<sub>4</sub>: Murderers TAT fantasy themes will contain more stories with the aggression due to external others than will non-murderers. Results: Significant p 0.001, but directionally opposite.
- H<sub>5</sub>: Murderers TAT fantasy themes will contain more stories with the outcome uncertain than will non-murderers. Results: (a) Significant p 0.01, murderers more uncertain outcomes; (b) Significant p 0.01, murderers less unfavorable outcomes; (c) Trend p 0.07, murderers less favorable outcomes.
- H<sub>6</sub>: Murderers TAT fantasy themes will contain more stories with the locus of control in external others, or chance than will non-murderers. Results: (a) Significant p 0.002, murderers less chance control events; (b) Significant p 0.03, murderers more self control events.
- H<sub>7</sub>: Murderers TAT fantasy themes will contain less different modes of coping behaviors than will non-murderers. Results: (a) Not significant--data indicate trivial differences; (b) Psychotic Non-Murderers use Harmavoidance more than any other group p 0.04.
- H<sub>8</sub>: Murderers TAT fantasy themes will show no differences on any of the scales due to a history of psychosis. Results: no differences were found--Indeed any differences appear to be trivial.

Significant findings were obtained on all seven scales. The major hypothesis was supported, and significance was noted on seven of the eight secondary hypotheses.



Numbers of coping behaviors, exhibited no significant difference, however, a difference was noted for psychotic non-murderers, who used Harmavoidance more extensively than did the other three groups. Four of these findings, while significant, were directionally opposite to that hypothesized.

The results uncovered two clearly specific syndromes in murderers:

1. A syndrome of massive repression of hostile and fearful affect as well as aggressive behavior; really a syndrome of repression of unpleasant feelings and thoughts, and
2. A syndrome of behavioral set, or expectancy for a fighting stance, in which murderers appear set to attack or defend, see outcomes of events non committally, and control as being their responsibility.

It is suggested that these findings give support to a sequential two-stage syndrome, necessary for the individual's survival as a child, and necessary to his being able to commit murder as an adult. The findings are discussed in the light of Freudian and ego-psychology traditions. Tomkins' theory, a modification of Freudian, is utilized to explain the mechanisms of repression and release of explosive violence associated with murder.

Literature related to murderers was extensively reviewed relative to degrees and differences of culpable and non-culpable homicide. Statistics relative to homicide and its concomittant causative effects was presented. A review of murderers family rearing and development, as well as clinical studies of murderers was discussed; both clinical and projective assessments were reviewed, relative to intrapsychic differences and to overt behavior.

A CLINICAL STUDY: RELATIONSHIPS OF ANGER  
AND FEAR TO AGGRESSION, IN MURDERERS  
AND IN NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS

By

Robert Railton McKie

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling, Personnel Services,  
and Educational Psychology

1971

© Copyright by  
ROBERT RAILTON MCKIE

**1972**

DEDICATED TO

My mother and father, Mary Frances and Stewart Scott McKie who kindled the initial spark in my quest for understanding . . . and to my wife Shirley Annette and my children, Kathryn Shirley, Robert Ross, and Stewart Scott for fanning and sustaining the fires.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to many fine people for their support and assistance throughout my Doctoral program.

I am particularly indebted to the members of my Doctoral Committee without whose continuing encouragement, and guidance this study would not have been possible.

They are:

Dr. Betram P. Karon, Chairman of my Dissertation Committee, who gave unstintingly of his time and clinical experience in guiding this research. Bert has been an exciting and inspiring teacher, as well as a good friend to me throughout my studies.

Dr. James W. Costar, Chairman of my Doctoral Committee, who has guided both my Masters and Doctoral programs. Jim has been a constant friend offering support and strength throughout both programs. He has selflessly encouraged, guided and supported me ensuring that I achieve my own area of academic interests.

Dr. Norman Kagan, who has been supportive and encouraging to me throughout my Doctoral program, ensuring me a variety of practical training, and research experiences. Norm has offered both encouragement and his clinical experience in developing this research.

Dr. Arvo Juola, the fourth member of my committee who has encouraged me in my own special interests, as well as guided my thinking in the methodological problems of this research. He has as well been a constant support and encouragement to me throughout my program.

There are numerous others who have been an integral and necessary part of this research or have been vital to my development throughout this program.

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Fred J. Pesetsky, Director, Michigan Corrections Psychiatric Clinic for his assistance in both administrative and clinical areas of this research. He and his staff, in particular Dr. Howard Porter, Dr. Robert Brook and Mr. Elton Scott have been a close support throughout my internship in Clinical and Forensic Psychology at the clinic, constantly assisting in the development and implementation of this research.

I am particularly indebted to the inmate staff of the Michigan Corrections Psychiatric Clinic, both for their suggestions in working with the prison inmate population, as well as for their valuable suggestions relative to the study itself. Several of this staff volunteered for the Pilot study. Several others worked as paid assistants. This is a valuable pool of untapped talent in Forensic research as Dr. Hans Toch noted. They are enthusiastic

and helpful and have a lot to offer. They should certainly be used more extensively as research assistants.

Of course without the assistance and co-operation of the inmate subjects, this study would not have been possible.

The executive staff of the Department of Corrections, Mr. Gus Harrison, Director; Mr. Howard Grossman, Deputy Director; and Mr. Perry Johnson, Warden, The State Prison of Southern Michigan approved and encouraged me in this project. I appreciate specifically their provision of facilities and their approval of the paid use of inmate typists, and an inmate administrative clerk to assist me. I should also like to express my appreciation to Warden Johnson's staff for their many courtesies and assistance during the gathering of the data.

It is my sincere hope that the understanding gained through the findings of this study will repay both Departmental Officials and inmate subjects for their time and courtesy. There is a need, expressed by both for the development of a specific treatment program for murderers, and other assaultive offenders.

Dr. Warren S. Wille, Consultant in Psychiatry, and Formerly Director, the Michigan Corrections Psychiatric Clinic, provided me with access to his extensive file of clinical interview studies on homicide, and his



prepublication draft on studies of 100 murderers. He was also unstinting of his experience and encouraging to me in this research.

Dr. Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, formerly a clinical intern in the Michigan Corrections Psychiatric Clinic generously provided me with a draft copy of his Doctoral Dissertation, as well as suggestions relative to modifying the study itself in the light of his own similar Doctoral research project.

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. E. L. V. Shelley, formerly Director of Treatment, Department of Corrections, Michigan, for his supervision and guidance during my internship at the Reception Diagnostic Centre.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance, encouragement and the teaching of Dr. Albert Rabin and the late Dr. Bufford Stefflre.

Many members of the Counseling Center, in particular, Drs. Bill Kell, Ted Hill, Jane Church, Ed. Lessin, Gwen Norrell, Cec. Williams, and Sam Plyler, contributed to my personal and professional growth. I am indebted to Dr. Allen J. Enelow, Chairman, Department of Psychiatry, Michigan State University and his staff, for my training there as a Graduate Research Assistant.

Mrs. Melannie Telegdi, Mr. Art Lewandowski, graduate students from the University of Waterloo, Dr. Arthur A. Thomas, Director of Alcoholism and Drug Treatment, Providence

Hospital, Detroit, and my wife Shirley, were invaluable in their assistance in the scoring of the data. While at times they did not see eye-to-eye with me, that is to say sometimes they would rather not read TAT protocols, generally they could be browbeaten, pleaded with or shamed into it.

As all previous graduate students have acknowledged, without the constant love and affection of wife and children, the completion of a Doctoral program would be impossible. Shirley went just that extra mile, scoring protocols and typing, typing, as well as being a source of nurture and support throughout. Kathryn and Robbie helped run some early calculations and Stewart helped sort protocols and tables, all encouraging and supporting Dad, and patiently waiting for Chapter V to be completed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	xi
LIST OF APPENDICES . . . . .	xiii
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
The Need for the Study . . . . .	1
A Statement of the Problem . . . . .	2
Theoretical Orientation . . . . .	2
Definition of Terms . . . . .	4
The Hypotheses . . . . .	5
Assumptions . . . . .	6
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	6
Organization of the Study . . . . .	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	10
Homicide and Murder: A Definition . . . . .	10
Types of Homicide . . . . .	10
The Arrest and Prosecution of Homicide . . . . .	15
Arrest Statistics . . . . .	15
Prosecution Statistics . . . . .	16
Homicide Statistics . . . . .	18
International Homicide Rates . . . . .	18
Types of Homicides . . . . .	19
Socio-Cultural Factors in Homicide . . . . .	19
Victimology . . . . .	19
Insanity and Suicide Relationships in Homicide . . . . .	22
Sex Influences in Homicide . . . . .	24
Age Factors in Homicide . . . . .	26
Racial Factors in Homicide . . . . .	27
A Summary of Sociological Studies of Murderers	28
Sociological Studies of Concomittants to Murderer . . . . .	29
Methods of Murderer . . . . .	29
Time of the Homicide . . . . .	30

Chapter	Page
Place of Homicide . . . . .	31
Motives . . . . .	32
Assault Till Death Interval . . . . .	32
The Effect of Stimulants (alcohol or drugs)	33
Previous Criminal Records . . . . .	33
The Family Background of Murderers . . . . .	34
Clinical Studies of Murderers . . . . .	39
The TAT Fantasies and Overt Behavior . . . . .	45
TAT Studies of Anger and Aggression	
Fantasies and Overt Behavior . . . . .	45
The Relationship of Thought to Behavior . . . . .	47
Summary of TAT Fantasy Research on Anger	
and Aggression . . . . .	50
The Hypotheses . . . . .	50
The Major Hypothesis: Conscious Anger . . . . .	50
The Secondary Hypotheses . . . . .	51
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	55
Design . . . . .	55
The Sample . . . . .	56
The Setting . . . . .	57
Instrumentation and Collection of Data . . . . .	58
Instrumentation . . . . .	58
Procedure . . . . .	58
Introductory Statement . . . . .	59
Test Instructions . . . . .	59
Test Scales . . . . .	60
Statistical Hypotheses . . . . .	62
Procedures for Analyzing the Data . . . . .	64
Scoring Protocols . . . . .	64
Analysis of the Data . . . . .	66
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	70
Analysis of the Levels of Conscious Anger	
Scale . . . . .	71
Analysis of the Levels of Conscious Fear Scale	73
Analysis of the Levels of Overt Aggression	
Scale . . . . .	74
Analysis of the Aggressor Concept Scale . . . . .	76
Analysis of the Theme Outcome Scale . . . . .	78
Analysis of the Locus of Control Scale . . . . .	81
Analysis of the Modes of Coping Behaviors	
Scale . . . . .	81

Chapter	Page
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	85
A Summary of the Results . . . . .	85
Findings and Theory . . . . .	93
A Clinical Analysis of the TAT Protocols of Twenty Murderers . . . . .	97
Summary . . . . .	103
Implications for Future Research . . . . .	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	111
APPENDIX . . . . .	118

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1. Racial Patterns in Homicide Trials . . . .	17
2.2. Types of Homicides . . . . .	20
2.3. The Violence-Prone Person: A Typology . .	40
3.1. The Sample . . . . .	56
3.2. Interjudge Reliabilities, Modes of Coping Behaviors Scale . . . . .	66
4.1. Results of the Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Levels of Conscious Anger Scale .	72
4.1.1. Mean Scores for the Levels of Conscious Anger Scale . . . . .	72
4.2. Results of the Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Levels of Conscious Fear Scale . .	73
4.2.2. Mean Scores for the Levels of Conscious Fear Scale . . . . .	74
4.3. Results of the Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Levels of Overt Aggression Scale .	75
4.3.3. Mean Scores for the Levels of Overt Aggression Scale . . . . .	75
4.4. Results of the Multivariate Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Three-Category Aggressor Concept Scale . . . . .	77
4.4.4. Multivariate Mean Scores for the Aggressor Concept Scale . . . . .	78
4.5. Results of the Multivariate Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Theme Outcome Scale .	79
4.5.5. Multivariate Mean Scores for the Theme Outcome Scale . . . . .	80

Table	Page
4.6. Results of the Two-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance of the Locus of Control Scale . . . . .	82
4.6.6. Multivariate Mean Scores for the Locus of Control Scale . . . . .	83
4.7. Mean Scores for the Number of Different Coping Behaviors . . . . .	83
4.7.1. Results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance for Sub-scale Number 11 Harmavoidance . .	84
4.7.7. Mean Score for Sub-scale Number 11, Harmavoidance . . . . .	84
5.1. Summary TAT Findings in Relation to Original Hypothesis . . . . .	86
5.2. Hero Sex in TAT Stories, Total . . . . .	101
5.3. Card No. 16, Hero Sex Category . . . . .	101

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. TAT Personality Test Scales . . . . .	119
B. Tables of Subject Personal Data . . . . .	129
C. Tables of TAT Raw Score and Mean Score Data . .	136
D. TAT Pilot Study Data . . . . .	143



## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### The Need for the Study

"Other crimes onley speake; Murther shriekes out."<sup>1</sup>  
There were 13,650 murders committed in the United States in 1968. This is a thirteen per cent increase in this offense over 1967. The long range trend 1960-1968 reveals that the number of murders has risen 52 per cent. There were 634 murders in the State of Michigan itself in 1968; 477 occurred in the city of Detroit.<sup>2</sup> The cost in dollars and cents for the apprehension, conviction and incarceration of murderers is exorbitant; the cost in terms of human misery is of inestimable consequence.

While murder is the subject of ninety-five per cent of all crime novels, according to Riewald (1950) a Swiss criminologist, Guttmacher (1960) points out that the psychiatric literature is amazingly limited in studies of murder. Indeed, what studies there are, comprise mainly socio-cultural reports, clinical interview studies, or

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Duchess of Malfi, "Elizabethan drama from Guttmacher, M.S., " The Mind of the Murderer (N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Cudahay, 1960), p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Uniform Crime Reports for the United States (Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, 1968).

more frequently, reports of bizarre and sensational murder cases. Of the two hundred and eighty-six Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) studies listed in the Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, there is only one clinical study listed concerned with the subject of murder.<sup>3</sup> We have little professional understanding of the circumstances of murder and less information about the thought processes of the murderer himself. It is hoped that this study may offer some small contribution to this latter area of need.

#### A Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate by means of a projective personality test, certain possible dynamic factors that may predispose an individual to commit murder. The study attempted to determine whether, in fact, there is a difference between these factors in the fantasy life of murderers and non-murderers. In addition, the study attempted to identify the inter-relationships, if any, of these factors.

#### Theoretical Orientation

The theoretical orientation for this study is based on the ego-psychology of Horney (1964) and basic psychoanalytic principles relative to ego-defense

---

<sup>3</sup>M. W. Kahn, "Psychological Test Study of a Mass Murderer," J. Proj. Tech., 24:11-6, Mr' 60, in Buros, O. K., ed., The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook (Highland Park, N. J.: Gryphon Press, 1965), p. 530.

mechanisms, as developed by Freud (1964). This research draws on such sociological studies as those by Wolfgang (1967); clinical studies by Guttmacher (1960), Tanay (1969) and by Wille (1970), and socio-clinical studies by Toch (1969). The major orientation of the study tests Karon's (1963) hypothesis that basically murderers are unable to tolerate conscious feelings of anger. While a more complete theoretical orientation will be developed in Chapter II, the overall orientation is briefly outlined below.

Basically it is argued here that murderers are products of abusive child-rearing practices and violent cultural environments. As a consequence, they are seen as very fearful, anticipating aggression from vague external sources. Because of their environment, murderers become violently assaultive in conflicts yet try to inhibit their aggressive impulses and anger expressions to minimize such conflicts. Their repression of anger is seen as becoming so effective that they cannot consciously tolerate expressions of angry feelings.

It is further argued that these characteristics are reflected in patterns of the fantasy life of murderers. Consequently, they should be reflected in fantasy themes such as those told in the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) cards. Support for this contention will be offered in a

review of TAT research, an extensive review of which is reported by Buss (1961). A pilot study of murderers and non-murderers TAT themes with and without histories of psychosis offered sufficient support to this view to warrant a more extensive research study. The pilot study data are reported in Appendix D.

#### Definition of Terms

Fantasy: Any thinking which is not followed by action.

Felon: Any individual convicted of a crime and Sentenced to the prison system, The Department of Corrections, State of Michigan.

Murderer: Anyone convicted of the intentional act of killing another individual. For the purposes of this study, legal conviction of the offense of 1st or 2nd degree murder only was accepted as sufficient evidence to categorize an individual as a murderer.

Non-violent Felon: A felon convicted of a non-person oriented crime.

Non-psychotic Felon: Any felon who had not had on his record any previous history of psychosis.

Psychotic Felon: Any felon who had had a clinical diagnosis of any psychotic disorder.

Thematic Apperception Test (TAT): A set of twenty semi-structured monochromatic card scenes, produced by Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

### The Hypotheses

Within this study one primary hypothesis is investigated:

- H<sub>1</sub>: Murderers are less likely to express conscious affectual anger in their fantasy themes on TAT cards than are non-murderers.

Seven additional hypotheses are also investigated in relationship to the main hypothesis:

- H<sub>2</sub>: Murderers are more likely to have a high level of conscious fear in their fantasy themes than are non-murderers.
- H<sub>3</sub>: Murderers are more likely to have a high level of aggression fantasy in their TAT themes than are non-murderers.
- H<sub>4</sub>: Murderers will be more likely to see the aggressor as some vague external other than will non-murders.
- H<sub>5</sub>: Murderers will see more TAT locus of control of fantasy themes as chance than will non-murderers.
- H<sub>6</sub>: Murderers will see more TAT theme outcomes as being uncertain as to what could occur than will non-murderers.
- H<sub>7</sub>: Murderers will use a lower number of different coping behaviors in TAT fantasy themes than will non-murderers.

There has been a tendency to classify murderers in terms of psychopathology (Gutmacher, 1960). More recent studies, Toch (1969); Tanay (1969); and Wille (1970); suggest that such classifications are essentially meaningless. The following hypothesis is intended to test this latter view:

- H<sub>8</sub>: A history of psychosis does not distinguish between murderers and non-murderers on the dimensions of fantasy life specified above.

### Assumptions

In this study it was assumed that:

1. The measures of fantasy behavior obtained on the TAT represented accurate samples of the individual's own internal fantasy life.
2. At the time of the administration of the TAT test, the individual's fantasy behaviors were accurately measured.
3. Those individuals with no history of psychosis were clinically clear of such disorder.
4. Those individuals with a history of psychosis have had either predisposing personality patterns, or latent psychotic personalities, and can for the purposes of this study be assumed to have had this disorder prior to the commission of the offense for which they are currently incarcerated.
5. It is valuable to understand the relationships of aggression fantasies and levels of anger and fear in these groups.

### Limitations of the Study

Generalizations to be drawn from this study are limited to incarcerated adult murderers in the State of Michigan. Indeed this study recognizes that there may be cross-cultural differences in populations of murderers

drawn from different states or locales. Felons tested were drawn from the penal institution, the State Prison of Southern Michigan, at Jackson, and were limited to a minimum age, by institutional requirements, of twenty-three years. No attempt was made to control for socio-economic status, ethnic, racial or social group membership. While the average I.Q. of selected inmates is somewhat below the population average, Appendix B, there was no attempt to select on the basis of any variable other than the four groups previously cited.

It should be noted, further, that incarcerated murders, adjudicated guilty of First or Second Degree Murder only were included in the study. This limitation further restricts the generalizability of the study, as it precludes those individuals sentenced for Manslaughter, sentenced to State Mental Institutions, or those acquitted by the judicial process.

Sample size is, through practical necessity, a limiting factor. Each of the four groups used in this study consisted of only ten individuals. Tests of significance used are those designed for the study of small samples, that result in more precise calculation for error.

The Thematic Apperception Test, the instrument used in this study is routinely used by the staff at the Psychiatric Clinic attached to the prison. This instrument

has an extremely wide acceptance for use in the study of fantasy life of subjects and has been used in the major studies of felons. There are questions relating to the measurement of fantasy behavior in the prediction of overt behavior. In addition, some authorities question the use of this instrument itself. It should be noted, however, that of the instruments most used in the study of inner fantasy life of an individual, the TAT is one of the most widely used. While no attempt will be made to deal further with these issues here, the interested reader is referred to Tomkins (1967), and Karon (1968).

Lastly, the assumption of the individual's psychopathology at the time of testing was open to serious question. This is especially true in a study of individuals who have committed murder. The question of the effect of institutionalization upon psychopathology is one which can be of major concern. There is indeed serious question about this factor in this study. Any assumptions, really are of course, purely speculative and await a special study of their own.

#### Organization of the Study

The general format of the study is as follows: in Chapter I, an introductory statement of the problem is made. In Chapter II, the review of the literature leading to the development of the theoretical orientation of this



study is undertaken. In Chapter III, the design of the study is discussed, including sampling procedure, method of testing, statistical hypotheses and methods of analysis. The results of an analysis of the study are reported in Chapter IV. Chapter V, provides the summary, conclusions, and implications for future research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Homicide and Murder: A Definition

##### Types of Homicide

Homicide is the act of one person killing another person. There are two basic categories of homicide:

(1) non-culpable homicide, in which the offender is not held legally liable for his actions, and (2) culpable homicide, in which the offender is held legally liable for his actions, Bohannon (1960).

##### Non-culpable Homicide

There are two main categories of non-culpable homicides: (1) Dangerous legal institutions, and (2) Institutionalized homicides.

Dangerous legal institutions.--Certain institutions such as auto racing, and boxing are recognized high risk competitive so-called sports in Western society. There are specifically encouraged actions and behaviors which clearly threaten homicidal assault and frequently result in one individual killing another. Nonetheless, these are highly institutionalized and accepted activities, and

as long as the individuals kill each other within the broadly defined rules there is no liability for the action of killing.

Institutionalized homicides.--These are homicides accepted as an institutionalized function of society. There are three classes of such homicides: (1) Jural, (2) Excuseable, (3) Ritual.

Jural homicides.--Jural homicides are basically homicides committed with the sanction of the law. There are two categories of jural homicides: (1) Authorized homicides, or legal executions, and (2) Justifiable homicide.

#### Authorized Homicides (legal executions)

Authorized homicides are still carried out in many parts of the world today. In fact, as Bohannon states, "execution of criminals by 'other legal agents' is considered a 'necessary' part of jural practice," in many countries. While Sweden, West Germany and Denmark have abolished the death penalty, Britain has established a temporary 5-year moratorium on executions. Canada and the U.S.A., however, have established only unofficial suspensions of capital punishment, in that by unofficial governmental action in these countries, there have been no executions in Canada since 1966 and in the U.S. since 1967.

## Justifiable Homicides

Justifiable homicides are homicides committed generally in the act of self defense, or in the act of stopping a person from committing a felony. These homicides are generally committed by law enforcement officers in the pursuit of their duty. In a study of justifiable homicides committed by police, Robbin (1963), reported on 32 cases of persons killed by a total of 42 police officers. Of these homicides, 30 cases were exonerated at inquest; two went to Grand Jury trials and received indictments. These two cases were tried by jury and the offending officers were found not guilty. Robbin, in reviewing these cases found that the officers had acted as reasonable men. In 28 of the 32 cases, warning shots were fired, and in the other four cases, there was no time for such shots. Of the victims, 24 of the 32 were in the act of committing felonies.

Excuseable homicides.--Such homicides are either (1) unintentional homicides: killings done without intent to harm, or without criminal negligence; or (2) homicides committed in self defense, under specific extenuating circumstances. Such circumstances are delineated by Perkins (1946), as having 4 specific conditions:

1. There must have been adequate provocation.

Such examples are: self-defense; adultery; seduction of an offender's juvenile daughter;

rape of offender's wife, or close relative,  
etc.

2. The killing must have been in the heat of passion.
3. The killing must have followed the provocation before there had been a reasonable period for the offender to cool off.
4. A causal connection must exist between the provocation and the heat of passion, and the homicide act, such that the sequence must be able to be seen as an unbroken chain or sequence reaction in which no deliberation, or rational alternative existed.

Ritual homicides.--These are homicide practices dictated by religious or cultural ceremonies. Such homicides occurred, in the past in heresy inquisitions and demonology practices. They are still extant in several primitive societies, such as in African tribal ceremonies. The Tio tribe maintain communal hunts of persons, using poison clouts; the Luo tribe carry out wife capture practices which frequently result in killing members; the Alur tribe have ritual dances in which homicides occur. The Ashanti engaged in ritual sacrifice.

## Culpable Homicide

The determinants of Culpable homicides.--This is the act of homicide in which an offender is held legally responsible for the act of killing. The extent of the penalty, is, as suggested by Bohannon (1960), almost universally dependent, in primitive, or modern society, upon two conditions:

1. The overall terms of the institution within which the homicide is committed, defense of home, robbery, defense of self or others, revenge of wrong.
2. The relationship of offender and victim, including their relative social or familial relationship.

### Murder: A Relative Degree of Homicide

There are two major categories of culpable homicide:

(1) murder, in which the act of homicide is viewed as an intentional deliberate act of inexcusable malice, and  
(2) manslaughter, in which the act of homicide is viewed as an accidental negligent act of homicide. The basic differentiation between murder and manslaughter is that murder is viewed as an intentional act of malice, whereas manslaughter is viewed as a careless act of criminal negligence. In general, the law takes the viewpoint that there are variations of degree of responsibility in the

act of homicide along a continuum from justifiable homicide, through excuseable homicide as non-culpable homicides, entering into culpable homicide with varying degrees of criminal intent such as manslaughter, and culminating in the inexcuseable, malicious act of murder.

In recognition of these various stages of culpable homicide, manslaughter is generally seen as having one or more degrees of responsibility. Manslaughter 2nd degree is seen as basically a lapse of the individual's responsibility without criminal intent, whereas Manslaughter 1st degree implies a criminal intent in lack of responsibility. Murder 2nd degree is viewed as a malicious criminal intent to kill, ameliorated, however, by lack of planning, and due primarily to one's being under the heat of passion, but without the extenuating circumstances of justifiable, or excuseable homicide. Murder 1st degree is viewed as the ultimate act of planned or calculated maliciousness, aimed at killing another person, and implies clear-cut criminal intent and motivation.

### The Arrest and Prosecution of Homicide

#### Arrest Statistics

The Uniform Crime Reports (1968), indicate a slight decrease, for the third straight year, of homicides solved. While in 1965 over 90 per cent of the homicides were solved, in 1968 only 86 per cent of the homicides were solved.

Of those arrested in 1968, 10 per cent were under 18 years of age, and 40 per cent were under 25 years of age. The largest age group of homicide offenders was the 20 to 24 year old group, representing 21 per cent of all homicide offenders. It is significant to note that between 1960 and 1968 there was a 127 per cent increase in the under 18 age group, and an increase of 62 per cent in the adult offender group.

Of those arrested for homicide 9 per cent of the juveniles were handled in juvenile court, the remainder were prosecuted as adults. Of the adult offenders, 64 per cent of those arrested were prosecuted. The distribution of charges was as follows: 43 per cent were found guilty of murder; 19 per cent were found guilty of a lesser charge; 38 per cent either won acquittals or had the charges dismissed.

#### Prosecution Statistics

Garfinkel (1949), in reviewing homicide trials noted that considerable bias frequently alters the legal process in murder trials. He found that the charges were considerably different for different racial groups. In fact specific patterns of legal charges tended to emerge at three distinct points in the legal proceedings: (1) at indictment, (2) after solicitors' demands for changes, (3) at the conviction. The patterns identified are presented in Table 2.1.



TABLE 2.1.--Racial Patterns in Homicide Trials.

---



---

Negro Offender: White Victim (N-W)

---

Indicted 1st<sup>o</sup> --convicted equally 1st<sup>o</sup> and 2nd<sup>o</sup>.  
 Fewest number of changes at indictment.  
 As many nol prose charges and charges less manslaughter,  
 As the other three groups.

---

White Offender: Negro Victim (W-N)

---

Indicted 1st<sup>o</sup> or manslaughter--convicted 2nd<sup>o</sup> or  
 manslaughter (None convicted 1st<sup>o</sup>)  
 Largest number of changes at indictment.  
 Less nol prose charges and charges less than manslaughter  
 but the largest acquital and manslaughter category.

---

Negro Offender: Negro Victim (N-N)

---

Overwhelmingly indicted 1st<sup>o</sup>--convicted 2nd<sup>o</sup> or  
 manslaughter mainly.  
 Largest number of charges at indictment.  
 Lesser extent acquital or dismissal.

---

White Offender: White Victim (W-W)

---

Indicted 1st<sup>o</sup> and to some extent for lesser offenses--  
 convicted 2nd<sup>o</sup>, manslaughter, or acquital.  
 Large number of change of charge and largest number  
 of categories of charges.

---

The law recognizes a broad range of behaviors extant in the act of homicide, and sets up rather definitive distinctions within which to view and judge the individual's culpability. Nevertheless the prosecution of the act of murder indicates that a host of extra-legal, cultural and investigative procedures frequently culminate in a most unrecognizeable distortion of judgements and sentencing.

### Homicide Statistics

#### International Homicide Rates

The homicide rate varies widely from country to country. The Uniform Crime Reports (1968) gives a U.S. homicide rate of 6.8 per 100,000 population. Morris and Blom-Cooper (1964) reported a British homicide rate of only 0.3 to 0.4 per 100,000. Interpol statistics (1960) give a Danish homicide rate of 0.53 and an Australian rate of 1.7 per 100,000.<sup>4</sup> Bohannan (1960) reported a homicide rate in Ceylon of 7.4 per 100,000 population. Canada (1969) had a homicide rate of 1.5 per 100,000 population. It can be seen that homicide rates vary from culture to culture.

---

<sup>4</sup>Interpol: International Crime Statistics for Years 1959-60, reported in Knudten, R.D., Crime in a Complex Society. An Introduction to Criminology (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1970), Table 6-5, p. 153.

### Types of Homicides

Homicide is, to a large degree a private family resolution of conflict. The data in Table 2.2, from the Uniform Crime Reports (1968) give the proportionate breakdown for seven categories of homicide.

Over 25 per cent of the homicides occur in the first three categories, involving immediate family members. Approximately 50 per cent of the homicides occur in other arguments with by-and-large acquaintances, or in marital triangles (contrary to popular opinion it is generally the extramarital lovers who kill each other, rather than the "wronged spouse" seeking revenge). Less than 25 per cent of the homicides occur as a result of felonies.

### Socio-Cultural Factors in Homicide

#### Victimology

The close inter-relationship of victim and offender has been a point of study for many years. One of the first researchers to intensively study this close relationship, Von Hentig (1967), became quite concerned with the victims role in his own demise. Many studies have lent strong support to this concept of victimology. While the victims behavior, generally, cannot be said to justify, nor excuse the act of killing him, it can, nevertheless, frequently be seen as a direct causative factor in his own death. De Quincy (1925) earlier, in a satirical essay had proposed that frequently the victim is a would-be murderer who

TABLE 2.2.--Types of Homicides.

Spouse Killing	Parent Kills Child	Other Family	Marital Triangle	Other Arguments	Known Felony	Suspected Felony
13.7	3.3	8.7	7.2	42.2	17.4	7.5

wishes to harm his offender, but lacking the courage of his convictions inappropriately focuses his anger upon his offender in such a way as to result in his own death.

Wolfgang (1967), in a study of 600 homicides found that 26 per cent were clearly victim induced. Wille (1970) reporting on 100 murderers noted 48 cases in which a quarrel occurred immediately preceding the act, and 24 cases in which there was a quarrel or other intense emotional involvement at least sometime prior to the act. He describes in case No. 5, a 26 year old man, how the victimology syndrome frequently occurs:

. . . after they had quarreled when returning home one evening, both in a state of intoxication, after being out with friends and drinking. On entering their apartment, the wife taunted him with remarks about what a stupid fool he was and how that very day, unbeknown to him, she had enjoyed sexual relations with another man, including oral-genital contacts, and that this much more than any satisfaction that her husband had been able to give her.

Wille goes on to suggest that the concept of victimology is frequently double-edged, in that while the victim may produce the stimulus for attack, the offender frequently sets up such potentially explosive relationships:

If this were not enough, the reader should be given the additional information that this man married a woman whose personality was very much like that of his mother, who was a very taunting, punitive person who had frequently sent him into helpless rages as a child, by her behavior toward him.

### Insanity and Suicide Relationships in Homicide

Gutmacher (1960) reported that in Britain there were 125 homicides : 5000 suicides while in the same period in the U.S. there were 8500 homicides : 16,000 suicides. Of the convicted murderers in England 40 per cent were insane while in the U.S. only 2 to 4 per cent of the murderers were insane. Gutmacher suggests that culturally there is a much greater taboo against externalizing anger and aggression in England than in the U.S., as suggested by both the higher suicide : homicide ratio, and higher insanity percentage, of murderers, in England. He therefore suggests that homicidal and suicidal persons have a considerably greater difficulty in coping with anger and aggression than do other persons.

Wolfgang (1967) notes that homicide occurs most frequently in the lower classes and suicide occurs more frequently in the middle and upper classes. He suggests that homicide is primarily a lower class subcultural phenomenon, the concomitant of the upper and middle class resort to suicide. Knudten (1970), who discusses only middle and upper class groups, suggested that such relationships, while possible, were perhaps somewhat more complicated. He noted that in these groups, American suicides increase during depressions, and decrease during

periods of prosperity. Homicides, however, increase during periods of prosperity.

Knudten further noted that Henry and Short (1965) suggested that an early introjection of value systems seemed to account for an orientation toward homicide or suicide. They suggested that individuals who commit suicide have introjected cruel and stringent demands, made and harshly enforced upon them by parents, as part of their normal self-expectancy. Individuals who commit homicide, on the other hand, have introjected violent patterns of behavior, demanded and forced on them for their survival by their environment, as a normal method of coping.

Homicidal and suicidal individuals are seen by Henry and Short as persons attempting to cope with extreme conflicts of anger and aggression toward either self or others.

Suicide is seen as intrapunitive hostility and aggression, directed primarily at the "evil" within one, and occurs most frequently in the upper and middle classes of our society.

Homicide is extra-punitive hostility and aggression, directed primarily at coping with the basic "evil" of others and occurs primarily in the lower classes. Cultural taboos against anger expression vary from

culture to culture and between socio-economic classes; these differences appear to have strong influences upon suicide and homicide behavior. Taboos about aggression and anger and problems related to these are frequently seen as also having concomitant effects upon sanity. Suicide and homicide appear to operate cross-culturally as inverse effects, that is, when the homicide rate increases the suicide rate decreases, and vice-versa.

#### Sex Influences in Homicide

Males are most frequently both victims and offenders in homicides. The Uniform Crime Reports (1968) shows a M:F ratio of 3:1 for victims of homicides, and a M:F ratio of 5:1 for offenders. Verkko (1951) notes that the distribution by sexes of victims of crimes against life in any country is always dependent on the frequency level of the crimes concerned. Verkko has proposed that there is both a static and a dynamic factor involved in homicide rates of males and females. He has proposed that these factors operate to influence both the victim and offender in a homicide, and has proposed two basic laws governing the frequency of sex differences for both offenders and victims of homicides.



## Homicide Victims

Static Law.--In countries of high frequency of crimes against life the female proportion of those killed is small; and vice-versa: in countries of low frequency of crime against life the female proportion of those killed is high.

Dynamic Law.--If the frequency of crimes against life in a country is on the increase, the increase effects mainly the number of male victims; and vice-versa: if the frequency of crimes against life is on the decrease, the decrease affects mainly the male victims.

## Homicide Offenders

Static Law.--In countries of high frequency of crimes against life the participation of females in these crimes is small; and vice-versa: in countries of low frequency of crimes against life the female proportion of these participating is high.

Dynamic Law.--If the frequency of crimes against life in a country tends to increase, the increase primarily affects number of male criminals: and vice-versa.

In other words Verkko sees both female homicide victims and female homicide offenders' rates are essentially static, and suggests that the apparent changes in ratio which appear to affect the female homicide rate for both offenders and victims is in reality due to changes

in the male rate. He suggests two reasons for such static female rates: (1) Females tend to live in a more peaceful environment than do males, and (2) The factors influencing females are not as subject to change as those influencing males.

#### Age Factors in Homicide

The greatest frequency of murders are committed by young men between the ages of 20 and 25 years. According to the Uniform Crime Reports (1968) 40 per cent of all homicides are committed by persons under 25 years of age. Of the total number of homicides 10 per cent were committed by persons under 18 years of age, and approximately 21 per cent were committed by persons 20 to 24 years of age.

Victims tend to be 10 to 15 years older than offenders according to Wolfgang (1967). The largest single age group, 28 per cent of the victims according to the Uniform Crime Reports (1968) was between 20 and 24 years of age. Of the total victims, 60 per cent were between 20 and 45 years of age.

There has been a substantial increase in homicides committed by younger persons. Homicides committed by persons under 18 years of age increased 127 per cent and homicides committed by those under 25 years of age increased 62 per cent, from 1967 to 1968.

### Racial Factors in Homicide

In the 1968 Uniform Crime Reports, 45 per cent of the victims were white, 54 per cent were Negro, and 1 per cent were other racial extractions. Homicide offenders were reported as 39 per cent white, 60 per cent Negro, and 1 per cent other racial extractions. Gutmacher (1960) reported, in a clinical study of homicide, a Negro:White homicide rate of 7:1, and a Negro:White suicide rate of 1:3. This latter data indicates that Negroes tend to resort to a more extra-punitive than intrapunitive form of handling aggression, while whites tend to resort more to intrapunitive handling of aggression. Wolfgang (1967), in a study of sex and racial factors, further noted that Negro males had a homicide rate of 41.7, white males 3.4, Negro females 9.3, and white females 0.4. While white males tend to have the highest homicide rate at 21 to 25 years and decrease markedly after 40, Negro males at 60 tend to kill at the same rate as white males of 20 to 25 years (p.18-19).<sup>5</sup>

Bohannon (1960), in studies of tribal homicide in Africa, found African homicide rates of 1.1 to 11.6 per 100,000 population. In contrast, however, Wolfgang

---

<sup>5</sup>Homicide rate is number of homicides per 100,000 population.

in a study of homicide in Philadelphia indicated a Negro homicide rate of 24.6 per 100,000. These data refute a racial basis for homicide, lending stronger support to the minority subculture of violence view, espoused by Wolfgang (1967). Benedict (1960), Barnouw (1963) and Vender Zanden (1966) suggest that child rearing practices and the personality variables of the culture determine propensity for violence in individuals in a culture.

Wolfgang's contention is that homicide occurs disproportionately in crowded, slum condition ghettos, in which persons experience violence as a way of life, and in which they perceive the external world as very threatening, but with good reasons.

#### A Summary of Sociological Studies of Murderers

From the studies to date, we have seen then that people who commit murder are, in the main, products of the lower socio-economic and cultural levels of our societies. They are persons who grew up in violence and respond violently to minor altercations, but generally after having put up with a great deal of festering hostility. Such backgrounds are bound to leave a damaging imprint on the psyche of the individual.

The question then arises as to whether or not there are specific developmental defects inherent in individuals who do in fact commit murder. The next

question would seem to be just what specific damage and personality defects are developed in these individuals. In order to get a better picture of just what effects one can expect upon an individual's personality, in going through such experiences, the next sections will review pertinent sociological and clinical studies of murderers.

### Sociological Studies of Concomittants to Murder

#### Methods of Murder

One of the predominant causes of homicide is a far too ready access to lethal weapons. Wolfgang (1967), in a study of 585 homicides in Philadelphia found 39 per cent of murders caused by stabbings; 33 per cent by shootings; 22 per cent by beatings; and 6 per cent by other miscellaneous methods. Tanay (1969), in a study of 53 murderers, found the murder causes to be: shootings, 58 per cent; stabbings, 21 per cent; beatings, 11 per cent; chokings, 4 per cent; drownings, 2 per cent; auto, 2 per cent; poison, 2 per cent. Wille (1970), in a study of 100 murders in Michigan noted the causes of murder to be shooting 63 per cent; stabbings, 10 per cent; bludgeoning, choking with bare hands, 24 per cent; drowning, poison, other, 3 per cent. The President's Commission on Violence noted that 65 per cent of homicides, nationally, are committed by the use of fire arms (1968).

Cultural factors tend to influence the mode of murder. Wolfgang (1967) in his study noted that white males tended predominantly to kill by beatings, while Negro males tended to predominantly kill by stabbings. Females tend predominantly to kill by stabbing, regardless of race, while female victims generally tend to be killed by beatings. While Wolfgang's statistics differ from the U.S. national norms, the Uniform Crime Reports (1968) indicate that guns are increasingly becoming the major instruments of murder. No figures are presently available as to racial or sex differences for the more recent statistics. The crime reports do indicate, however, that 7 out of 10 murders in the southern states are committed by guns, while only 3 out of 10 murders in the northern states are committed by guns.

#### Time of the Homicide

In his study of homicide, Wolfgang (1967) noted that there tended to be more homicides committed in hot summer than at any other time of the year. Other than this, he found no significant association between homicide rate and season of the year. He further noted that most homicides occur on the weekend, and mainly on Saturday night, in particular.

In his Philadelphia study, 65 per cent of the homicides (380 murders) occurred during the weekend, that

is within the 52 hour time-period of 8:00 P.M. Friday to 12:00 P.M. Sunday. Only 35 per cent of the homicides (208 murders) occurred during the week day, within the 112 hour period of 1:00 A.M. Monday to 8:00 P.M. Friday. Wolfgang suggested that the tensions of the week tend to be held in by structured routines of work and family life. He suggests further, that over the weekend, and on Saturday night in particular, especially under the influence of excessive drinking, that pent-up rage tends to erupt disproportionately in violence.

#### Place of Homicide

Wolfgang noted that most homicides occurred in the home. The next most dangerous places were, in order, highways, public streets, and fields. The U.S. national norms indicate 58 per cent of homicides occur in homes. Tanay (1969) found 51.2 per cent occurred in homes; 11 per cent occurred out doors. In the study done by Wille (1970), he found: 48 per cent occurred in homes; 27 per cent outdoors; 3 per cent in autos; 13 per cent in a place of business; 7 per cent in bars; 2 per cent in prison.

Wolfgang (1967) noted that men generally kill men, and are killed by men, in the streets. Women are generally killed in the bedroom (87 per cent killed there, are killed by men), and kill (84 per cent of their victims killed

there are men) in the kitchen. In general, then, one could expect that the place of a homicide is likely to be that frequented by the two individuals in conflict. It further appears that the place of homicide is generally the one which the aggressor feels to be his, or her area of primacy and where the victim is either trespassing upon his or her "sacred ground," or has "injured" the aggressor in their primacy area.

### Motives

Homicide is seen as the culmination of vaguely defined altercations in eight out of 10 cases, by Wolfgang (1967). Wille (1970) found that in 48 out of 100 cases a quarrel immediately preceded the act; in a further 24 out of 100 cases a quarrel, or other intense emotional involvement had occurred at sometime, at least, during the relationship between the individuals concerned; in 28 out of 100 cases there was no emotional involvement readily discernable.

### Assault Till Death Interval

The majority of deaths occur very shortly after the homicidal assault. Wolfgang (1967) noted that 50 per cent of the shooting victims, one-third of the stabbing victims, and one-sixteenth of the beating victims died within 10 minutes of the assault. He further noted that a total of one-third of the victims died within 10 minutes; three-fifths of the victims died within the first hour. Less than 5 per cent of the victims lasted over 10 days.



He suggested that fewer die from aggravated assault wounds than a generation ago because of: (1) improved communications to the police; (2) rapid transportation to a hospital; (3) advanced medical techniques. Because of the lower incidence of death from beatings then, many homicides could be prevented simply by the control of dangerous, or lethal weapons alone.

#### The Effect of Stimulants (alcohol or drugs)

Frequently, reduced awareness, or impairment by drugs or alcohol is a contributing factor to homicide. Wolfgang noted that in two-thirds of the cases in Philadelphia, either one or both parties had been drinking heavily. Wille (1970) found alcohol contributed in 24 per cent of the cases, and drugs in 2 per cent of the cases. Wille noted that two conditional uses of alcohol tended to be involved in homicide: (1) offenders who are resentful, and angry, losing control under alcohol, (2) offenders who drink to give themselves "courage" to commit a homicidal act.

#### Previous Criminal Records

Murder is not, as popularly characterized, an offense committed by that nice person, or someone, next door, nor is it an offense that could be as readily committed by anyone of us as the murderer. Murder is

generally the culmination of a violent way of life, by a violent person. Wolfgang (1967) found that two-thirds of all murderers were previous offenders. He did note that more males than females were legal offenders, but this may be explained by the fact that men, more readily than women, are likely to be sentenced for offenses. Murderers previous offenses are more likely to be person-oriented than non-person oriented. When these persons commit person-oriented offenses, the offenses are more likely to be serious offenses, such as attempted assault, or intent-to-kill offenses. Wille (1970) noted that 24 per cent of murder offenders had serious police records without imprisonment, and 23 per cent had previous prison records.

#### The Family Background of Murderers

The family background of murderers most frequently appears to have been one calculated to instill a view of the world which is punitive and hostile. These were child developmental conditions filled with intense emotional deprivation, and value distortion, as well as being fraught with excessive brutality. MacDonald (1963) noted several specific features in the family relationship in a study of 100 murderers. There was invariably great parental brutality, extreme maternal seduction, or the triad of childhood fire-setting, cruelty to animals and

enuresis. He noted that the family interaction frequently tended to produce paranoid delusions, with great anger.

Gutmacher (1960) noted that the family background was generally one of defective ethical standards, and lacking in satisfying early nurturance needs. He noted, in the case of sociopathic murderers specifically, that the child tended to be raised by affectionally rejecting, inconsistant parents. The family background tended to lead to the development of strong aggressive, and destructive drives.

Ducan, Frazier, Litin, Johnson, and Barron (1958) noted, in clinical interviews of parents and siblings of murderers, that the murderers had most frequently been the victim of the parental physical brutality. This brutality went far beyond the ordinary excesses of discipline generally perpetrated. In fact the brutality was quite often so extreme as to compel neighbors to intercede for the child.

Duncan et al. further noted that the parents had a remarkable apptitude for evasive shifting of blame. There was no suggestion on the part of the parent of self-criticism or guilt, either for the child's upbringing, or for his downfall. There was a remarkable tendency to lie on many important issues, often differing sharply from spouse, or offspring, and to remain totally unshaken by glaring discrepancies in recounting past events.

Lamberti, Blackman and Weiss (1958) in a study of sudden impulse murderers, noted that they tended to come from family backgrounds where conformity to norms of the social system were emphasized. These individuals were, however, failing to conform because of underlying familial conflicts, and had resorted to attempts to blame other people.

Palmer (1960) in a study of 51 murderers, and brothers, paired, noted, without exception, that the murderer of the pair experienced greater psychological stress, than did the other brother. The murderer of the pair frequently had some physical defect seen as a social stigma. The parents tended to react differentially, being overly rigid, and inconsistent, and this was noted as especially conspicuous behavior by the murderer-brother. The assaultive child had generally been exposed to a severely frightening experience of a definitely traumatic nature. In addition, there was a general lack of acceptance and approval, by school and community, of the murderer-brother.

Palmer further noted that the mother had resented the birth of the murderer-son more than his brothers. Her reaction to this child, on the surface, indicated that she had, however, appeared to have been doing what was accepted as normal mothering behavior. She was

found, nonetheless, to have been clearly mixing her mothering behavior with thinly disguised aggression toward this son.

The upbringing of the rejected son appears to have become clearly a family battleground. The mother further appeared to have been more rigid in her feeding of the son who had committed murder. In addition, she was either abrupt, or longer, that is to say at extremes, in the toilet training of this youngster. The mothers directed their frustrations to the child and to the father equally. The fathers, on the other hand, directed their frustration to the child, who was seen by them, as the root-cause of the family troubles.

In essence then the family of murderers, is frequently seen as one who did not want the child, initially. As a consequence, he became the butt of severe physical and emotional abuse, serving as a focal point of mothers rejection, and the pawn in her war with father. In turn, the father frequently attacked the child, as the source of marital and family discord. While everything in the way of normal upbringing appeared to have been offered, on the surface, to the child, great under-currents of violence, both physically and emotionally directed at him, occurred, frequently erupting with such intensity that outside aid was needed. The parents' hostility,

and denial of abusive behavior, was frequently so all-consuming that they lied in the face of glaring discrepancies about their abusive treatment of their rejected child.

Capote (1965), gives a frighteningly vivid and detailed reconstruction of the case histories of two such individuals. Maas (1968) in the Valachi papers, gives a case history of one such individual's rise as a hired gun in organized crime. There are numerous potential spawning grounds for these violent individuals. Karon (1964) details the intrapsychic problems of anger and aggression among minority subculture groups. Hollingshead and Rogler delineated the problems of violence in families with mental illness. Goffman (1963) described the intense emotional conflicts and pain produced through social stigmatizing in our society. Cavan (1964) and Wolfgang (1967) described how impoverished and emotionally conflictual family backgrounds lead to a genesis of crime and violence.

Marshall (1970) reporting on the dominant Canadian Anglo-Saxon culture, as surveyed by Goldfarb, notes that violence is more acceptable than love, and sex. He notes that "many Canadians believe that a family quarrel can often imply love." He goes on to state that "Many Canadians apparently believe family relationships are

phoney if they are based entirely on love. This attitude is particularly common among English Canadians." It is indeed a sad commentary on our social philosophy!

### Clinical Studies of Murderers

This investigator is particularly indebted to Dr. Warren S. Wille (1969), for making available, pre-publication, his extensive file of clinical interview studies of murderers. His findings and suggestions were very helpful, here, as well as in an overall development of this study.

Toch (1969), in a study of violent offenders, noted that their violence modes could be broadly classified into two major categories: (1) Self-preserving, or enhancing; or, (2) Self-centered. He was further able to identify ten sub-categories of violence-prone modes, six of which he saw as self-preserving, and four as self-centered. These classifications are presented in Table 2.3.

Toch's typology studies indicate violence is channeled in several different ways as primary response modes, for some individuals. In these ways, violence serves as a coping behavior.

It is not unexpected that such specific typology or, personality patterns are found in groups of violent offenders. Enelow and McKie (1969) in a study of patients' responses to pain, noted that:

TABLE 2.3.--The Violence-Prone Person: A Typology.

---

A. Self-Preserving or Enhancing	
<hr/>	
1.	Rep defending: a self-allocated role encompassing aggressive violence in defending one's reputation.
2.	Norm enforcing: a self-nominated role to enforce one's own rules, perceived as right, with violence.
3.	Self-image compensating:
	(a) Self-image defending: a role in which violence is used in retribution against persons who cast aspersions on one's self-image.
	(b) Self-image promoting: a role in which violence is used to enhance self worth, and in which toughness and status are seen as virtues.
4.	Self-defending: a role in which others are seen as sources of danger which require neutralization.
5.	Pressure removing: a role in which explosions of rage are used in situations one cannot deal with.
<hr/>	
B. Self-Centered (Others Seen as Objects)	
<hr/>	
1.	Bullying: a role in which violence is used for the pleasure of terrorizing susceptible individuals.
2.	Exploitation: a role in which violence is used to overcome resistance in using others as tools for pleasure and convenience.
3.	Self-indulgence: a role in which violence is used for non-compliance with satisfying one's needs.
4.	Catharting: a role in which violence is used to discharge internal pressure in response to needs, or moods.
<hr/>	



Pain is a very private and personal experience . . . it is influenced by previous experiences with pain and the consequences of those experiences. The earliest of these experiences may take place before it is possible to have verbal or visual memory, yet may have an important role in shaping later reactions to pain. In other words pain threshold is idiosyncratic, but is experientially modified. Thus pain has both objective and subjective components.

The violent offender is an individual, who as we have seen, has been subjected to enormous physical abuse and pain.

One analogous method of viewing the murderer is to see him as a person who has been subjected to intense experiences in coping with painful stimuli. Specific characterological patterns then can be expected to be as readily identified for persons subjected to painful interpersonal abuse, as for those subjected to impersonal or cultural differential pain experiences. As Enelow and McKie further noted, "This culture tends to view masculinity as a symbol of pain bearing capacity. . . . Men when in pain, tend to deny or minimize it." The following studies shed further light on how individuals tend to repress, divert, or redirect their reactions to their painful developmental experiences, in our culture.

MacDonald (1963), in a study of normal and sociopathic murderers, found normal murderers to have defective personality structures which he felt were more as a result of defective ethical standards of their social milieu rather than as a result of "hidden neurotic complexes."

They also tended to have aggressive and destructive drives, drives essential to homicide, as a result of frustration of early nurture.

He found sociopathic murderers had an early anti-social career: pilfering; early school expulsion. They exhibited reckless courage which he attributed as being due to a devaluation of life, and characteristically, tended to exhibit cruelty to animals well past their childhood stage. Sociopathic murderers exhibited a distorted sexual adjustment, developed no lasting friendships and were devoid of loyalty.

Schilder (1936) in a similar study of normal and sociopathic murderers found that in normals, life and death do not seem to play an important part in their psychic life. Schilder states that: "They killed as easily as children in their play." In point of fact, they exhibited many infantile trends, killing because they were not really aware of the deprivation they effect on others. He found many similar patterns to normals, in sociopathic murderers, but with the additional trait, which was later so clearly explored by Lindner (1944), of characterizing them as "a rebel without a cause."

Wille (1970) found that the majority of murderers tend to have relatively little conscience to prevent homicide. In a classification of superego controls,

through clinical interviews, he found only 6 per cent with severe (overly-punitive) superegoes; 21 per cent with relatively "normal," or intact superegoes; 71 per cent, however, had poorly developed, or defective superegoes, and 2 per cent were undetermined. He notes, however, that 20 per cent of his sample developed psychosis subsequent to committing homicide, including 5 of the 6 with severe superegoes. Only 7 per cent of the group had a history of psychosis prior to the act; 6 per cent being adjudged psychotic at the time of the act. Wille presents the following description of murderers:

These findings, and those of the continuing series of cases examined since this first sample of 100 cases, refute the concept that in the majority of homicides the murderer is a 'once in a lifetime criminal,' a person who had never been involved in other types of law breaking. On the contrary, the study indicates that in approximately half of the cases the assailant has been involved in a variety of other types of law breaking, is often prone to alcoholic excess, and has previously indicated a more than usual propensity for acting out behavior. In the other half of the sample, the homicide is truly a 'once in a lifetime occurrence' committed during a fit of rage by a person who has shown no previous propensity toward law breaking, and would be considered an 'average, normal citizen' by his neighbors.

Tanay (1969) in his study of 53 murderers, noted that there had been a predominant history of severe or violent child rearing. He noted, as characteristically different from Wille (1970) that the majority of murderers had severe superegoes. In reviewing the crime sequence,

he noted, in retrospect, that there had been an apparent alteration in state of consciousness just previous to the homicide. He proposed to identify three characteristic murderer profiles as: ego-dissociative; psychotic; and, ego-syntonic.

There are those murderers who seem rational, coherent, and controlled, yet whose homicidal acts had a bizarre senseless quality about them. In a study of four such cases, Satten, Menninger, Rosen and Mayman (1960) found histories of longstanding, even lifelong problems of erratic control of aggressive behavior. Lack of control was such that, previous fights were far from ordinary and would have become homicidal assaults had not someone intervened. In spite of demonstrated violence, these men were found to have self-images of physical inferiority, weakness and inadequacy; case histories indicated severe sexual inhibition.

Each man had a case history of altered states of consciousness in connection with violent outbursts. During examination they exhibited erratic impulsiveness. Speech patterns shifted erratically, from blockage and aphasia, to torrential explosiveness. Body responses varied with rising affect until they frequently, bodily, stiffened under high affect. They varied between extreme overcontrol and hyperkinesis (pacing about the room).

Satten et al. noted that these men displayed a tendency not to experience anger, or rage with their aggressive violence. They exhibited shallow, cold relationships and appeared to have been lonely isolates, in which people were scarcely real to them, in the sense of being cared about. There was a marked tendency to blur boundaries between reality and fantasy. Each had expressed fear of losing control, previously, to either legal officials or psychiatrists, before the murders took place, however, each warning had been disregarded.

In summary then, in all of the clinical studies of murderers, the pattern emerges of repression of hostile affect, impairment of superego controls and erratic, impulsive aggressiveness. They act as if they were frightened persons poised for assault from any quarter. When they respond aggressively they do so with a torrential outpouring of violence, and with little concept of the effect of their actions on others.

#### The TAT Fantasies and Overt Behavior

##### TAT Studies of Anger and Aggression Fantasies and Overt Behavior

A most extensive review of studies of anger and aggression is reported by Buss (1961). In addition, this investigator is particularly indebted to Dr. Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi (1970) for providing me with his review of

the TAT literature more pertinently related to a violent felon population. This review draws heavily on these two sources.

In their study of semi-institutionalized delinquents, Mussen and Naylor (1954) found that TAT aggression correlated significantly with supervisors' ratings of overt behavior.

Stone (1956) studied three groups of army felons: (1) non-violent crimes; (2) desertion, non-violent histories; (3) murderers and attempted murders. He found that the violent group showed considerably more aggression than the two non-violent groups.

Purcell (1956) rated army psychiatric patients as to antisocial aggressiveness. TAT ratings of the most antisocial group were most significantly aggressive; contained more direct and undisguised aggression; showed less punishment anticipated; and, contained more aggressive themes excusing aggression. This group also had fewer themes of guilt, or shame.

Satten, Menninger, Rosen and Mayman (1960), reported on TAT protocols of murderers without apparent motive. These were otherwise sane, normal persons who had committed bizarre sudden murders. Their TAT stories were brief, frequently autobiographical, and were filled with a "quality of primitive murderous hostility, in some

cases glibly rationalized on the basis of the victims having 'provoked' their murders." Other themes of murder were precipitated by rejection characterized as oral deprivation. There was a marked absence of affect accompanying the violent themes.

In a study by Silber and Courtless (1968), TAT aggression was compared in four groups of subjects: mentally retarded and non-retarded offenders with and without histories of serious offenses. In this study serious offenders showed the least TAT aggression fantasy. No differences were found between retarded and non-retarded offenders.

#### The Relationship of Thought to Behavior

Freud (1964) recognized fantasies as having both conscious and unconscious components, and as existing in both healthy and disturbed psyches. In uncovering repressed sexual memories of childhood in patients, he found that, in point of fact, frequently no overt sexual behavior had occurred, rather the patient had repressed a childhood wish for such an event. It appeared to Freud that repression served as a denial of morally painful thoughts-to avoid anxiety. Repressed thoughts then were seen by Freud as having a strong wish-fulfillment component.

Fenichel (1945) more precisely defined fantasies as "any thinking which is not followed by action." The

potential effect of these unfulfilled thoughts upon subsequent overt behavior has been the continuing study of clinicians.

While the Freudian tradition had proposed that fantasy only grew out of repressed desires, later neo-analysts saw an egoadaptive component as another possible explanation of fantasy use. Indeed, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann (1967) enlarges upon both the parataxic (preverbal), and prototaxic (verbal) component aspects of fantasy in therapy patients, seeing the former as frequently wish-fulfillment but the latter as more ego adaptive. She noted, however, that distortions due to social acceptance of the fantasy content could occur in either parataxic or prototaxic fantasy modes.

Clinicians, such as Tomkins (1967), in his TAT studies, have been more interested in relating the defensive, and adaptive aspects of fantasy to predicting overt behavior. The literature dealing with this problem will be next reviewed. Particular emphasis will be in the relationship of such studies as are pertinent to this one.

Buss (1961) unequivocally states that "clinical studies yielded one clear-cut positive finding: TAT aggression is directly related to assaultiveness. This generalization holds for prisoners of both sexes and several kinds of patient populations. TAT aggression



is not related to assertiveness, uncooperativeness, and other behaviors peripherally associated with aggression" (p. 153).

Tomkins (1967) was less encouraging in this regard, and wrote "It has been this writer's experience in 'blind' analysis of the TAT's of children and adolescents who presented serious behavior problems that he has, in almost every instance, misdiagnosed the specific behavior problem which was the concern of the parent and therapist." Tomkins had noted "Because antisocial behavior in the TAT usually represents suppressed or repressed material, it will be found most frequently in the protocols of normal, neurotic and psychotic individuals. It will in general be found less prominent in the protocols of those whose behavior is actually antisocial" (p. 227).

The studies were somewhat ambiguous on the handling of anger and aggression on the TAT by violent offenders. Partly this ambivalence may be due to a lack of clarity in the scales. Most scales combined both anger affect and aggression themes. It appears that there may be a difference between the amount of anger and the amount of overt aggression in fantasy themes. Another scale confusion was the inclusion of sexual themes whether hostilely aggressive or not, as well as a somewhat inconsistent tendency to "interpret" underlying conflict or aggression

from themes. In addition to the difficulties in scale measurements, a further complication was introduced by a lack of specificity of the term violent offender, and aggressive overt behavior criterion. Murderers who have committed one violent act, may or may not have the same degree of overt aggressiveness as acting out antisocial felons, or aggressive patients in stages of treatment.

#### Summary of TAT Fantasy Research on Anger and Aggression

What is important is that there does seem to be clear differences in patterns of anger, and of aggression, at least, between violent and non-violent felons. These patterns are able to be identified in TAT fantasy themes. Most importantly the fantasy themes do correlate, either directly or inversely, with overt behavior of the subjects.

#### The Hypotheses

##### The Major Hypothesis: Conscious Anger

Karon (1963) had proposed from his clinical studies that murderers are incapable of tolerating conscious feelings of anger. Satten, Menninger, Rosen and Mayman (1960) noted that there was a marked absence of affect accompanying violent themes, in murderers' TAT responses. We expected to find then that murderers would show less conscious anger than non-murderers in their TAT fantasy themes.

### The Secondary Hypotheses

The secondary hypotheses were based, of necessity, upon very limited theoretical and experimental information. As was pointed out in Chapter I, very few clinical studies have been done with murderers.

In essence then we were exploring new areas of research. We have had to extrapolate beyond existing information and data. Much of what was hypothesized was partly our own best guess built tenuously upon analytic and ego-psychology theory.

Conscious Fear.--The clinical studies, previously cited, of murderers' family lives indicated intense emotional deprivation and much violence. There had been much disapproval when compared to other sibs, as noted by Palmer (1960). Horney (1964) sees fear of disapproval the major motivation behind overpowering anxiety. We had expected that murderers would have had a strong element of awareness of fear of danger and of constant loss of approval.

Overt Aggression.--This area has been researched the most. The majority of the studies, previously cited, suggested that murderers "kill with ease," Schilder (1936); expressed "primitive, murderous hostility," Satten, et al. (1960); and their "TAT themes contained more direct and undisguised aggression," Purcell (1956). We had expected

to find more overt aggression in fantasy themes of murderers than in non-murderers.

Aggressor Concept.--In the studies of murderers developmental years, they seemed to experience aggression from parents, sibs, community and school. Jensen (1957) had noted no difference, in studying acting out aggressive high school students, between victim and hero aggressor. In the case of murderers, however, they had been the receptors of aggression from many and diverse sources. It seemed reasonable to expect an overgeneralized paranoid projective structure to aggression, especially in view of MacDonalds (1963) findings that murderers frequently had strong paranoid delusions, with great anger.

Theme Outcome.--The concept of theme outcome is built on a dimension of hopelessness-pessimism. Vogel (1967) utilizing comparisons of ratios of categories of hopelessness with suicidal patients was unable to distinguish between groups on this dimension. It seemed that rather than  $\chi^2$  ratios comparisons, that perhaps significant differences lay with the individual categories, and subjects differences in them. Horney (1964) noted the paralyzing uncertainty of hopelessness. It would seem from a review of murderers lives that they had certainly experienced a greater expectancy of uncertain

outcomes and that perhaps this would be distinguishingly characteristic of their outlook on life.

Locus of Control.--Rotter (1966) developed the concept of internal-external involvement as a measure of the individuals' sense of control of events. Consistent with Horney's (1964) view of the paralyzing aspects of helplessness, and her relation of helplessness to lack of self-confidence one would expect murderers to see themselves less able to control events befalling them.

Modes of Coping Behaviors.--Dollard and Miller (1950) suggest that the lack of adequate learning experiences contributes to a probable reduction of learned coping behaviors. According to this point of view, individuals with narrow and inadequate repertoires of coping behaviors would be expected to respond erratically and inadequately to stress. Murder then would be viewed as the result of a response to inadequacy of learned behaviors. We should expect to find with this rationale, that murderers are individuals, then who have a lower number of learned coping behaviors, than non-murderers.

Murray (1938) developed a classic list of needs or behaviors. While he was able to identify some twenty-six needs, he found, in his study, that twenty needs quite adequately described the behaviors of all subjects. The additional needs were essentially subdivisions of this basic group of twenty.

Differences or lack of differences both qualitatively in numbers of coping behaviors, and quantitatively, in frequency of use of these twenty behaviors, would lend support to either a learned, or intrapsychic conflict, explanation of differences in murderers or non-murderers.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This research was designed to study aggression fantasies and levels of anger and fear in the fantasies of murderers and non-murderers. The design and methods used in the study are described under the following headings: (1) design, (2) setting, (3) sample, (4) instrumentation and collection of data, (5) statistical hypotheses, and (6) procedures for analyzing the data.

#### Design

The design selected was a post-test four group design. The individuals studied were randomly selected from each of four groups of inmates, and assigned to the study: (1) murderers, psychotic (MurP); (2) murderers, non-psychotic (MurNP); (3) non-murderers, psychotic (NMurP); (4) non-murderers, non-psychotic (NMurNP). The groups were then tested by administering the TAT test and scoring it for each of seven scales. The scales selected were: (1) Levels of Conscious Anger; (2) Levels of Conscious Fear; (3) Levels of Overt Aggression Fantasy; (4) Theme Outcome; (5) Locus of Control; (6) Aggressor Concept Scale; (7) Modes of Coping Behaviors.

### The Sample

The sample of subjects used in this study consisted of felons committed to the State Prison, at Jackson, Michigan. They were drawn from two basic groups: (1) Felons convicted of Murder first Degree, or Second Degree; and (2) Felons convicted of non-person oriented crimes. In addition, each group consisted of equal numbers of individuals who have had a history of a psychotic disorder and individuals who have not had any such history.

The sample consisted of ten individuals in each of the four groups (see Table 3.1). This number was chosen for two basic reasons: (1) this was considered to be the smallest number that would lend probable significance to the data; (2) testing a larger group would be impractical in both time and money for a graduate student dissertation study.

TABLE 3.1.--The Sample.

	Murderers	Non-Murderers
History of Psychosis	10 subjects	10 subjects
No History of Psychosis	10 subjects	10 subjects

The sample of non-psychotic subjects was randomly selected from the prison IBM print-out of felons incarcerated for the offense of murder and felons incarcerated for non-person crimes.



The sample of psychotic subjects was selected randomly from the same lists utilizing psychiatric histories on file in their records, in the Psychiatric Clinic.

No attempt was made to match individuals on the basis of race, socio-economic status, religion, intelligence or other characteristics. Indeed as has been pointed out by Kiesler (1966), the system of matching subjects on traits is open to serious question. While homogeneity may be attempted on some variables through matching, one can as readily compile a list of variables on the matched individual to demonstrate heterogeneity. In effect Kiesler suggests that while individuals may be matched on some traits, in fact they are uniquely idiosyncratic. Statistically, one of the major difficulties in matching is that of overcoming the effects of regression. The extreme scores, because of the larger error shift toward the means. Two effects may result: (1) a skewed distribution, as there is more an individual than group shift of scores; (2) an unequal regression to two different means, if the scores come from two different populations.

### The Setting

The study was conducted at the State Prison of Southern Michigan, at Jackson, Michigan. This prison is, in area, the largest walled prison in the world. It has an inmate population of approximately five thousand

felons. In addition, this unit is the major state penal institution in Michigan.

The prison has an industries system, educational system through high school and some college courses, trade schools and a hospital. The Reception Diagnostic Center (RDC) and the Psychiatric Clinic, though separate units are part of the physical plant of the prison. Basic diagnostic and test data are available on all felons entering the RDC. These consist of IQ data, average academic grade records (A.G.R.) and some personality test data. In addition, psychiatric case histories of felons requiring treatment in the institution are available in the Psychiatric Clinic. These data along with the inmate records were used to help select the subjects.

### Instrumentation and Collection of Data

#### Instrumentation

The instrument used was the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). This test consists of a set of twenty semi-structured ambiguous situations on monochromatic cards. The cards administered were the twenty regular cards used for adult males.

#### Procedure

The test was administered individually to each subject by this examiner. All twenty cards were

administered at one sitting, with a ten minute break after the first ten cards were administered. Tomkins (1967) has recommended that at least one day should intervene between the administration of the first group of ten cards and the second group of ten cards. The clinical experience of Karon (1970) indicated that an adequate clinical protocol can be obtained if all twenty cards were administered and a ten minute break was provided between the first ten and the last ten cards. The practical advantage in getting patient co-operation is obvious. The instructions used were as follows.

#### Introductory Statement

Hello Mr. . . . I am a psychologist conducting research for Michigan State University, on inmates. I would like to show you some pictures and get your reactions to them. This will provide an opportunity for you to contribute to a better understanding of inmates and to helping them. In addition, your participation will help me complete my studies. I have been authorized by the Lansing office, to pay you two packs of cigarettes for your participation.

#### Test Instructions

The following instructions, modified to the inmate population level, from Tomkins instructions were found to be adequate to good theme production (Tomkins, 1967, pp. 21-25).

Cards 1-10.--I am going to show you a series of cards with pictures on them. This is a test of imagination. I would like you to tell me a story about the picture. Tell me first: What is going on? What caused it to happen? How will it end? Try to tell me the best story you can create.

Cards 10-20.--Now I am going to show you another set of pictures. This time they are more difficult and will require more of your imagination to create a good story about them. As before, tell me: What is going on? What caused it to happen? How will it end? Let your imagination really go and try to tell me the best story you can.

### Test Scales

Seven scales were developed for scoring the themes elicited on the TAT. The scales are listed in Appendix B.

Levels of Conscious Anger.--This scale was specifically developed for this study. All previous scales used had combined various combinations of aggression, hostility moods and anger expressions. This scale was designed to score specifically feeling states or affectual levels of anger only. There are five levels of anger scored.

Levels of Conscious Fear.--This scale was also developed specifically for this study. All previous scales had utilized avoidance behavioral themes, or

combinations of themes and affect. This scale was designed to score specifically feeling states or affectual levels of fear only. There are five levels of fear scored.

Aggression Theme Level.--This scale is a modification of several scales developed to measure fantasies of overt aggression. The basis for scoring aggression is that an instrumental response must be made that delivers a noxious stimuli to the organism. Five levels of aggression are scored.

Aggressor Concept Scale.--This scale was based on an aggression sub-scale designed by Jensen (1957). Its purpose was to identify the conceptualization of the aggressor as seen by the individual subject. The scale scores three categories of aggressor: (1) Offensive aggression; (2) Defensive aggression; (3) External others aggression. This scale was modified slightly to score overall aggressor concept rather than specifically each aggressor theme.

Theme Outcome.--This scale was developed and used by Roberta Burrage Vogel (1967) in her Doctoral dissertation to measure prevailing attitude toward fantasy events. This scale measures theme outcome as (1) Favorable, (2) Uncertain, (3) Unfavorable. The scale was also slightly modified to score only overall story outcome rather than multiple theme outcomes.

Locus of Control.--This scale was also developed and used by Roberta Burrage Vogel (1967) in her Doctoral dissertation. This scale measures the degree of self involvement in fantasy events. The scale measures (1) Self control of events, (2) External chance control of events, (3) Specific others control of events. This scale was also slightly modified to score overall story Locus of Control rather than specifically the Locus of Control of each fantasy theme.

Modes of Coping Behaviors Scale.--This scale was adapted from Murrays Needs Scale (1938) and utilized directly, to score the frequency of each of the 20 Needs, in each and every fantasy theme.

### Statistical Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested with reference to levels of conscious anger expressions:

- H<sub>1</sub>: Murderers will show less conscious anger, as measured in themes told to TAT cards, than will non-murderers.
- H<sub>1.1</sub>: There will be no difference between the levels of conscious anger, as measured in TAT themes, of psychotic murderers and non-psychotic murderers.

The following hypotheses were tested with reference to levels of conscious fear:

- H<sub>2</sub>: Murderers will show more conscious fear, as measured in themes told to TAT cards, than will non-murderers.
- H<sub>2.1</sub>: There will be no difference between the levels of conscious fear, as measured in TAT themes,

of psychotic murderers and non-psychotic murderers.

The following hypotheses were tested with reference to levels of fantasy aggression:

- H<sub>3</sub>: Murderers will show more aggression, as measured by themes of aggression told to TAT cards, than will non-murderers.
- H<sub>3.1</sub>: There will be no difference between the levels of aggression, as measured by themes of aggression in TAT cards, of psychotic murderers and non-psychotic murderers.

The following hypotheses were tested with reference to the concept of the source of aggression.

- H<sub>4</sub>: Murderers will see the aggression as measured by themes told to TAT cards as significantly more likely to be vague external others than will non-murderers.
- H<sub>4.1</sub>: There will be no differences between concept of aggressor, as measured by themes told to TAT cards, of psychotic murderers and non-psychotic murderers.

The following hypotheses were tested with reference to the concept of theme outcome:

- H<sub>5</sub>: Murderers will see more TAT fantasy themes as being uncertain as to outcome than will non-murderers.
- H<sub>5.1</sub>: There will be no difference between theme outcomes, as told to TAT cards, of psychotic murderers and non-psychotic murderers.

The following hypotheses were tested with reference to the concept of locus of control:

- H<sub>6</sub>: Murderers will see more themes told to TAT cards as controlled by vague chance, than will non-murderers.

- H<sub>6.1</sub>: There will be no difference between locus of control as seen in themes told to TAT cards, of psychotic murderers and non-psychotic murderers.

The following hypotheses were tested with reference to the concept of modes of fantasy coping behaviors:

- H<sub>7</sub>: Murderers will use a lower number of different coping behaviors than will non-murderers.
- H<sub>7.1</sub>: There will be no difference between the number of different coping behaviors used by psychotic murderers and non-psychotic murderers.

### Procedures for Analyzing the Data

#### Scoring Protocols

The TAT protocols were initially scored for scales 1 to 6, independently, in Ontario by two graduate students from the clinical psychology program, University of Waterloo. One student Mr. Art Lewandowski, was a beginning Doctoral student; the other student, Mrs. Melannie Telegdi, was a senior Doctoral student, having completed, all course work and was finishing her internship. Scoring was based on the instructions for the scales listed in Appendix A. The protocols were all coded, blinded and presented in a random order to the raters. The order of scoring is listed in Appendix C.

There was difficulty in obtaining a reasonable interjudge reliability in only the levels of Conscious Anger Scale (Pearson Product Moment Correlation 0.56). Scoring was reviewed by Mr. Lewandowski and by Mrs. Telegdi on this scale and both agreed that only Mr. Lewandowski was



having difficulty. Two problems appeared to be occurring: (1) difficulty in separating affect from behavior; (2) difficulty in separating his own bias and adhering to the scale. A rescoring by Mr. Lewandowski produced no higher interjudge reliability (Pearson Product Moment Correlation 0.48). After consultation with Dr. Bert Karon, it was decided to reject Mr. Lewandowski's scoring on this scale and to obtain a more experienced clinician as a rater.

We were fortunate to obtain the services of Dr. David A. Thomas, Director of Alcoholism and Drug Treatment, Providence Hospital, Detroit, who then scored the protocols for the Levels of Conscious Anger only. The interjudge reliability, Pearson Product Moment between Mrs. Telegdi and Dr. Thomas was 0.82. Correlations for the levels of Conscious Fear Scale were 0.88, and for the levels of Aggression were 0.94, also by the Pearson Product Moment method.

The three triple category scales interjudge reliabilities were calculated by per cent agreement of total protocol scores for all categories. The correlations were: Aggressor Concept 82 per cent; Theme Outcome 78 per cent; Locus of control 75 per cent. Using the binomial test, Runyon and Haber (1967, p. 200), a 55 per cent agreement is significant at the 0.05 level.

Scale number 7 was scored independently by this researcher and his wife. Mrs. McKie is a university graduate with a B.A. and two years experience as a Social Case worker. Correlations for this scale were calculated

by the Pearson Product Moment method. Correlations were amazingly good, considering that each score had to be placed in one of 20 categories. The correlations are listed below in Table 3.2.

TABLE 3.2.--Interjudge Reliabilities, Modes of Coping Behaviors Scale.

Scale No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pearson r	.75	.77	.53	.95	.68	.80	.77	.62	.77	.58
Scale No.	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Pearson r	.72	.58	.71	1.0	.60	.68	.56	.86	.63	.69

### Analysis of the Data

Means and interjudge correlations were obtained using a computer program, Bastat number 5, developed by the Michigan State University, Agriculture Experimental Station. The means data are included in Appendix C.

The correlations were stated above. In addition, intercorrelations of race, I.Q., A.G.R. and social class (all subjects were in class V, lower class, on Hollingshead and Redlich's scale [1958]), were run with means of each of the seven scales. There were no significant correlations of any of these variables with the TAT scores used in

this study. Consequently, no further analyses of these variables were undertaken. The raw score data for each of these variables are, however, listed with the Subject Personal data in Appendix B.

Data from the scales: (1) Levels of conscious anger, (2) Levels of conscious fear; and, (3) Levels of aggression fantasy, were each analyzed by the two-way analysis of variance technique. A 0.05 level of significance was used. The means as stated above were derived from the Bastat program. They were analyzed by a univariate program of two-way Anova developed by Jeremy Finn, State University of New York, at Buffalo.

Data from the scales: (4) Aggressor concept; (5) Theme outcome; (6) Locus of control, were analyzed by the multivariate two-way analysis of variance technique, using the multivariate form of the Jeremy Finn program. These scales consisted of three categories of choice, which while distinct, were not necessarily independent. The multivariate form of two-way ANOVA takes this inter-relationship into account. It enabled us to run an overall analysis of the three categories as a whole, at the same time running an analysis of the differences between categories. An inspection of the overall F ratio enabled us to determine, then, whether indeed there was a true difference between subject groups on this variable. If

indeed there was a significance in the overall F ratio we could then look at the individual category F ratios to determine which category, or categories differ. In one instance, on the Aggressor Concept scale, the overall F ratio for rows (psychotic vs non-psychotic), was not significant ( $p = 0.16$ ). Nevertheless a significant difference ( $p = 0.026$ ) was indicated for the category External others. In such a case, since the overall F ratio did not indicate a true difference in the data on this variable, one should regard the category difference as possibly being in error. It would be, then, more accurate to note this difference as a possible trend, rather than as a real difference, Kennedy (1971).

Scale number 7 was subjected to two types of analysis. Firstly, the number of different coping behaviors used in TAT fantasy themes by each S was tabulated. If a S used the behavior once, or several times the behavior was accepted as an inherent part of his coping repertoire. No attempt was made at this stage to investigate the quantitative use of this behavior. Means of the numbers of these categories of behaviors were tabulated for each of the four groups of Ss, for analysis of variance. Secondly, a one-way ANOVA was carried out on the means of each of the twenty subscales, to determine if indeed there were quantitative differences

in the use of one, or more of these behaviors, between groups of Ss.

The raw data and means for each of the seven scales are listed in Appendix C. The results of the analyses of the data are discussed in Chapter IV.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The analysis of the data is presented in the following order: (1) analysis of the levels of conscious anger data; (2) analysis of the levels of conscious fear data; (3) analysis of the levels of overt aggression data; (4) analysis of the aggressor concept data; (5) analysis of the theme outcome data; (6) analysis of the locus of control data; (7) analysis of the modes of coping behaviors data. In each instance the data is reviewed in relation to four subject groups: murderers psychotic (MurP); murderers non-psychotic (MurNP); non-murderers psychotic (NMurP); non-murderers non-psychotic (NMurNP).

For each of the seven scales, two major statistical hypotheses are tested. The first statistical hypothesis tested is that there will be a significant difference between the scores of murderers and non-murderers on each of the scales. The direction of this difference was specified in Chapter I. The second statistical hypothesis tested is that a history of psychosis does not differentiate between murderers and non-murderers

on the scales. In addition, the data are examined for possible interaction effects.

Means and interjudge correlations were obtained by the computer Bastat program. Means are listed in Appendix C. Interjudge correlations are in Chapter III. The first three scales, anger fear, and aggression, were analyzed by a computer program of univariate two-way analysis of variance. The next three scales, aggressor concept, theme outcome, and locus of control, were analyzed by a computer program of multi-variate two-way analysis of variance. The multivariate program, as was stated in Chapter III, was chosen to compensate for possible inter-dependence effects of our three-category scales. Utilizing the multivariate form of the two-way ANOVA enables us to view each scale in overall, and in specific category relationship, Kennedy (1971). The seventh scale, Modes of Coping Behaviors, was inspected for differences in the numbers of coping behaviors between the four subject groups. In addition a one-way analysis of variance was run on each of the twenty subscales.

#### Analysis of the Levels of Conscious Anger Scale

Mean scores of the two judges' data were obtained, as stated above, and were examined by two-way analysis of variance. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1.--Results of the Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Levels of Conscious Anger Scale.

Source	df	MS	F	P less than
Rows (Psy vs NPsy)	1	28.9000	3.1375	0.0850
Columns (Mur vs NMur)	1	52.9000	5.7431*	0.0219
Interaction (Murder & Psychosis)	1	12.1000	1.3136	0.2593
Error	36	9.2111		
Total	39			

\* p significant at 0.05 level.

These data clearly indicate a difference between the levels of conscious anger in murderers, and in non-murderers TAT fantasy themes. An examination of the mean scores in Table 4.1.1, below, indicate that murderers express significantly lower levels of conscious anger, in their TAT fantasy themes, than do non-murderers. This finding supports hypothesis  $H_1$ .

TABLE 4.1.1.--Mean Scores for the Levels of Conscious Anger Scale.

	Murderers	Non-Murderers
Psychotic	3.3	4.5
Non-Psychotic	3.9	7.3



It will be noted further, that there was no statistically significant relationship identified between the scores of psychotic and non-psychotic murderers; nor was there any interaction effect. These findings support hypothesis  $H_{1.1}$ . The data are, however, suggestive ( $p = 0.0850$ ) that psychotic persons express less conscious anger than non-psychotic individuals.

Analysis of the Levels of Conscious  
Fear Scale

These results of the two-way analysis of variance for conscious fear are reported in Table 4.2, below.

TABLE 4.2.--Results of the Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Levels of Conscious Fear Scale.

Source	df	MS	F	P less than
Rows (Psy vs NPsy)	1	0.2250	0.0073	0.9325
Columns (Mur vs NMur)	1	198.0250	6.4126*	0.0159
Interaction (Murder & Psychosis)	1	11.0250	0.3570	0.5540
Error	36	30.8806		
Total	39			

\* p significant at 0.05 level.

The data indicate a difference between the Levels of conscious fear in murderers, and in non-murderers TAT fantasy themes. An examination of the mean scores in

Table 4.2.2, below, indicates that murderers express significantly lower levels of conscious fear, in their TAT fantasy themes, than do non-murderers. While this finding rejects the null hypothesis, it is in the opposite direction to that specified in hypothesis  $H_2$ .

TABLE 4.2.2.--Mean Scores for the Levels of Conscious Fear Scale.

	Murderers	Non-Murderers
Psychotic	6.1	11.6
Non-Psychotic	7.0	10.4

Again, the differences between psychotic and non-psychotic murderers on levels of conscious fear is not statistically significant. This finding is in support of hypothesis  $H_{2.1}$ .

#### Analysis of the Levels of Overt Aggression Scale

Mean scores of the two judges' data were obtained, as stated before, and were examined by two-way analysis of variance. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 4.3.

As on the two previous scales, these data indicate a significant difference between murderers and non-murderers for levels of overt aggression in TAT themes. The mean

TABLE 4.3.--Results of the Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Levels of Overt Aggression Scale.

Source	df	MS	F	P less than
Rows (Psy vs NPsy)	1	648.0250	3.1694	0.0835
Columns (Mur vs NMur)	1	874.2250	4.2757*	0.0460
Interaction (Murder & Psychosis)	1	60.0250	0.2936	0.5913
Error	36	204.4639		
Total	39			

\*P significant at 0.05 level.

scores, in Table 4.3.3, below, indicate that murderers express significantly lower levels of overt aggression, in TAT fantasy themes, than do non-murderers. As on the levels of conscious fear scale, this finding rejects the null hypothesis, but again it is in the opposite direction to that specified in hypothesis  $H_3$ .

TABLE 4.3.3.--Mean Scores for the Levels of Overt Aggression Scale.

	Murderers	Non-Murderers
Psychotic	24.1	35.9
Non-Psychotic	34.6	41.5

As was noted on the fear and anger scales, there was no significant difference between the scores of psychotic and non-psychotic murderers nor was there any trend toward interaction effects. This finding supports hypothesis  $H_{3.1}$ . As with the conscious anger scale, however, there is a trend ( $p = 0.0835$ ) for psychotic persons to express less overt aggression in fantasy themes, than for non-psychotic persons.

#### Analysis of the Aggressor Concept Scale

This three-category scale was analyzed by multivariate two-way analysis of variance. The results are listed in Table 4.4.

These data indicate an overall multivariate  $F$  ratio, for murderers versus non-murderers, significant well below the 0.05 level. In looking within the row of "column" data, it can be seen that the distinction between murderers and non-murderers perceptions of an aggressor is in their perception of external others as the aggressor. An examination of the multivariate means in Table 4.4.4, indicates that murderers see aggressors less as external others, or chance than do non-murderers. This finding, while it rejects the null hypothesis, is the direct opposite of hypothesis  $H_4$ .

The overall multivariate F's for differences due to a history of psychosis, or for interaction effects are not significant. These findings support hypothesis H<sub>4.1</sub>.

TABLE 4.4.--Results of the Multivariate Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Three-Category Aggressor Concept Scale.

Source	df	MS	Multivariate F	P less than
Rows: (Psy vs NPsy)	3, 34		1.8400	0.1586
1.Offensive Aggression	1	5.6250	0.8917	0.3514
2.Defensive Aggression	1	0.2250	0.2082	0.6510
3.External Aggression	1	16.9000	0.3651 <sup>a</sup>	0.0264
Columns: (Mur vs NMur)	3, 34		4.3130*	0.0111
1.Offensive Aggression	1	4.2250	0.6697	0.4186
2.Defensive Aggression	1	1.2250	1.1337	0.2941
3.External Aggression	1	40.0000	12.6984*	0.0011
Interaction: (Mur & Psy)	3, 34		0.1931	0.9004
1.Offensive Aggression	1	3.0250	0.4795	0.4931
2.Defensive Aggression	1	0.0250	0.0231	0.8800
3.External Aggression	1	0.1000	0.0317	0.8596
Error:				
1.Offensive Aggression	36	6.3083		
2.Defensive Aggression	36	1.0856		
3.External Aggression	36	3.1500		
Total:				
1.Offensive Aggression	39			
2.Defensive Aggression	39			
3.External Aggression	39			

\* p significant at 0.05 level.

<sup>a</sup>Due to a dependence between these measures, and in view of the lack of significance of the multivariate F, this estimate may be in error.

TABLE 4.4.4.--Multivariate Mean Scores for the Aggressor Concept Scale.

	Murderers	Non-Murderers
<u>Psychotic</u>		
Offensive	4.3	5.5
Defensive	0.9	1.2
External	3.1	5.0
<u>Non-Psychotic</u>		
Offensive	5.6	5.7
Defensive	1.0	1.4
External	4.3	6.4

The fact that there is a significance level of 0.0264 shown for the difference between psychotic and non-psychotic felons on category three could be in error, due to a dependence between categories. Had there been a clearly independent difference it would have been reflected in the overall multivariate F ratio. It is of interest then to note this difference only as a possible trend, that psychotic felons may see somewhat less aggression as due to vague external chance than do non-psychotic felons.

#### Analysis of the Theme Outcome Scale

The multivariate analysis of the theme outcome scale indicates a significant difference between the perceptions of murderers and non-murderers on this dimension. There are no significant differences due

TABLE 4.5.--Results of the Multivariate Two-Way Analysis of Variance for the Theme Outcome Scale.

Source	df	MS	Multivariate F	P less than
Rows: (Psy vs NPsy)	3, 34		0.7230	0.5453
1.Favorable	1	3.0250	0.3882	0.5372
2.Uncertain	1	2.5000	0.1939	0.6624
3.Unfavorable	1	0.6250	0.1540	0.6971
Columns: (Mur vs NMur)	3, 34		3.3020*	0.0319
1.Favorable	1	27.2250	3.4941	0.0698
2.Uncertain	1	90.0000	6.9798*	0.0122
3.Unfavorable	1	27.2250	6.7085*	0.0138
Interaction: (Mur & Psy)	3, 34		0.9993	0.4051
1.Favorable	1	15.6250	2.0053	0.1654
2.Uncertain	1	32.4000	2.5127	0.1217
3.Unfavorable	1	2.0250	0.4990	0.4845
Error:				
1.Favorable	36	7.7917		
2.Uncertain	36	12.8944		
3.Unfavorable	36	4.0583		
Total:				
1.Favorable	39			
2.Uncertain	39			
3.Unfavorable	39			

\* p significant at 0.05 level.

to psychosis, or to interaction effects which is in support of hypothesis  $H_{5.1}$ . The data are listed in Table 4.5.

There appears, from the data to be a definite difference in perception of theme outcomes for two of the categories, uncertain, and unfavorable and a trend, bordering on significant for the category of favorable, that distinguishes the perceptions of outcome of murderers from non-murderers. In examining the Table 4.5.5, of multivariate means, below, this pattern emerges as quite distinct.

TABLE 4.5.5.--Multivariate Mean Scores for the Theme Outcome Scale.

	Murderers	Non-Murderers
<u>Psychotic</u>		
Favorable	1.7	4.6
Uncertain	17.5	12.7
Unfavorable	1.3	3.4
<u>Non-Psychotic</u>		
Favorable	2.4	2.8
Uncertain	16.2	15.0
Unfavorable	2.0	3.2

Murderers have significantly more uncertain theme outcomes, which is in support of hypothesis  $H_5$ . What is also apparent is that murderers see significantly less unfavorable outcomes, and there is a trend bordering on significance ( $p 0.07$ ) toward murderers seeing less favorable



outcomes. In essence, then one can state that, murderers tend to perceive outcomes of events very non-committally.

#### Analysis of the Locus of Control Scale

The multivariate two-way analysis of variance of the locus of control data, indicate, Table 4.6, a significant difference between murderers and non-murderers on this dimension. There was no significant relationship, however, for the effect of a history of psychosis or for interaction effects; these latter findings are in accord with hypothesis  $H_{6.1}$ .

An inspection of the multivariate means, Table 4.6.6, indicates that murderers saw the locus of control of events resting significantly more with themselves, than did non-murderers. In addition, they saw control of events less due to chance than did non-murderers. This latter finding that murderers saw the locus of control of events, less due to chance, than do non-murderers rejects the null hypothesis, but again is directionally opposite to hypothesis  $H_6$ .

#### Analysis of the Modes of Coping Behaviors Scale

The data from this scale were first subjected to analysis of the average number of different coping behaviors for each of the four categories of subjects. The mean

TABLE 4.6.--Results of the Two-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance of the Locus of Control Scale.

Source	df	MS	Multivariate F	P less than
Rows: (Psy vs NPsy)	3, 34		1.9683	0.1373
1.Self	1	16.9000	3.6000	0.0659
2.Chance	1	2.5000	2.0548	0.1604
3.Others	1	10.0000	2.6201	0.1143
Columns: (Mur vs NMur)	3, 34		4.1453*	0.0132
1.Self	1	25.6000	5.4533*	0.0253
2. Chance	1	14.4000	11.8356*	0.0015
3.Others	1	2.5000	0.6550	0.4237
Interaction: (Mur & Psy)	3, 34		0.3778	0.7696
1.Self	1	0.9000	0.1917	0.6642
2.Chance	1	0.9000	0.7397	0.3955
3.Others	1	0.1000	0.0262	0.8724
Error:				
1.Self	36	4.6944		
2.Chance	36	1.2166		
3.Others	36	3.8166		
Total:				
1.Self	39			
2.Chance	39			
3.Others	39			

\* p significant at the 0.05 level.

TABLE 4.6.6.--Multivariate Mean Scores for the Locus of Control Scale.

	Murderers	Non-Murderers
<u>Psychotic</u>		
Self	15.9	14.0
Chance	0.9	2.4
Others	3.7	4.3
<u>Non-Psychotic</u>		
Self	14.3	13.0
Chance	1.7	2.6
Others	4.8	5.2

differences data in Table 4.7, below indicated only trivial differences and were not subjected to further analysis. This finding fails to substantiate hypothesis  $H_7$ . Hypothesis  $H_{7.1}$ , indicating no difference due to a history of psychosis was of course substantiated.

TABLE 4.7.--Mean Scores for the Number of Different Coping Behaviors.

	Murderers	Non-Murderers
Psychotic	10.8	11.3
Non-Psychotic	10.7	11.6

In an in-depth examination of these data, a one-way analysis of variance was performed on the mean values for each of the twenty subscales. Only one of these scales,

number 11, Harmavoidance showed any significant findings. Since it would be a tedious pursuit of non-significant data to publish all twenty sub-scale analyses, only the analysis for sub-scale number 11 is listed below in Table 4.7.1.

TABLE 4.7.1.--Results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance for Sub-scale Number 11 Harmavoidance.

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P less than
Between Groups	5.9000	3	1.9667	3.0517*	0.041
Within Groups	23.2000	36	0.6444		
Totals	29.1000	39			

\* p significant at 0.05 level.

The means for the four groups of subjects are in Table 4.7.7, below.

TABLE 4.7.7.--Mean Score for Sub-scale Number 11, Harmavoidance.

Psychotic Murderers	Psychotic Non-Murderers	Non-Psychotic Murderers	Non-Psychotic Non-Murderers
0.7	1.5	0.5	0.7

By inspection one sees that the difference lies with the category, psychotic non-murderers. This group of subjects shows a significantly greater use of the coping behavior Harmavoidance, than do any of the other three groups.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

#### A Summary of the Results

Table 5.1 presents a summary of the findings in relation to the original hypotheses. The findings clearly differentiated between murderers and non-murderers on six of the seven scales. The major hypothesis, that murderers will show less conscious anger than non-murderers was substantiated. Six of the seven secondary hypotheses were found to have significance, although four of these were directionally opposite to that hypothesized.<sup>6</sup> Scale number seven was the only one which showed no overall significance for any of the four groups. The lack of significance on this scale, however, contributed to reinforcing the data found on the other six scales, as will be pointed out later. In addition to the data contributed through the major and secondary hypotheses, two additional significant findings were noted, and four trends approaching significance developed.

---

<sup>6</sup>In such instances, one finds much comfort in Karon's statement "That's okay. You didn't invent reality. You just discovered it."

TABLE 5.1.--Summary TAT Findings in Relation to Original Hypothesis.

Hypothesis	Summary Statement	Finding
H <sub>1</sub> :	Murderers will show less feelings of anger than non-murderers	supported, 0.02
H <sub>2</sub> :	Murderers will show more feeling of fear than non-murderers	opposite direction, 0.02
H <sub>3</sub> :	Murderers will show more overt aggression than non-murderers	opposite direction, .046
H <sub>4</sub> :	Murderers will see the aggressor more as external others or chance, than non-murderers	opposite direction, 0.01
	Trend only: psychotic vs non-psychotic, psychotic tend to see less external-chance aggression than non-psychotic felons	Multivariate F, ns
H <sub>5</sub> :	Murderers will see outcome of events more as uncertain than non-murderers Additional findings: Murderers vs non-murderers Less favorable Less unfavorable	supported, 0.01 trend, 0.07 significant, 0.01
H <sub>6</sub> :	Murderers will see control of events more as chance than non-murderers Additional findings: Murderers vs non-murderers More as self than non-murderers	opposite direction, 0.001 significant, 0.03

TABLE 5.1.--Continued.

Hypothesis	Summary Statement	Finding
H <sub>7</sub> :	Murderers will use less different kinds of coping behavior than non-murderers Additional findings: Psychotic non-murderers use Harmavoidance more, as a coping behavior than does any other group	not significant  significant, 0.04
H <sub>8</sub> :	There will be no significant differences between groups of murderers, on any scale due to a history of psychosis.	no significant differences found
<u>Additional Trends:</u>		
H <sub>1</sub>	The data are suggestive (p 0.0850) that psychotic persons express less conscious anger than non-psychotic persons.	
H <sub>3</sub>	The data are suggestive (p 0.0835) that psychotic persons express less overt aggressions than non-psychotic persons.	

In summary then, we can unequivocally state that distinctly different patterns of handling anger, fear, and overt aggression were identified in the fantasies of murderers, as contrasted with the fantasies of non-murderers. In addition, we have been able to demonstrate that no significant differences were found between murderers who were psychotic and murderers who were not psychotic. Indeed what differences did occur were clearly trivial. Our findings in addition indicated no significant interaction effects for psychosis or murder between the four categories of subjects.

The patterns that emerge then are clearly demarcated. Murderers think less about anger. They think less about fear. They also think less about overt aggressive behavior. In other words, these thoughts occur significantly less in the fantasies of murderers than in the fantasies of non-murderers. Yet, when murderers act aggressively, as we have seen from their case histories (Chapter II), they respond rapidly and much more violently than do non-murderers. As pointed out there, in the assault-till-death interval studies, murderers aggression is destructive. When they get angry, fearful or aggressive, people suddenly die.

From these findings then, it would appear that murderers avoid unpleasant thoughts: thoughts of anger; thoughts of fear and thoughts of aggression. These findings



suggest a theory of repression of anger and fear feelings; in effect they appear to clamp a tight lid on unpleasant affect. In addition they appear to deny, or inhibit aggressive overt behavior impulses.

Examining the other findings sheds some further light upon these observations. Firstly, and perhaps one of the more important secondary findings, is that no significant differences were found between psychotic murderers and non-psychotic murderers on any of the tested dimensions. The data are suggestive ( $p < 0.08$ ), however, of a difference between psychotic and non-psychotic persons on levels of conscious anger, and overt aggression. Nevertheless the findings are that there is a particular pattern of repression of anger, fear and aggression that carries across murderers and appears to be one of their truly distinguishing intrapsychic characteristics. The implications are that all murderers then bottle-up their feelings of anger and fear and inhibit their hostile aggressive impulses.

While it had been hypothesized that murders would be expectant of hostile aggression from almost any chance interaction, this finding was significantly reversed. In other words, they expect that aggression happens by chance significantly less than do non-murderers. The implications here are that external others, or chance plays much less significance in triggering aggression in their life, as they see it. Aggression to them is mainly offensive, or

defensive aggression. The implications are, then, that they are basically set to attack or defend, and even that they are more aware of their own aggressive tendencies than they are of chance or others. One would begin to suspect that they fear their own hostile and fear potential. In point of fact one would suspect that perhaps one of the prime contributing sources to their need to repress their unpleasant feelings and impulses is their need to deny these feelings to themselves.

Outcome of events is seen more as uncertain, by murderers and significantly less as unfavorable. There was also a trend ( $p < 0.07$ ) for murderers to see less favorable outcomes. By far the majority of outcomes are seen by murderers as being uncertain. One could hypothesize that this means that murderers are very non-committal and refuse to speculate about how events will come out.

The events referred to were, however, mainly interactions between people. A more plausible suggestion would be that murderers simply do not become involved or refuse to become involved in any indepth interpersonal relationships. They see very little reason for themselves to do so, outcomes in the sense of pleasant or unpleasant, rewarding or unrewarding, are too uncertain. In addition, returning to the suggestion of them being emotionally very repressed persons who avoid unpleasant feelings

and impulses, close interpersonal relationships would be impossible to them, partly because of their involvement with self and partly because such relationships would create undue pressure upon their defenses of affect repression causing loss of affect and impulse control.

Interestingly, murderers see control of events less as being due to chance than do non-murderers. They also see control of events as being due more to themselves than do non-murderers. While we had previously hypothesized that control of events would be seen more as due to external chance, we had done so in the belief that murderers feared their environment, and the environments threat. These findings suggest a somewhat different view.

It would seem more likely, as has been developed, that murderers fear the loss of affect and impulse control most. In other words, they fear themselves; their potential destructiveness. They seem to fear being found out how bad or dangerous or fearful they themselves are. One would suspect that they have introjected feelings of unworth and inadequacy, much as if "I am the one who can be dangerous, or fearful, terrifyingly potent or terrifyingly inadequate." They appear then to be so bound up in self and so turned inward that they see little else outside themselves. Murderers see themselves as both the cause of their success and the contributor to their own downfall.

When discussing this research project, in committee, one of the questions proposed was, whether the phenomena we were initially seeing and speculating about, in the pilot study, were indeed due to intrapsychic disturbances and differences, or whether they were due to a difference in number of learned coping behaviors; that is a response to inadequacy. It was suggested that an attempt should be made to clarify this question. Kagan (1970) proposed a scoring of the protocol themes for the number of different coping behaviors and comparing these findings between categories of subjects. It was, in retrospect a very worthwhile suggestion. Had we not done this the question would no doubt have plagued the study.

The findings indeed indicated no significant difference in number of coping behaviors in the repertoire of any of the four groups of subjects. In addition, an in-depth analysis of the numbers of each of these different coping behaviors used, with one exception, indicated no difference for any of the four groups of subjects. The one exception, was that psychotic non-murderers used the coping behavior Harmavoidance, more intensively than did any other group of subjects.

We can unequivocally state then, that the differences between murderers and non-murderers are due to intrapsychic differences rather than a lack of adequately learned coping

behaviors. Indeed these intrapsychic differences would appear to be such as to account for the differences in overt behavior of murderers as opposed to non-murderers. In order to develop this point further, it is necessary to explore these findings in the light of theories of repression. This will be attempted in the next subsection.

### Findings and Theory

Freud (1964) has pointed out the wish fulfilling qualities of fantasies. He suggested that fantasies also have an element of strong repression for fear of being found out, or giving way to them because of their socially bad implications. Freud demonstrated that much of the fantasy of subjects is unconscious and cannot be tolerated in their conscious minds. It would seem, then, that one of the main reasons for a lower level of anger, fear, and aggression in conscious fantasies of murderers is that they have extremely strong drives to express anger, fear, and act out overtly aggressively. We know, from the studies of family interaction with murderers that doing so as a child was an extremely dangerous act. This behavior was so dangerous in fact that frequently the child stood a strong chance of being killed. He invariably attracted hostility, frequently overt rejection, and at the very least he was noticed. Even being noticed had an

element of uncertainty for him. Consequently he had to be on guard constantly. In essence, then he was the cause of everything that happened to him. He had to be innocuous and sometimes ingratiating when he was angry or fearful. He had to accept his other siblings getting more love, affection and acceptance than he did and he had to accept frequent beatings, holding back his feelings of wanting to strike out, for fear of getting hurt worse. These conditions accompanied with repression of affect and inhibition of aggressive impulses would result in a shallow capacity for interpersonal relationships and a distrust or fear of people.

One additional consequence of being raised in such a family environment was the potential of becoming psychotic. As noted from the studies by Wille (1970) and Tanay (1969), a large proportion of murderers either were psychotic before the act, or became psychotic afterwards. Meyer and Karon (1967) demonstrated with the TAT the dynamics of the destructiveness of mothers of psychotic patients. Mothers of schizophrenics gave more TAT themes, than did mothers of non-schizophrenics, in which the dominant character takes from the dependent one.

MacDonald (1963) mentioned the rejecting father and seductive mother syndrome, as well as their affectionally inconsistent relationship to sons who later became murderers. As MacDonald pointed out, frequently paranoid delusions

with great anger developed. The anger emerged periodically, explosively and sometimes was noted as bizarre temper tantrums, sometimes as strange behavior, and at times occurred as noted by MacDonald within the triad of enuresis, fire-setting, or cruelty to animals. There was then a potent, but strangulated desire to release intense sadistic hatred.

The ego psychologists noted particularly the adaptive aspects of repression, Horney (1964), states: "There are several reasons why a child who grows up in such an atmosphere will repress hostility: helplessness, fear, love or feelings of guilt." She goes on to give what she refers to as mottoes for the underlying feelings associated with these various needs for hostility repression out of helplessness: "I have to repress my hostility because I need you"; out of fear: "I have to repress my hostility because I am afraid of you"; out of fear of losing love: "I have to repress hostility for fear of losing you"; out of guilt: "I have to repress my hostility because I would be a bad child if I felt hostile." Horney notes that while these behaviors occur in children, nevertheless, through necessity, often enough the "acute individual reactions to individual provocations crystallize into a character attitude" (p. 86-87).

As we have seen from the act of murder, the results of the release of these unpleasant feelings or affects and from aggression of those who commit murder the amount of pent-up feelings is tremendous. Yet the amount of these in fantasies is limited. In understanding just how these repression mechanisms may work in murderers it is perhaps most helpful to look at these factors in terms of Tomkins (1967) intensity-extensity theory of repression (P. 106). Tomkins sees fantasies in terms of Freud's wish-fulfillment concept. He does, however, suggest a more elaborate structure, seeing personality as having a limited quantum of pressure units. The expenditure of pressure in one area reducing it in another. The unit of pressure is seen as having two components: intensity, the strength or drive of the wish; and, extensity, its scope or mass. These are analagous to the mass X velocity concept in the physics of matter. The product  $mv$  = momentum in matter; in other words Tomkins sees this pressure as the total impact value or momentum of a drive.

Tomkins sees wishes or fantasies kept in balance much as energy vectors keep units of matter in balance. One pressure requires an equal and opposite pressure to maintain equilibrium. A brief shift in pressure differentials, then allows one drive to emerge. Either reduction of the opposing drive, then, or an increase in the repressed drive is enough to cause a release of



the repressed thoughts. Because of the degree of pressure of the hostile impulse, its emergence tends to be erratic and explosive in release.

The data, then suggest two syndromes, characteristic of murderers: (1) A syndrome of intense thought and affect repression; and, (2) A syndrome of behavioral set, or expectancy. The repression syndrome results in the individual avoiding all negative affect and behaviors in thought. The second syndrome maintains a fight set, such that the individual is poised to either attack, or defend. The individual is set to a non-committal outcome expectancy, and sees control of events as being solely in his hands. We would suggest further that these are two universal, and sequentially operative syndromes, necessary to both the individuals early survival, and to his later becoming a murderer.

#### A Clinical Analysis of the TAT Protocols of Twenty Murderers

After the TAT protocols were scored for each of the seven scales, the protocols of the twenty murderers were reviewed by Karon and McKie in an attempt to identify those clinical features of the protocols that were not accounted for in the scoring. In reviewing the protocols, no attempt was made to blind the protocols; indeed, they were actually reviewed in light of all pertinent data. Each individuals' personal history was thoroughly

scrutinized and an attempt was made to determine any relationships which would account for that individual's particular modes of behavior, or past history, relevant to his having killed a person.

Unfortunately, as was noted by Tomkins (1967, p. 227) no ready interrelationship between the TAT stories and overt antisocial behavior, such as murder, was found. As Karon (1968) has noted, however, "Typically, clinical data consist of a vast amount of information with literally infinite facets which could be examined, from which the clinician extracts what is most pertinent to him for some purpose. This is a model difficult to encompass in traditional psychometrics." In other words what will be reported here is impressionistic clinical data and must be interpreted within the frame of reference of the individual clinician's experience.

Characteristic of the TAT protocols of murderers are certain clear impressions:

1. The protocols are, in general, shorter than those of other inmates. To anyone having experience with TAT protocols of college students, an initial exposure to protocols of inmates in general is something of a shock. The suggestion of Tomkins (1967, p. 25), that typical TAT protocols are 300 words in length, seems inconceivable. Stories of a sentence or two, indeed of a word or two, in

some instances are not unusual for murderers, but this is true for most patient populations, unlike the Harvard undergraduates who were used to standardize the TAT originally.

2. There is a definite "now" orientation to the TAT stories of murderers. These individuals seem quite stimulus bound, frequently doing little more than describing the features of the picture. Characteristic of their thema is an absence of past-present-future sequencing.

3. There is a noticeable paucity of affect related to their stories. Hostile affect is noticeably limited. Affectional affect is limited to older figures, more frequently "dear old granpa and dear old granma, lovingly embracin' after all they been through."

4. While hostile aggression is limited, there is a marked tendency for the aggression to be intense when it is present. For example, the card 8 BM frequently elicited themes of torture "One man cuttin' on another man." Aggression, when present frequently had to do with death, torture, or similar levels of violence. Affect was conspicuously absent from many of these themes. People died, were tortured, or severely hurt for very trivial forms of retribution. The rationalizations were glibly offered, if at all. One got the impression that the stories were reporting "that's how it's done" and that it never crossed the subjects minds to question

the code. On the other hand it is probably conceivable that for years their questions had been to no avail.

5. Sexual guilt was intense in the pictures. It was preferable for a man to kill a woman rather than to have sexual intercourse with her. Intercourse was generally followed by feelings of remorse or shame. Seldom were there any feelings of tenderness, enjoyment or pleasure reported in reference to intercourse. Subject 154000's response to card 13 MF most clearly captures this conflict:

Well could say. This a man and woman-woman in bed. Seem like something happened to the guy. He'd be a little shamed for what he's did. The woman could be daid. And--I would say--They have already had intercourse--or--and he is shamed what he did and he killed her.

What a horrendous way to expiate one's sexual guilt, by killing one's sexual partner! No sexual feelings, or behavior were reported among parental figures, nor among older persons in murderers fantasy themes. Indeed older persons were seen as being able to express tenderness, devoid of sexuality. The murderers tended to have Socrates concept of sexuality; something conflictual that hopefully would pass.

6. Initially it had appeared that there was a difference in the sex of the heroes for murderers, and non-murderers. A tabulation of hero sex for each of the stories was done. The results are presented in Table 5.2.

TABLE 5.2.--Hero Sex in TAT Stories, Total

Hero Sex	Psychotic Murderer	Non-Psychotic Murderer	Psychotic Non-Murderer	Non-Psychotic Non-Murderer
1.Male Hero	105	128	130	121
2.Female Hero	38	30	23	38
3.Ambivalent Sex	1	3	5	3
4.Non Clearly Defined	56	39	42	38

101

TABLE 5.3.--Card No. 16, Hero Sex Category.

Hero Sex	Psychotic Murderer	Non-Psychotic Murderer	Psychotic Non-Murderer	Non-Psychotic Non-Murderer
1.Male Hero	1	7	9	6
2.Female Hero	1	-	-	1
3.Ambivalent Sex	-	-	-	-
4.Non Clearly Defined	8	3	1	3

No clear pattern emerged for any of the four categories of subjects. The only card in which major differences appeared for the hero sex category was Card 16. Psychotic murderers primarily saw no hero sex clearly defined. The other three subject groups saw mainly male heroes. These data appear in Table 5.3.

7. Murderers generally saw parental figures as controlling, or punitive. The non-murderers more often tended to see parental figures as offering aid. Consequently, murderers stories tended to portray more themes of rejection of parental figures, while non-murderers tended to portray support from these persons. In addition, murderers did not often show the male as offering consolation, but rather to be self-centeredly concerned as to his own fate. Females were seen more as seductive, controlling persons who wanted to punish the male, by murderers. Non-murderers, on the other hand tended to see a more satisfying degree of warmth between male and female figures.

8. Of particular note was the striking lack of fun, humor, or warmth in murderers protocols, as contrasted with those of non-murderers. Murderers protocols had a lack of spontaneity, and projected a harsh, bleak view of a merciless life experience.

In summary, then the protocols of murderers, as contrasted with non-murderers is a contrast of harsh,

versus warm relationships. It is one in which one group, murderers, appear as vindictive, punitive and struggling with residues of parental conflicts, as opposed to those, non-murderers, more accepting of close relationships, and more likely to see some value, or satisfaction in family ties. In addition there is a marked difference in sexual guilt between these two groups, and especially the way in which this guilt is handled. Murderers are more likely to see a need to expiate sexual guilt by killing their sexual partner, while non-murderers are less likely to feel the need to expiate the shame. Non-murderers are more likely to see sexual guilt as the embarrassment of inexperienced youth, something to be sought after, rather than avoided.

#### Summary

This study investigated the handling of anger, fear, and aggression in the fantasy themes told to TAT cards by 20 murderers, and 20 non-murderers. Half of each subject group had a history of a psychotic disorder, and half had no such history. The subjects were all inmates at the State Prison for Southern Michigan, at Jackson, Michigan.

Two distinct personality syndromes were identified in murderers: (1) A syndrome of repression: repression of anger and fear affect, and inhibition of thoughts of

aggressive behavior; (2) A syndrome of behavioral expectancy, or set: a fighting stance set, in which murderers are ready to attack or defend, non-committal about outcome of events, and see control for outcome of events as their responsibility.

In contrast, non-murderers fantasy themes had more hostile and fear affect, more overt aggressive fantasies, and were less rigid and set in their handling of their fantasies. They were more naturally responsive to thoughts and feelings, and more flexible in coping with or expressing them.

A clinical review of murderers TAT protocols indicated a limited degree of verbalization. While murderers fantasies contained limited anger, or fear affect, or aggressive behavior, what was there, was at a high intensity level. There was a shallowness of interpersonal relationships; parental figures in particular were seen as controlling and conflictual. Sexual guilt was very intense, with women seen as seductive, and with the method of expiating sexual guilt seen as killing the female sexual partner.

In other words, clearly distinct and sharply different patterns of fantasy behavior appear in murderers and non-murderers. Much popular misconception still persists that murderers are like any of the rest of the population. The idea persists that anyone under duress will kill.



That this is just not so was brought home forcefully to this investigator while completing the writing of this dissertation. During this period, he met a railroad policeman who was staying at the same motel in East Lansing. This man had just separated from his wife, after having caught her in bed with his best friend, in a sexual relationship.

What made his behavior stand out was that he had returned home from work in full uniform, including a .357 magnum revolver. He drew his revolver, pointed it, then said "the hell with it. Get out!" His wife and his best friend then provoked him twice more, telling him he was inadequate and daring him to do anything about it. As he described it, it was much more provocation than many of the victomology syndromes have produced, leading to homicide. He did hit the man with the gun to get him out of the house, and threatened to throw his wife bodily down the stairs.

He was very upset and angry and was charged with assault against the former friend, but was released because he had expert witnesses testify that he was "temporarily insane." All the controlled behavior, and no shot fired! He said he was clearly not going to prison and besides could not feel justified in killing either person. It is of interest to note further that

he had been an artillery observer in combat aircraft for two years in Vietnam just six years previous.

It is realized that this isolated case is not conclusive evidence supporting the notion that specific differences do exist between those who commit murder and those who do not. Nevertheless, this case does fit in with the variations in control of affect and behavior handling identified in the non-murderers. Some individuals, as his case demonstrates, just do not harbour pent-up rage, and are clearly able to handle these extreme stresses in a healthy manner. Others clearly are not so equipped, emotionally.

As was pointed out in Chapter I, page 8, the individuals tested were institutionalized murderers. Whether or not the results identified are purely post hoc effects due to guilt over their crime or to institutionalization effects will no doubt be raised. This question cannot, of course, be answered without a study of these specific issues.

My own clinical findings, however, with patients who have later committed violent assaultive behavior is consistent with these research findings. In addition, the life style and behavioral data, reported in Chapter II, is consistent with these findings. Nevertheless, the reader must bear in mind that this is, of course, a retroactive study of murderers.

### Implications for Future Research

This study appears to have answered some of the more basic questions relative to the handling of anger and aggression by persons who have committed murder. Indeed, the findings in this study supply a very plausible explanation for the intrapsychic processes of individuals, that would no doubt cause them to commit murder.

Primarily because of the explanations offered by this study, it perhaps raises more questions than it settles. These questions can be broadly classified into two basic areas: (1) Methodological implications; (2) Findings implications.

Methodologically, the study differs from some studies in this area in several potentially significant ways. The study is more traditional, in that it utilized a well developed, and clinically validated instrument, the TAT. This differs from current trends to modify developed tests either by selection of specific cards, or by redrawing them, Vogel (1967). This procedure also differs sharply from that of developing new projective instruments for immediate use in investigative tasks, Beit-Hallahmi (1970).

Indeed, the implications are that the modification or development of new tests should be separate from the investigative use of tests. This would suggest that these are two distinct procedures, and are perhaps not mutually compatible. At the least, they are sources of potential research difficulty.

One other methodological concern, requiring further elucidation, is the selection and definition of subject groups. Many studies have tested violence-prone or assaultive individuals. Definition is needed in the light of the contrast between murderers' fantasy behavior and that indicated for other assaultive groups; specifically the definition of their assaultive behavior.

One additional methodological difference in this study was the modification of scales 1 to 6 to score only the major overall effect measured. In the case of scales 1 to 3, the highest level of anger, fear, or aggression only, was scored. In scales 4 to 6, the predominant mode only for aggressor concept, theme outcome or locus of control was scored. Since these are really impressionistic judgments, it was felt, from the pilot study, that scoring each and every possible circumstance only complicated the judgments made in scorings. A uniform sampling of extremes, it would seem, gives a clearer indication of the individual's average response pattern. Vogel (1967) for example, scored scales 5 and 6 for each and every theme finding few significant differences. Such a procedure in scoring results gives fractional scores and in this investigator's opinion, masks the real significance to be derived from these scales. On the other hand, scoring scale 7 for each and every behavior was another situation entirely; this scale was utilized to score total numbers of behaviors not major intensities or predominant modes of behaviors. Further, research in scoring procedures

could offer clarification in scale development for projective tests.

This study utilized an additional and new scale approach in that two scales, anger and fear were developed to measure these dimensions solely as affect expressions. All previous scales had utilized behavioral measures of affect measurement. Since affect is one of the major concerns of diagnosticians and therapists, it should also be explored further in clinical projective research. In addition, one would foresee the study of relationships between behavior and affect expression as being of prime concern, and a too long neglected area of research with projective test instruments (as it is in psychology in general).

In turning to the implications for research generated by the findings, the most obvious suggestion is one of a need for replication. Secondly, the findings suggest a need for investigation of the handling of the fantasy behaviors, tested in this study, by both other assaultive groups, murderers prior to conviction, armed robbers and sex-offenders and by different socio-cultural levels of subjects. There are implications for investigation of these effects in college students as well as other non criminal subject groups, in order that we might understand how healthy people handle anger, fear, and aggression.

Returning to the repression and behavioral set identified in the study, the relationship of these syndromes to family development, underlying conflict, as well as life-style, could be investigated. The investigation of the mechanisms of these syndromes, especially under stress, may be of importance to understanding fantasy and overt behavior relationships.

In summary, then, the research implications of the study suggest further investigation in both methodology and findings. Methodology investigation suggests further research into the use of a standard instrument such as the TAT versus the use of newly developed tests and in definition of subject populations. Findings investigation should include replication on similar and on different populations. In addition, this investigation should encompass different forensic subjects such as sex-offenders and perhaps armed robbers, or burglars in order to explore more thoroughly the possible relationships of offense to the handling of aggression. The two syndromes identified, should themselves be explored in relationship to stress and acting out behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnouw, V. Culture and Personality. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1963.
- Beit-Hallahmi, B. "Aggressive and Sexual Fantasies in Violent and Non-violent Prison Inmates." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.
- Benedict, R. Patterns of Culture. N.Y.: Mentor Book, New American Library, 1960.
- Bohannon, P. Patterns of Homicide Among Tribal Societies in Africa (1960), reprinted in Wolfgang, M., ed., Studies in Homicide. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1967, pp. 211-237.
- Bohannon, P. African Homicide and Suicide. N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Buros, O. K. The Sixth Mental Measurements Year Book. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Buss, A. The Psychology of Aggression. N.Y.: Wiley, 1961.
- Canada, Police Administration Statistics, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa, 1969.
- Capote, T. In Cold Blood: A True Account of a Multiple Murder and its Consequences. N.Y.: Random House, 1965.
- Cavan, R. S. Readings in Juvenile Delinquency. Lippincott, N.Y.: 1964.
- De Quincey, Thomas. On Murder Considered as one of the Fine Arts, The Arts of Cheating, Swindling, and Murder. Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Douglas Jerrold, and Thomas DeQuincey. N.Y.: The Arnold Co., 1925, p. 153.
- Dollard, J., and Miller, N. E. Personality and Psychotherapy: an Analysis in Terms of Learning, Thinking and Culture. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1950.



- Duncan, G. M.; Frazier, S. H.; Litin, A. M.; and Barron, A. J. "Etiological Factors in First-Degree Murder." The Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 168 (November, 1958), 1755-1758.
- Enelow, A. J., and McKie, R. R. "A Psychiatrist's View of Pain." Occupational Health Nursing (August, 1969), 15-18.
- Fenichel, O. The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis. N.Y.: Norton, 1945.
- Freud, S. A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis. Edited by Boni & Liveright. Edition 1924, 14th Printing. N.Y.: Washington Square Press, August 1964.
- Fromm-Reichmann, F. Principles of Intensive Psychotherapy. 10th Printing. Chicago: Phoenix Books, University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Garfinkel, H. "Research Note in Inter-and Intra-racial Homicides." Social Forces, 27:4:370-381 (May, 1949).
- Goffman, E. Stigma; Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Gutmacher, M. S. The Mind of the Murderer. N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Cudahay, 1960.
- Hays, W. L. Statistics for Psychologists. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Henry, A. F., and Short, J. Suicide and Homicide. N.Y.: New York Free Press, 1965.
- Hollingshead, A. de B., and Redlich, F. C. Social Class and Mental Illness; a Community Study. N.Y.: Wiley, 1958.
- Hollingshead, A. de B., and Rogler, L. H. Trapped: Families and Schizophrenia, N.Y., Wiley, 1965.
- Horney, K. The Neurotic Personality of our Time. (1937). 1964 edition. N.Y.: W. W. Norton Co.
- "Interpol: International Crime Statistics for Years 1959-60." Reported in Knudten, R. D. Crime in a Complex Society, An Introduction to Criminology. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1970, Table 6-5, p. 153.

- Jensen, A. R. "Aggression in Fantasy and Overt Behavior." Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, Vol. 71, No. 16 (1957), 445.
- Kagan, N. Personal communication, July 1970, Department of Guidance and Counseling and Psychological Foundations, College of Education, Erickson Hall Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Kahn, M. W. "Psychological Test Study of a Mass Murderer." J. Proj. Tech., Mr '60 in Buros, O.K., ed. The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1956, p. 530, #726.
- Karon, B. P. "The Resolution of Acute Schizophrenic Reactions: A Contribution to the Development of Non-classical psychotherapeutic Techniques." Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 1 (1) (1963), 27-43.
- Karon, B. P. The Negro Personality. N.Y.: Springer, 1965.
- Karon, B. P. "Problems of Validities." Projective Techniques in Personality Assessment, A Modern Introduction. Edited by A. I. Rabin. N.Y.: Springer, 1968, Ch. 4, pp. 85-111.
- Karon, B. P. Personal communication, July 1970, Department of Psychology, Psychology Research Building, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Kennedy, M. Personal communication, July 1971, Office of Research Consultation, College of Education, Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Kiesler, D. "Some Myths of Psychotherapy Research and the Search for a Paradigm." Psychological Bulletin, 65 (1966), 110-136.
- Knudten, R. D. Crime in a Complex Society, An Introduction to Criminology. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1970.
- Lamberti, J. W.; Blackman, N.; and Weiss, J. A. "The Sudden Murderer: A Preliminary Report." The Journal of Social Therapy, 4:1 & 2:2-14 (1958).

- Lindner, R. M. Rebel Without a Cause. N.Y.: Grune & Stratton, 1944.
- Lindner, R. M. The Fifty Minute Hour. N.Y.: Rinehart, 1955.
- Maas, P. The Valachi Papers. N. Y.: Putnam & Sons, 1968.
- MacDonald, J. M. "The Threat to Kill." The American Journal of Psychiatry, 120:2:125-130 (August, 1963).
- Mahler, M. S.; Furer, M.; and Settlege, C. F. "Severe Emotional Disturbances in Childhood: Psychosis." American Handbook of Psychiatry. Edited by S. Arieti. Vol. 1. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1959, Chapter 41.
- Marshall, D. "We're more violent than we think," based on a Canadian Culture survey by Martin Goldfarb Consultants, McCleans. Toronto: August, 1970, pp. 25-28.
- Meyer, R. G., and Karon, B. P. "The Schizophrenogenic Mother Concept and the TAT." Psychiatry, 30 (2) (1967), 173-179.
- Morris, T., and Blom-Cooper, L. Victimology, a Calender of Murder: Criminal Homicide in England Since 1957. London: Michael Joseph, Ltd., 1964.
- Murray, H. A. Explorations in Personality: A Clinical Study of Fifty Men of College Age. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Palmer, S. A Study of Murder. N.Y.: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1960, pp. 99-139.
- Perkins, R. M. "The Law of Homicide." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 36:412-427 (March-April, 1946).
- Purcell, K. "The TAT and Antisocial Behavior." J. Consult. Psychol., 20 (1956), 449-456.
- Riewald, P. Society and It's Criminals. N.Y.: International University Press, 1950, p. 107.
- Robbin, G. D. "Justifiable Homicide by Police Officers." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 54:2:225-231 (June 1963).

- Rotter, J. B. "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement." Psychological Monographs, 1966 (80), 1, Whole No. 609.
- Runyon, R. P., and Haber, A. Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1967.
- Satten, J.; Menninger, K.; Rosen, I.; and Mayman, M. "Murder Without Apparent Motive; A Study in Personality Disorganization." American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 117 (1960), 48-53.
- Schilder, P. "The Attitude of Murderers Towards Death." J. Abnormal Soc. Psychol. 31 (1936), 348-363.
- Shelley, E. L. V., formerly Director of Treatment, Department of Corrections, Michigan. Personal communication during supervision, while this writer was serving as the Senior Psychologist, Reception Diagnostic Center, State Prison of Southern Michigan, at Jackson, Michigan (Feb. 1968).
- Silber, D. E., Courtless, T. F. "Measures of Fantasy Aggression among Mentally Retarded Offenders." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 72 (6) (1968), 918-923.
- Stone, H. "The TAT Aggressive Content Scale." J. Proj. Tech., 20 (1956), 445-452.
- Tanay, E. "Psychiatric Study of Homicide." American Journal of Psychiatry, 125:9 (March, 1969), 1252-1257.
- "The Duchess of Malfi," Elizabethan drama, from Gutmacher, M. S., The Mind of the Murderer. N.Y.: Farrar, Straus and Cudahay, 1960, p. 3.
- Thematic Apperception Test. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- The President's Commission on Violence, in, Newton, G. D., Zimring, F. D. Firearms and Violence in American Life. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 10, 1968.
- Toch, H. H. Violent Men: An Inquiry Into the Psychology of Violence. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

- Toch, H. H., ed. Legal and Criminal Psychology. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Tomkins, S. S. The Thematic Apperception Test: The Theory and Techniques of Interpretation, (1947). 9th edition. N.Y.: Grune & Stratton, 1967.
- Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1968.
- Vander Zanden, J. W. American Minority Relations, The Sociology of Race and Ethnic Groups. N.Y.: Ronald Press, 1966.
- Verkko, V. "Are There Regular Sequences in Crimes Against Life Which can be Formulated as Laws?" Homicides and Suicides in Finland and Their Dependence on National Character, Scandinavian Studies in Sociology, 3, Copenhagen: C.E.S. Gads Forlag, 1951, Chapter V, pp. 50-57.
- Vogel, R. B. "A Projective Study of Dynamic Factors in Attempted Suicide." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Von Hentig, H. The Criminal & His Victim, Studies in the Sociobiology of Crime. Archon Books, (1967) reprinted by Yale University Press, Chapter XII.
- Wille, W. S., Consultant in Psychiatry, and Formerly Clinic Director, Michigan Corrections Psychiatric Clinic. Prepublication Data: One Hundred Case Studies of Murderers. Personal communications, July-August, 1970, Michigan Corrections Psychiatric Clinic, Jackson, Michigan.
- Wille, W. S. "Citizens Who Commit Homicides." Revista Interamericana de Psicologia, June 1970, pp. 131-144.
- Wolfgang, M. E. Studies in Homicide. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1967.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### TAT PERSONALITY TEST SCALES

- Scale Number 1--Levels of Conscious Anger
- Scale Number 2--Levels of Conscious Fear
- Scale Number 3--Levels of Overt Aggression Fantasy
- Scale Number 4--Aggressor Concept
- Scale Number 5--Theme Outcome
- Scale Number 6--Locus of Control
- Scale Number 7--Modes of Coping Behaviors

## SCALE 1

### Levels of Conscious Anger\*

Anger, for the purposes of this scale, is defined as an emotional or feeling state response from dislike, or aversion, to rage. Anger is not to be scored if there is aggressive action expressed without a feeling state expressed, e.g. (1) he killed her-score aggression only no anger; (2) he was so upset he killed her-score both aggression and anger. Score the highest level of anger only for each story.

#### Scale Score

1. Unconscious: Any anger expressed as a being in a dream or as being in a play or drama. That is anger clearly removed from a reality situation; impotent, frigid, depression. Other examples: that's in a play, having a dream, he's having the thought not me; denial of self feelings.
2. Conscious Aversive Feelings: Feelings of being angry, mad, dislike or upset because of an action, but not expressed to another or to the cause of the annoyance. Verbalized to self: angry; disappointed; disturbed with; worried; disturbed; not like person doing something; or, harming him.
3. Expressed Anger: Feelings expressed to or about the cause of annoyance. Examples: expressed dislike; mad at someone; haughty; snotty attitude.
4. Punitive Anger: Feelings expressed to stop or want to punish the cause of annoyance. Examples: want to strike, or start an argument, cursing, mean look.
5. Uncontrolled Rage: Feelings expressed at a level of wanting to inflict pain or to destroy the cause of annoyance. Example: want to kill, hate, detest.

---

\*Developed by R. R. McKie.



## SCALE 2

Levels of Conscious Fear\*

Fear, for the purposes of this study, is defined as an emotional response or feeling state of avoidance or fright to panic. Fear is not to be scored if there is flight or action stated without feelings described or indicated. Score the highest level of fear only for each story.

Scale  
Score

1. Unconscious: Any fear expressed as in a dream or in a drama. That is, fear clearly removed from a reality situation. Example: dreaming of own death, a play.
2. Conscious Fear Feelings: Feelings of fright acknowledged as belonging to an individual, but not expressed verbally to, or about the fear cause; sadness; sorry to see change; feeling of loss; nervous; disturbed; wishing wouldn't do something; or, harm him; feeling shouldn't be here; doesn't trust.
3. Expressed Fear: Feelings expressed to or about the cause of fear object: feelings of avoidance; or, fear of abandonment, where clear that he feels action must be taken; distressed; trying to avoid someone; startled over noise, or sight; not: taking action.
4. Trembling Fear: Fear at a level that the individual feels can be harmful to him. He can acknowledge how punitive the fear object is: grief; crying; frightened; shrieked; haunted place; spooky; lost her nerve; pleading; heartbroken.
5. Panic: Fear at a level to cause fear of life or limb, that the individual flees in panic or is terrorized by.

---

\*Developed by R. R. McKie.

## SCALE 3

Aggression Theme Level\*

Aggression, for the purposes of this scale, is defined as an instrumental response that delivers a noxious stimuli to an organism. Score the highest aggression content in the story. Do not score sexual acts as aggression unless they involve intended harm to a partner or third person.

Scale  
Score

1. Passive: There are two types of passive aggression.  
(1) Direct-blocking someone's goal; (2) Indirect-sitins or strikes. Examples: don't wanta give in; the silent treatment; a standoff; strict; sneakout; impotence; frigid; depression.
2. Indirect: In this type of aggression the noxious stimuli is delivered to an "organism surrogate":  
(1) Verbal: gossip, or, (2) Physical: arson, etc., financial reverse; difficult early life; drunkenness; breaking, or entering; spying; extramarital relationships; hypnosis; nervous concern, but no direct threat obvious: e.g. don't go near the water; disturbed.
3. Verbal Rejection: There are three modes of verbal rejection (1) Direct dismissal, (2) Aversive feelings expressed, (3) Verbal attack-criticism, derogation-cursing. Examples: divorce; scream; get out!; cursing; argument.
4. Threat: A threat response symbolizes and substitutes for or is anticipatory of subsequent attack. Examples: robbery; in prison; menacing storm; divorce; mean look, spooky; weird.
5. Physical Assault: Physical assault may be: (1) Overcoming a barrier by eliminating a noxious stimuli;

---

\*Developed by R. R. McKie

or, (2) Pain or death infliction. Note: intent is all that is necessary-shoot at and miss-swing a fist at-violence; landslide; a death; being manhandled.

#### SCALE 4

##### Aggressor Concept Scale\*

This scale is designed to measure the individual's concept of aggressor. Each story is scored for one of three categories of aggressor, regardless of the number of themes.

- A. Offensive Aggression: The hero in the story is seen as the one committing aggression. Any story in which the aggression is offensive aggression.
- B. Defensive Aggression: The victim in the story is seen as the one committing the aggression. Any story in which the aggression is defensive.
- C. External or Chance Aggression: Chance, fate, or natural causes or vague others are seen as the aggressor. Any story in which the aggression is external to, or beyond the control of individuals.

#### SCALE 5

##### Theme Outcome Scale

The outcome of all themes is scored for this scale (from Hopelessness-Pessimism Scale, Roberta Burrage Vogel, 1967) Favorable outcomes are weighted 1; uncertain outcomes are given weights of 2; and unfavorable outcomes, weights of 3. Each story is to be scored either 1, 2 or 3 only, regardless of the number of themes.

\*Modified, from A. R. Jensen (1957)

1. Favorable Outcome:

- a. The total outcome of the present situation is favorable; everything works out for the best. A favorable solution to the situation is obtained.
- b. The outcome for right now is unfavorable not entirely satisfactory; however, there is hope and in the future things actually do turn out fine. The future outcome is favorable, satisfactory.

2. Uncertain Outcome: The outcome for the present is not good, or uncertain the outlook is dim and it is uncertain, whether the future outcome will be favorable or unfavorable. The story is left with an uncertain outcome so it is unclear whether it turns out favorably or unfavorably.

3. Unfavorable Outcomes, Unfavorable Future Outcomes: The outcome for the present is unfavorable, unsatisfactory. Additionally, there does not seem to be any hope for any favorable outcome at any future time. Future outcome is also unfavorable, unsatisfactory. No hope at any future time expressed.

SCALE 6

Locus of Control

The outcome of all themes is evaluated to determine the factors determining outcome (from the Internal-External Involvement Scale, Roberta Burrage Vogel, 1967).

External-personal responses were given weights of 3.

External-chance responses were given weights of 2. Internal

responses (including responses stating no involvements) were given weights of 1. Each story is to be scored 1, 2, or 3 only regardless of the number of themes.

1. Internal:

- a. No outside involvement cited at all, or
- b. Personal faults, problems are cited as reasons for hero's misfortunes.

2. External-chance: Uncontrollable circumstances and fate are cited as reasons for the hero's misfortunes. This includes such things as "financial troubles," "unemployment," etc.

3. External-personal:

- a. Indirect: other people are seen as being involved in some way in the occurrence of the misfortune but the nature of the involvement is not clear, or,
- b. Direct: other people are seen as being involved in some way in the occurrence of the misfortune and such involvement is directly expressed.

SCALE 7

Modes of Coping Behaviors

Score each theme for all behaviors exhibited. Score each behavior as one of the twenty behaviors listed below. Any behavior may have one, or more categories of behaviors.

Example: He had sexual intercourse with her--score sex no. (18), He raped her--score Aggression (4) and sex (18).

Final Score for each subject is the tabulated frequency for each category of behaviors used.

<u>Sub-scale</u>	Behavior Description
1.n Abasement	To submit passively to external force. To accept injury, blame, criticism, punishment. To surrender. To become resigned to fate. To admit inferiority, error, wrongdoing, or defeat. To confess and atone. To blame, belittle, or mutilate the self. To seek and enjoy pain, punishment, illness, and misfortune.
2.n Achievement	To accomplish something difficult. To master, manipulate, or organize physical objects, human beings, or ideas. To do this as rapidly and as independently as possible. To overcome obstacles and attain a high standard. To excel oneself. To rival and surpass others. To increase self-regard by the successful exercise of talent.
3.n Affiliation	To draw near and enjoyably co-operate or reciprocate with an allied other (an other who resembles the subject or who likes the subject). To please and win affection of a cathected object. To adhere and remain loyal to a friend.
4.n Aggression	To overcome opposition forcefully. To fight. To revenge an injury. To attack, injure, or kill another. To oppose forcefully or punish another.
5.n Autonomy	To get free, shake off restraint, break out of confinement. To resist coercion and restriction. To avoid or quit activities prescribed by domineering authorities. To be independent and free to act according to impulse. To be unattached, irresponsible. To defy convention.
6.n Counteraction	To master or make up for a failure by restriving. To obliterate a humiliation by resumed action. To overcome weaknesses, to repress fear. To efface a dishonor by

- action. To search for obstacles and difficulties to overcome. To maintain self-respect and pride on a high level.
- 7.n Defendance To defend the self against assault, criticism, and blame. To conceal or justify a misdeed, failure, or humiliation. To vindicate the ego.
- 8.n Deference To admire and support a superior. To praise, honor, or eulogize. To yield eagerly to the influence of an allied other. To emulate an exemplar. To conform to custom.
- 9.n Dominance To control one's human environment. To influence or direct the behavior of others by suggestion, seduction, persuasion, or command. To dissuade, restrain, or prohibit.
- 10.n Exhibition To make an impression. To be seen and heard. To excite, amaze, fascinate, entertain, shock, intrigue, amuse, or entice others.
- 11.n Harmavoidance To avoid pain, physical injury, illness, and death. To escape from a dangerous situation. To take precautionary measures.
- 12.n Infavoidance To avoid humiliation. To quit embarrassing situations or to avoid conditions which may lead to belittlement: the scorn, derision, or indifference of others. To refrain from action because of the fear of failure.
- 13.n Nurturance To give sympathy and gratify the needs of a helpless object: an infant or any object that is weak, disabled, tired, inexperienced, infirm, defeated, humiliated, lonely, dejected, sick, mentally confused. To assist an object in danger. To feed, help, support, console, protect, comfort, nurse, heal.

- 14.n Order                      To put things in order. To achieve cleanliness, arrangement, organization, balance, neatness, tidiness, and precision.
- 15.n Play                        To act for "fun" without further purpose. To like to laugh and make jokes. To seek enjoyable relaxation of stress. To participate in games, sports, dancing, drinking parties, cards.
- 16.n Rejection                  To separate oneself from a negatively cathected object. To exclude, abandon, expel, or remain indifferent to an inferior object. To snub or jilt an object.
- 17.n Sentience                  To seek and enjoy sensuous impressions.
- 18.n Sex                          To form and further an erotic relationship. To have sexual intercourse.
- 19.n Succorance                To have one's needs gratified by the sympathetic aid of an allied object. To be nursed, supported, sustained, surrounded, protected, loved, advised, guided, indulged, forgiven, consoled. To remain close to a devoted protector. To always have a supporter.
- 20.n Understanding            To ask or answer general questions. To be interested in theory. To speculate, formulate, analyze, and generalize.

\* Adapted from Murray, 1938, pp. 152-226.



## APPENDIX B

### TABLES OF SUBJECT PERSONAL DATA

1. Psychotic Murderers
2. Non-Psychotic Murderers
3. Non-Murderers Psychotic
4. Non-Murderers Non-Psychotic

## SUBJECT PERSONAL DATA AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

[illegible]

Murderers,  
Non-Psychotic

25	139444	W	38 Nov. 27	Monroe, Michigan	Housewife (killed 1940 train Wrk.)	Pile Drvr. 1 Sis. W.P.A. 3 Bro.	Married Son 16 Dau. 15	8.0	98	Construction 8 yrs.	USAAF Food Serv. 18 mo.	5
4	105999	W	32 June 23	Ludington, Michigan	Housewife Twice Married	Died 5 Sis. 25yrs. ago 5 Bro. Syphillis	Married 6 Child.	Illit.	83	Casual Labor 9yr. Junkyard	None	5
17	123444	W	27 Oct. 18	Atlantic, N.J.	Housewife (Dad cold-never close)	Radio, TV 2 Bro. Announcer	Divorced 4 sons	6.1	95	Sporadic odd jobs	None	5
14	117444	W	45 Nov. 10	Esco., Ky.	Housewife Miner	6 Sis. 5 Bro.	Married Twice Divorced & Pro. 2nd Wife	6.1	100	Drifting Barber 4yr. Uranium Mines 2 yrs.	USAAF Combat Copilot 3yr.	5
35	154000	N	43 Nov. 25	Detroit, Michigan	Housewife Machin. (both dead)	1 Bro.	Single	5.9	97	Odd jobs Ford 3yr.	None	5
2	103000	N	36 July 7	Detroit, Michigan	Housewife Plaster. (both dead) (She Relig. Dad cold)	3 Sis. 3 Bro.	Divorced Sev. Common Law	7.3	92	Sporadic odd jobs	Marines Hawaii 2 1/2 yrs.	5
13	116444	N	40 April 13	Rural, Ark.	Housewife Farmer Trader	4 Sis. 4 Bro.	Separated 4 Child.	4.5	100	Painter, Since 18 Muslim Min.	None	5
31	150444	N	25 Dec. 14	Saginaw, Michigan	Housewife Fath at (felt spoil. 12 yrs. until 12 Stepf. no atten. after)	1 Sis.	Married 3yr. Sep. 4yr. 4 Child.	7.3	100	Odd jobs Since Service	3 yrs. Para. Sgt. (Ger.)	5
19	125000	N	28 Mar. 9	Magnolia, Ark.	Housewife Foundry (both marry twice lived with mother till remar. when 13)	7 Sis. 7 Bro.	Married 4 Child.	7.6	102	Sporadic odd jobs	Army lyr. Undes. (Pvt)	5
26	141000	W	28 Sept. 1	Lubbock, Tex.	Housewife Plumber (both 2, divorced)	4 Sis. 4 Bro.	Twice Married 2 Child.	9.2	105	Sporadic Foundry-Mach.	Paratro. Cuban 5 Crisis 3 1/2 yr.	5

\* I.Q. = Data transformed to Wechsler Scale equivalents.

Subject Number	Subject Code Number	Present Sentence	Criminal History	Victim Date Relation	Homocide Data Victim Interaction	Offender Interaction	Psychiatric History	Psychiatric Diagnosis
<u>Murderers/</u>								
<u>Psychotic</u>								
1	101000	M-2(7-15)	None	Pimp	Took Money Attack.Offender	Knife in self-defense	None Previous	Schizophrenia Paranoid(after)
39	159444	M-2(12-25)	Gambling,Chgd. Weapons in car	Nov. Wife	Called Police to have Husband l've.	Argue, Shoot with shotgun	None Previous	Schizophrenia Paranoid(after)
27	142000	M-1(Life)	Driving Misdemeanors only	Oct. Homo-sex Friend	Attempted Sodomy-Drunk	Choked-left in ditch with water	Psychotic,Harley Hosp.4UCT-release	Schizophrenia Chron.Undif.
23	136444	M-2(10-30)	Arrested at 17 reckless driv.	Wife	Mocked Hus. Sexual Powers	Shot her with gun	None Previous	Schizophrenia Paranoid(after)
16	122000	M-2(Life)	B&E;Juvenile Ref. Home at 8yrs.,Wis.	2 Men and 13yr Prost.refused sex	Prostitute	Wanted Sex with mans wife-argument	None Previous	Schizophrenia Chron.Undif(after)
7	108444	M-1(Nat'l Life)	A&R;Fel.Aslt(2) Strg.Arm;Illeg. Pos.	May12 Girlfrl.	Broke-up at party,refused him.	Went got gun, shot her	Hist.1963 SPSM Kalamazoo63-66	Schizophrenia Catatonic(before)
36	155999	M-1(Life)	Drunk and Disorderly	Aug. Wife	Wouldn't argue or reply to him	Quarreled & Accused wife.leave killed her knife	None Previous	Alcoholism, Schizophrenia, Paranoid
29	147999	M-1(Nat'l Life)	None	Nov.23 Landlady	Argument, deny. his chgs.	Accused her being lesbian,his wife.	None Previous	Schizophrenia Paranoid(after)
11	113999	M-1(Life)	None	Jan. Plain Clothes Police.	Drew Gun on ham,robbery	Shot-sawed off shotgun	None Previous	Schizophrenia Paranoid(after)
41	166000	M-2(Life)	B&E;Auto Lar; 4X; Contrib. Delinq.	Acquaintance	Argued over copper wire at dump	Struck victim with tire iron and took wire	None Previous	Schizophrenia Acute.Undif. (after)

Murderers,  
Non-Psychotic

25	139444	M-2 (35-55)	AWOL & Court Marshal; B&E (2); Escape	July	Killed Wf. Shot Br.	Wf. & Br. living together, ref. him children	Warned them on two prev. - shot	None Previous	Explosive Personal
4	105999	M-1 (Life)	Attempted Rape		Neighbor Widow	Cried out threat. Rept.	Raped & beat to death	None Previous	None
17	123444	M-2 (35-50)	Juvenile Arrests Armed Rob (1-5)		Unknown Male	Attempt to Resist. Rob.	Robbed, Pistol whipped to death	None Previous	Antisocial person Passive Aggtend.
14	117444	M-1 (Life)	Murder Life Ky. Paroled 7 yrs. Oth. Arrests Minor		Male Friend	Recognized Resist. Rob.	Robbery, Killed as Recog.	None Previous	Passive Aggressive Personality
35	154000	M-2 (8-20)	U&P (6); Attempt Larceny Bldg.	Aug.	Male Friend	Visiting, ret. offenders home 5a.m.	Saw man enter home - shot	None Previous	History of Narcotics Use
2	103000	M-1 (Life)	Felonious Aslts (2)	Sept. 26	Father	Quarrel over he should leave (stepmother)	Entered dad's room - shot while sleeping	None Previous	Passive Aggressive Aggressive Type
13	116444	M-1 (Life)	Minor Traffic Tkts., Misdem.		Girl- friend	Girl & Friend in his bed	Attempted to shoot both	None Previous	Inadequate Person
31	150444	2 Life M-1's B.V.S.; B&E M-1 (Life)			Dr. & Wf. Tea. & Wf.	Resisted Assault	Raped wives Knifed & drwned in tubs	None Previous	Antisocial Person Severe
19	125000	M-2 (15-25)	Petty Larceny (3-4); D&D	July 4	Wife	Refus. to give money - accused him want. to take out a girl friend	Demanded money argued over girl shot	None Previous	None
26	141000	M-2 (Life)	Stockade (2) D&D; A&B; Drunk Driv.	Mar.	Neigh's Wife	Resisted rape threaten	Raped & knifed neighbor woman	Hysterical Pers. Alcoholic (SPSM) on prev. charges	Hysterical Personality

## SUBJECT PERSONAL DATA AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Subject Number	Subject Code Number	Personal Data				Family Background				Educational Level	
		Race	Age	Birth-date	Birthplace	Mother	Father	Sibs.	Marital	A.G.R.	I.Q.*
<u>Non-Murderers, Psychotic</u>											
6	107999	W	26		Flint, Mich.	Stepmo. Nurse (Adopted 6 mo.)	Stepfthr. Eng. G.M.	1 Step sister	Single	3.4	87
22	133000	W	22	July 29	Yager, W.Va.	Married Twice (Housewife)	3 Step fathers (laborers)	7 Child. (3 Step)	Single	5.1	95
9	111000	N	23	Aug. 22	Detroit, Michigan	Housewife (Separated)	Night Watch	6 Child.	Single	4.0	90
33	152999	W	33	Feb. 22	Grand Rapids, Michigan	Housewife (Divorced) Stepfthr.-not accept	C.S.P. Ionia	1 Sis. 1 Bro.	Twice 2 Child.	6.4	100
18	124999	N	33	June 21	Coyle, Okla.	Housewife	Farmer	5 Child.	Single	3.2	90
32	151999	N	23	Oct. 7	Jackson, Miss.	Maid Unmarried	Unknown no Step.	1/2 Bro. 1/2 Sis.	Single	Illit.	90
12	115444	N	44	Feb. 17	Rural, Alabama	Cook Widow (Dad died he 2)	Textile Mech.	1 Sis.	Widower No Child	3.5	90
5	106000	N	27	Sept. 4	Phoenix, Ariz.	Mother died 14 mo. raised by div.Aunt & Grandmother Father died (15)		None	Single	Illit.	90
24	137999	N	30	July 3	Chicago, Illinois	Mother Father died when Grocer 2 (raised Foster Parents, State homes)		5 Sis. 1 Bro.	Married No Child.	6.1	100
3	104000	N	31	Oct. 24	Detroit, Michigan	Housewife	Factory (Ford)	2 Sis. 2 Bro.	Married Twice (Div.& now sep)	6.1	100
<u>Non-Murderers, Non-Psychotic</u>											
38	157000	N	25	Oct. 6	Rural, Alabama	Day Worker	Factory (Divorced)	2 Sis. 4 Bro.	Single	2.5	90
40	162999	W	31	Sept. 16	Allegan, Michigan	Nurses Aid (Both Twice Marry)	Tool & Die	2 Sis. 1/2 Bro.	Divorced 5 Child.	8.0	108
8	109444	W	48	Nov. 16	Lansing, Michigan	Day Cleaning	Factory (Rio)	3 Sis. 1 Bro.	Divorced No Child.	8.5	100
20	129000	W	32	Mar. 31	Adrian, Michigan	Laundry Operator	Heavy Eq. Operator	5 Sis. 5 Bro.	Single	8.1	110
21	132000	N	25	July 26	Flint, Michigan	Laundry Worker (Separated)	Auto Plant	2 Sis. 5 Bro.	Single	5.1	90
34	153999	W	24	Sept. 7	Maddisonville, Tenn.	Housewife	Farmer	3 Sis. 7 Bro.	Twice 2 Child.	4.2	90
30	148444	W	48	Aug. 1	Mt. Clemens, Michigan	Housewife	PX Clerk Selfridge.	None	Twice Div. 5 Child.	8.1	100
10	112000	N	40	July 4	Ypsilanti, Michigan	School Cook	Creamery Worker	3 Sis. 1 Bro.	Div. 4 Child.	6.9	100
15	121000	N	26	Sept. 8	Detroit, Michigan	Mother A.D.C. (raised by grandmother)	Painter (Separated)	3 Bro. No Sis.	Married 2 Child.	6.3	100
37	156444	W	27	Apr. 21	Lake City, Ark.	Drive-in Rest Clerk	Garage Owner	2 Sis. 1 Bro.	Married 1 Child.	6.3	100

\* I.Q. = Data transformed to Wechsler Scale equivalents.

Work History	Military Service	Social Class	Present Sentence	Criminal History	Psychiatric History	Psychiatric Diagnosis
Foundry Eq.Pt. Gas Station	None	5	Night B&E(3-15)	Larceny auto; aid escape;B&E	None Previous	Schizophrenia Paranoid (SPSM)
Sporadic odd jobs	None	5	Esc(1½-4)	2pgs.B&E,UDAA. B.T.S.	None Previous	Schizophrenia Paranoid (SPSM)
Sporadic odd jobs	Army 1yr. Dishon.Dis.	5	Lar.P. (4-5)	AWOL,Stockade, Purse Snatching	None Previous	Schizophrenia Catatonic (SPSM)
Sporadic odd jobs	Army 2yr. Dison.Dis.	5	B&E(3-10)	Court Marshall B&E(several)	None Previous	Schizophrenia Chronic Undif. (SPSM)
Sporadic odd jobs	None	5	B&E(5-10)	B&E 6 states Tresspassing	None Previous	Schizophrenia ChronicUndf (SPSM)
Sporadic odd jobs	None	5	CCW(2-5)	B&E;Burglary D&D	None Previous	Schizophrenia Paranoid (SPSM)
Sporadic Factory work	Army 2yr. Pfc.Eur. & Pacif.	5	LarBldg. (2-4)	D&D;Larceny B&E	None Previous	Schizoaffactive Schizophrenia
Stock boy, Bowling Alley Restaurants	Naval Res. 1½yr. Med.disch. Back&eyes	5	B&E(4-5)	Att.Unarmed Rob; Assault	Ypsilanti 1965 SPSM Psych Clinic	Chronic Resid. Schizophrenia
Decorator 10yrs.(foot off at 17)	None	5	Viol.Drg. (3-10)	Viol.Chk.; B&E	None Previous	Acute Schizophrenia in Remission
Sporadic odd jobs	Army 2½yr. Korea Parts Clerk (Undes.Dis.)	5	U&P(2½-5)	B&E	None Previous	Schizoaffactive Schizophrenia
Sporadic odd jobs	None,bad heart	5	U&P(1½-14)	Asslt.wepon.U&P; B&E;Viol.Prob.	(No Treat.) Narcotic Addict	Borderline; Narcotic Add.
Machine Repair 6yr.	Army 8mo. Undes.Dis. (Car Theft)	5	U&P(2½-14)	NSF Chks;U&P; Lar.Auto; B.T.S. in Geo.	Kalamazoo llda. Alcoholism	Alcoholism Episodic
4yr.Cook Trk.Driver	U.S.A.A.F.6mo. T.B.med.discg.	5	Forg(3-14) U&P(3-14)	D&D; Forgery(2)	None Previous	Dyssocial Alcoholism
Sporadic odd jobs	Army Pvt. 1yr. Undes.Dis.	5	U&P(6-14)	B&E;U&P; Forgery;Escape	None Previous	Alcoholism
GM 3yrs. odd jobs	None	5	U&P(4½-14)	U&P;B&E	None Previous	None
Produce Co. odd jobs	None	5	U&P(2-5)	U&P;CCW; A&B	None Previous	None
Salesman 20yrs.	RCAF 1yr.;USAAF 6yr.;Gunner B17 WII.Ger.Italy	5	U&P(3-14)	U&P;Forgery	30%Psychiatric Pension;Anxiety	Hypertension
AutopsyAst. Hosp.Od.Jb.	Army Pfc. Ordinance	5	U&P(4-14)	U&P;Forgery	(Since 1954) Heroin Addict	Narcotic Add.
Sporadic odd jobs	Army 2yrs. Pfc. Signals	5	U&P(3-5)	U&P;Attempt U&P	None Previous	Anxiety Neurosis Psychophysiologic Skin Disorder
Sporadic odd jobs	Army 3rs.Spec.4 Cook,Drv.,Typist	5	B&E(1½-10) U&P(1½-14)	Forgery;B&E	None Previous	None

## APPENDIX C

### TABLES OF TAT RAW SCORE AND MEAN SCORE DATA

1. Levels of Conscious Anger Data
2. Levels of Conscious Fear Data
3. Levels of Overt Aggression Data
4. Aggressor Concept Data
5. Theme Outcome Data
6. Locus of Control Data
7. Modes of Coping Behaviors Data



TAT RAW SCORES AND MEAN SCORE DATA

Scoring Order	Subject Code Number	Scale 1			Scale 2			Scale 3			Scale 4			Scale 5			Scale 6																							
		Conscious			Conscious			Aggression			Aggressor Concept			Theme Outcome			Locus of Control																							
		Anger Level	Fear Level	Art. Mel. Av.	Anger Level	Fear Level	Art. Mel. Av.	Theme Level	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.	Art. Mel. Av.																						
<b>Murderers, Psychotic</b>																																								
1	101000	6	2	4	8	8	8	24	15	20	2	3	4	11	3	0	3	14	3	2	4	13	0	20	0	0	20	0	10	0	10	15	0	5	13	0	8			
39	159444	6	6	6	3	2	3	29	20	25	3	0	6	11	3	1	2	14	3	1	4	13	4	14	2	0	20	0	2	17	1	16	0	4	17	2	1	17	1	3
27	142000	3	1	2	6	6	6	30	18	24	6	0	4	10	4	1	14	5	1	3	12	5	13	2	1	19	0	3	16	1	16	0	4	18	0	2	17	0	3	
23	136444	0	0	0	14	12	13	21	4	13	5	0	1	14	1	0	1	18	3	0	1	16	1	18	1	1	19	0	1	19	1	15	0	5	19	0	1	17	0	3
16	122000	7	6	7	2	0	1	20	24	22	2	2	3	13	2	1	3	14	2	2	3	14	2	17	1	1	19	0	2	18	1	15	1	4	15	1	4	15	1	4
7	108444	7	9	8	8	6	7	50	52	51	9	0	5	6	8	1	4	7	9	1	5	7	0	12	8	0	19	1	0	16	5	12	2	6	13	3	4	13	3	5
36	155999	3	4	4	5	4	5	27	18	23	8	0	2	10	3	0	3	14	6	0	3	12	3	17	0	1	19	0	2	18	0	16	2	2	17	1	2	17	2	2
29	147999	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	5	2	0	2	16	0	0	0	20	1	0	1	18	1	19	0	0	20	0	1	20	0	20	0	0	20	0	0	20	0	0
11	113999	2	2	2	10	7	9	43	30	37	6	2	5	7	6	1	2	11	6	2	4	9	4	13	3	0	17	3	2	15	3	15	0	5	12	1	6	14	1	6
41	166000	0	0	0	9	8	9	26	16	21	7	0	3	10	3	0	3	14	5	0	3	12	6	13	1	1	19	0	4	16	1	17	1	2	15	1	4	16	1	3
<b>Murderers, Non-psychotic</b>																																								
25	139444	0	0	0	13	12	13	19	9	14	2	0	4	14	1	0	2	17	2	0	3	16	1	18	1	0	19	1	1	19	1	15	0	5	17	2	1	16	1	3
4	105999	8	2	5	8	8	8	37	36	37	9	3	1	7	7	1	3	9	8	2	2	8	4	10	6	4	13	3	4	12	5	12	2	6	17	0	3	15	1	5
17	123444	4	4	4	10	9	10	26	12	19	4	0	7	9	0	0	7	13	2	0	7	11	8	9	3	8	11	1	8	10	2	15	0	5	15	1	4	15	1	5
14	117444	2	2	2	0	4	2	25	12	19	7	1	3	9	3	0	2	15	5	1	3	12	3	15	2	1	18	1	2	17	2	15	1	4	12	3	5	14	2	5
35	154000	6	7	7	19	17	18	46	32	39	10	1	4	5	3	3	4	10	7	2	4	8	1	13	6	1	14	5	1	14	6	14	3	3	16	2	2	15	3	3
2	103000	6	9	8	11	9	10	46	46	46	6	0	7	7	1	2	10	7	4	1	9	7	14	5	1	16	2	2	15	4	2	9	4	7	11	3	6	10	4	7
13	116444	6	5	6	9	7	8	39	34	37	4	2	6	8	2	2	6	10	3	2	6	9	3	16	1	2	18	0	3	17	1	17	1	2	13	2	5	15	2	4
31	150444	5	3	4	14	13	14	50	56	53	12	1	2	5	10	1	4	5	11	1	3	5	6	6	8	5	7	8	6	7	8	16	1	3	14	2	4	15	2	4
19	125000	7	6	7	25	26	26	56	59	58	8	0	7	5	7	1	7	5	8	1	7	5	4	9	7	3	14	3	4	12	5	14	3	3	9	3	7	12	3	5
26	141000	0	3	2	9	5	7	40	33	37	7	1	5	7	3	2	6	9	5	2	6	8	3	14	2	1	16	2	2	15	2	15	5	0	11	4	4	13	5	2

Legend: Art.--Scored by Mr. Art Lewandowski.  
 Melannie--Scored by Dr. Melannie Teleghi.  
 Dave--Scored by Dr. David A. Thomas.  
 Av.--Average or Mean Scores derived by M.S.U. Bastat program.

TAT RAW SCORE AND MEAN SCORE DATA

Scoring Order	Subject Code Number	Scale 1			Scale 2			Scale 3			Scale 4			Scale 5			Scale 6																							
		Conscious Anger Level Dave Mel. Av.			Conscious Fear Level Art. Mel. Av.			Aggression Theme Level Art. Mel. Av.			Aggressor Concept Art Melannie Average			Theme Outcome Art. Melannie Average			Locus of Control Art. Melannie Average																							
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3																		
<u>Non-Murderers, Psychotic</u>																																								
6	107999	3	3	3	12	11	12	47	38	43	6	0	7	7	6	0	3	11	6	0	5	9	1	18	1	1	19	0	1	19	1	12	2	6	17	2	1	15	2	4
22	133000	4	4	4	10	13	12	53	42	48	7	3	6	4	4	1	4	11	6	2	5	8	0	14	6	0	20	0	0	17	3	10	3	7	12	2	6	11	3	7
9	111000	0	0	0	0	2	1	43	47	45	8	1	5	6	7	1	5	7	8	1	5	7	9	7	4	5	8	7	7	8	6	11	1	8	9	3	8	10	2	8
33	152999	8	9	9	3	5	4	26	22	24	7	1	2	10	3	1	3	13	5	1	3	12	4	15	1	2	17	1	3	16	1	13	1	6	17	1	2	15	1	4
18	124999	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5	11	3	1	1	15	1	0	1	18	2	1	1	17	0	20	0	0	20	0	0	20	0	14	1	5	18	0	2	16	1	4
32	151999	0	0	0	7	11	9	39	30	35	6	0	7	7	2	0	7	11	4	0	7	9	1	16	3	1	18	1	1	17	2	12	1	7	14	0	6	13	1	7
12	115444	4	0	2	8	5	7	37	22	30	7	0	5	8	2	0	6	12	5	0	6	10	2	15	3	0	20	0	1	18	2	16	0	4	15	4	1	16	2	3
5	106000	6	6	6	7	8	8	39	34	37	6	4	2	8	3	3	11	5	4	3	10	5	12	3	3	15	2	4	14	3	11	1	8	16	0	4	14	1	6	
24	137999	14	10	12	16	18	17	63	59	61	16	1	3	0	8	1	8	3	12	1	6	2	8	12	0	5	13	2	7	13	1	15	1	4	13	4	3	14	3	4
3	104000	2	4	3	0	0	0	15	9	12	3	0	2	15	3	0	1	16	3	0	2	16	0	19	1	0	20	0	0	20	1	19	0	1	18	1	1	19	1	1
<u>Non-Murderers, Non-Psychotic</u>																																								
38	157000	9	8	9	12	5	9	29	21	25	5	1	5	9	0	3	7	10	3	2	6	10	1	18	1	0	20	0	1	19	1	9	3	8	11	3	6	10	3	7
40	162999	5	6	6	2	2	2	47	44	46	6	2	6	6	9	1	6	4	8	2	6	5	2	11	7	2	12	6	2	12	7	9	1	10	14	1	5	12	1	8
8	109444	8	5	7	15	8	12	51	48	50	10	0	4	6	5	2	5	8	8	1	5	7	0	17	3	1	17	2	1	17	3	15	0	5	16	2	2	16	1	4
20	129000	9	4	7	6	8	7	27	21	24	6	0	4	10	3	0	5	12	5	0	5	11	4	15	1	1	19	0	3	17	1	13	3	4	14	3	3	14	3	4
21	132000	5	6	6	19	15	17	46	42	44	8	1	5	6	4	0	8	8	6	1	7	7	1	17	2	0	19	1	1	18	2	12	0	8	15	3	2	1	2	5
34	153999	4	4	4	5	4	5	32	35	34	7	2	4	7	2	2	7	9	5	2	6	8	6	10	4	4	15	1	5	13	3	13	4	3	11	2	7	12	3	5
30	148444	9	9	9	16	15	16	61	55	58	9	0	9	2	5	0	9	6	7	0	9	4	6	8	6	6	7	7	6	8	7	13	4	3	10	5	5	12	5	4
10	112000	6	6	6	5	7	6	26	20	23	5	0	5	10	2	0	5	13	4	0	5	12	4	15	1	2	18	0	3	17	1	16	2	2	16	3	1	16	3	2
15	121000	8	6	7	15	21	18	58	51	55	11	1	6	2	3	4	8	5	7	3	7	4	5	10	5	5	13	2	5	12	4	13	1	6	8	3	9	11	2	8
37	156444	11	13	12	16	8	12	63	48	56	5	2	10	3	3	4	6	7	4	3	8	5	2	14	4	0	19	1	1	17	3	14	2	4	11	3	6	13	3	5

Legend: Art.--Scored by Mr. Art Lewandowski.  
 Melannie--Scored by Dr. Melannie Telegdi.  
 Dave--Scored by Dr. David A. Thomas.  
 Av.--Average or Mean Scores derived by M.S.U. Lastat program.

TAT RAW SCORE AND MEAN SCORE DATA  
SCALE NO. 7: MODES OF COPING BEHAVIORS

Subject Code Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	Abase- ment S.R.Av.	Achieve- ment S.R.Av.	Affili- ation S.R.Av.	Aggres- sion S.R.Av.	Autono- my S.R.Av.	Counter- action S.R.Av.	Defend- ence S.R.Av.	Defer- ence S.R.Av.	Domi- nance S.R.Av.	Exhibi- tion S.R.Av.	Harm- avoidance S.R.Av.
<u>Murderers, Psychotic</u>											
101000	6 5 6	1 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	3 3 3	2 2 2	0 0 0
159444	0 0 0	3 2 3	0 3 2	1 2 2	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
142000	2 2 2	2 3 3	1 2 2	0 1 1	1 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 3 2	0 0 0	0 1 1
136444	1 2 2	0 2 1	0 0 0	2 1 2	1 6 4	1 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	2 0 1
122000	0 1 1	1 2 2	1 1 1	0 0 0	2 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	3 2 3	0 0 0	0 1 1
108444	2 2 2	2 2 2	0 0 0	6 7 7	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	6 5 6	0 0 0	2 2 2
155999	0 1 1	1 2 2	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 3 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 1
147999	1 1 1	3 3 3	1 1 1	0 0 0	4 8 6	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
113999	2 1 2	1 1 1	2 2 2	5 4 5	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	3 3 3	0 0 0	1 1 1
166000	0 2 1	3 2 3	1 4 3	0 1 1	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 0 1	0 0 0
<u>Murderers, Non-Psychotic</u>											
139444	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 1 1	0 0 0	4 7 6	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 0 1	0 0 0
105999	1 2 2	3 3 3	0 0 0	7 7 7	3 2 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	1 1 1
123444	1 0 1	3 2 3	0 1 1	0 0 0	0 2 1	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 1 1	2 3 3	0 0 0	2 1 2
117444	5 5 5	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	4 3 4	0 0 0	1 1 1
154000	3 3 3	3 3 3	0 0 0	2 2 2	4 4 4	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	4 5 5	0 0 0	0 1 1
103000	2 2 2	4 4 4	0 1 1	7 6 7	0 0 0	5 5 5	1 1 1	0 0 0	2 3 3	0 0 0	3 3 3
116444	0 0 0	1 2 2	1 1 1	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	3 3 3	1 1 1	1 1 1
150444	2 1 2	1 1 1	1 0 1	7 6 7	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	5 5 5	1 0 1	0 1 1
125000	2 3 3	1 3 2	0 1 1	3 1 2	0 1 1	1 0 1	1 0 1	0 0 0	3 3 3	0 1 1	4 3 4
141000	3 3 3	1 2 2	1 2 2	1 0 1	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 1 2	0 0 0	1 1 1

Subject Code Number	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	No. Different Coping Behaviors
	Infra- voidance S.R.Av.	Nurtur- ance S.R.Av.	Order S.R.Av.	Play S.R.Av.	Rejec- tion S.R.Av.	Sen- tience S.R.Av.	Sex S.R.Av.	Succor- ance S.R.Av.	Under- standing S.R.Av.	
<u>Murderers, Psychotic</u>										
101000	0 0 0	2 1 2	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 2	4 3 4	10
159444	0 1 1	3 3 3	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 3 2	1 0 1	0 0 0	3 7 5	3 2 3	10
142000	0 0 0	3 0 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 2 2	1 0 1	1 1 1	1 2 2	3 0 2	10
136444	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	5 5 5	6 3 5	10
122000	0 1 1	2 1 2	0 0 0	2 1 2	2 2 2	2 1 2	0 0 0	1 2 2	2 2 2	12
108444	0 0 0	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 1 1	2 2 2	4 4 4	3 3 3	12
155999	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 2	5 2 4	8
147999	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	2 1 2	0 0 0	1 0 1	0 0 0	2 1 2	1 1 1	9
113999	0 1 1	2 2 2	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	0 0 0	3 4 4	2 2 2	14
166000	0 2 1	3 3 3	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 3 2	3 1 2	0 1 1	3 1 2	4 3 4	13
<u>Murderers, Non-Psychotic</u>										
139444	0 0 0	2 3 3	0 0 0	0 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	6 2 4	3 2 3	8
105999	2 2 2	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 1	10
123444	1 0 1	2 1 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 3 2	4 3 4	10
117444	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	10
154000	0 1 1	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 1 2	2 0 1	1 1 1	1 6 4	2 2 2	12
103000	0 0 0	9 9 9	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 2 2	3 3 3	2 2 2	13
116444	0 0 0	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 2 2	1 1 1	4 4 4	4 3 4	12
150444	0 0 0	2 3 3	0 0 0	0 2 1	2 2 2	1 1 1	0 0 0	2 3 3	4 4 4	11
125000	0 0 0	1 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	8 7 8	2 2 2	11
141000	0 0 0	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 2	7 4 6	10

Legend: S = Shirley A. McKie

R = Robert R. McKie

AV = Average, or mean score.

TAT RAW SCORE AND MEAN SCORE DATA  
SCALE NO. 7: MODES OF COPING BEHAVIORS

Subject Code Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	Abase- ment S.R.Av.	Achieve- ment S.R.Av.	Affili- ation S.R.Av.	Aggres- sion S.R.Av.	Autono- my S.R.Av.	Counter- action S.R.Av.	Defend- ence S.R.Av.	Defer- ence S.R.Av.	Domi- nance S.R.Av.	Exhibi- tion S.R.Av.	Harm- avoidance S.R.Av.
<u>Non-Murderers, Psychotic</u>											
107999	2 4	3 3 3	2 2 2	10 10 10	6 5 6	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1
133000	2 0	1 0 0	1 1 1	7 8 8	3 6 5	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	2 3 3	1 1 1	1 1 1
111000	0 0	0 4 5	0 0 0	7 8 8	1 1 1	3 5 4	0 0 0	0 0 0	10 5 8	0 0 0	0 0 0
152999	1 1	1 3 2	3 0 0	1 1 1	2 7 5	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	5 2 4	0 0 0	0 2 1
124999	2 1	2 2 2	0 1 1	0 0 0	6 7 7	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0
151999	1 0	1 2 2	2 1 2	2 2 2	3 7 5	0 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	1 1 1
115444	2 1	2 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0
106000	3 3	3 1 1	2 2 2	4 4 4	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	1 1 1
137999	3 1	2 1 1	0 0 0	5 5 5	3 3 3	0 1 1	0 1 1	0 0 0	3 3 3	1 0 1	0 0 0
104000	0 1	1 2 2	2 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0
<u>Non-Murderers, Non-Psychotic</u>											
157000	1 0	1 0 0	0 1 1	1 0 0	0 1 3	2 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	6 4 5	1 2 2	0 1 1
162999	1 0	1 1 1	0 1 1	3 0 0	2 5 4	0 3 2	0 0 0	0 1 1	6 6 6	0 0 0	0 1 1
109444	2 1	2 2 2	0 0 0	3 3 3	1 1 1	0 0 0	1 0 1	0 0 0	3 5 4	1 0 1	2 2 2
129000	3 2	3 3 2	3 1 1	0 2 2	2 6 4	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 1	0 0 0	1 0 1	1 0 1
132000	1 1	1 1 2	2 0 1	1 2 3	3 3 3	3 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	1 2 2	0 0 0	1 1 1
153999	2 2	2 3 4	4 0 1	1 3 4	4 2 3	3 0 1	1 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0
148444	4 3	4 1 2	2 1 1	1 2 2	2 1 1	1 1 0	1 0 0	0 1 1	3 1 2	1 0 1	0 0 0
112000	1 1	1 0 0	0 2 2	2 1 1	1 5 5	5 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
121000	2 3	3 2 2	2 1 1	1 4 3	4 1 3	2 0 1	1 2 2	2 0 0	3 1 2	0 0 0	0 0 0
156444	0 1	1 1 1	1 0 0	0 3 3	3 2 7	5 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 4 3	1 0 1	1 1 1

Subject Code Number	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	No. Different Coping Behaviors
	Infra- voidance	Nurtur- ance	Order	Play	Rejec- tion	Sen- tience	Sex	Succor- ance	Under- standing	
	S.R.Av.	S.R.Av.	S.R.Av.	S.R.Av.	S.R.Av.	S.R.Av.	S.R.Av.	S.R.Av.	S.R.Av.	
<u>Non-Murderers,</u>										
<u>Psychotic</u>										
107999	2 1 2	4 4 4	0 0 0	1 2 2	0 0 0	0 1 1	2 2 2	1 1 1	1 1 1	15
133000	1 1 1	3 1 2	0 0 0	1 1 1	2 2 2	0 0 0	1 1 1	5 5 5	2 2 2	15
111000	0 0 0	1 2 2	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	4 3 4	2 2 2	9
152999	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	2 2 2	1 0 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	12
124999	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1	0 0 0	4 3 4	3 4 4	8
151999	0 0 0	1 2 2	0 0 0	0 1 1	0 0 0	0 1 1	0 0 0	7 5 6	1 1 1	11
115444	1 1 1	3 4 4	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	3 6 5	4 4 4	11
106000	2 2 2	5 4 4	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 2 2	2 2 2	14
137999	0 2 1	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 2 1	2 1 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	5 5 5	5 2 4	12
104000	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 1 2	6
<u>Non-Murderers,</u>										
<u>Non-Psychotic</u>										
157000	0 0 0	2 1 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 3 3	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 4 3	3 3 3	10
162999	0 0 0	2 4 3	0 0 0	1 2 2	5 4 5	2 0 1	0 2 1	1 2 2	1 1 1	12
109444	2 1 2	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 1	3 3 3	12
129000	0 0 0	2 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 1	0 0 0	1 2 2	5 1 3	10
132000	0 0 0	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 1 1	0 0 0	4 2 3	4 3 4	12
153999	0 0 0	4 1 3	0 0 0	1 2 2	1 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 2	2 3 3	11
148444	0 0 0	2 5 4	1 1 1	0 2 1	0 2 1	0 0 0	1 1 1	2 3 3	3 4 4	14
112000	1 1 1	2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 2 2	0 0 0	3 4 4	6 5 6	9
121000	2 1 2	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	4 1 3	1 1 1	1 1 1	0 1 1	7 5 6	14
156444	0 0 0	3 1 2	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 2 2	1 1 1	0 0 0	2 3 3	4 4 4	12

Legend: S = Shirley A. McKie  
R = Robert R. McKie  
AV = Average, or mean score.

APPENDIX D

TAT PILOT STUDY DATA

Pilot Study Data TAT Fantasy Themes

Scale No.		1	2	3	4	5	6
Group	Subjects	Aggression Theme Level	Levels of Anger	Levels of Fear	Aggressor Concept	Theme Outcome	Locus of Control
1. Murderers Non-Psychotic	a	48	7	17	C	2	2
	b	49	8	23	B	2	2
2. Murderers Psychotic	a	38	10	15	C	2	2
	b	49	12	12	C	2	2
3. Non-Murderers Non-Psychotic	a	34	37	3	A	1-3	1,2,3
	b	56	18	7	A-C	1,2,3	1,2,3
4. Non-Murderers Psychotic	a	81	11	18	A-C	3	1,2,3
	b	67	4	18	A-C	1	1,2,3

Note: This pilot study consisted of 8 felons: 2 felons for each of the 4 groups (see subjects a & b).



MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293102117052