

The Psychological Typology of Criminal Homicidal Aggression

Joseph A. Kudryavtsev
Natalya A. Ratinova

Abstract: *The results of a Russian study of the psychological aspects of criminal homicidal aggression are presented. The authors propose a typology of homicidal aggressors based on an analysis of their criminal behavior, their psychological structure, the dysfunction of the self-control mechanism, and their differing personality characteristics. They identify the following types of aggression: functional-utilitarian; habitual noncontrolled; situational-defensive, motivated by an affective goal; and catastrophic aggression. They present the differential criteria as useful to criminal experts in their analysis of offenders, particularly in cases involving the determination of criminal responsibility.*

A number of studies by forensic psychiatrists and psychologists have been devoted to the analysis of different aspects of criminal aggression and violence. In methodological studies of criminal aggression, Ratinov and Sitkovskaya (1990) defined *aggressiveness* as the personality attribute of a person consisting in the presence of destructive tendencies or dispositions in interpersonal relations. They conceived aggression as the “manifestation of aggressiveness in destructive actions, the aim of which is to cause harm to others” (p. 5). They viewed aggressiveness as an integral motivating part of the personality and as specific to the personal value system of the individual. Its identification is thought to be of prognostic importance.

In their psychological study, Osuna and Luna (1989) pointed out the importance of psychological testing in predicting criminal behavior. In their study, following testing using Toulouse-Pierone attention-perceptions tests and Gibson’s spiral maze, they concluded that the presence of impulsiveness and a deficit of attention-perception could aid in the identification of subgroups of aggressive persons as differentiated by varying criminal behaviors. A number of studies have been devoted to the prognostic investigation of the early genesis or roots of aggressiveness (Palermo & Simpson, 1994; Pollock et al., 1990; Voloshina, 1990; Widom, 1989). Widom (1989) reported a higher rate of detentions in juvenile offenders, adult criminals, and violent criminals among those persons who had been harshly treated and neglected during their childhood when compared to a control group. The victims of physical brutality had the highest indices of deten-



tions compared to the control group. Neglect was, in this respect, less significant. The author concluded that the findings confirmed the widespread hypothesis that violence begets violence.

Pollock and colleagues (1990) also found a relationship between physically abusive treatment in childhood and criminal aggression in adult males. Calculations conducted by the authors (hierarchical logistic regression analysis) supported the idea that violence is influenced by the cultural context in which a person lives. Voloshina (1990) reported that adolescents who witness or experience violent behavior adopt these behaviors and concluded that although they are initially effective on the verbal level, that personal frequent encounters with such behavior brings about familiarization with these types of conduct and causes them to become "fixed in them as stereotypical habits, primarily during informal contacts with others" (p. 16).

A monograph by Palermo (1994) paid special attention to the psychology of criminal behavior. He underlined the fundamental role of *affectivity* (affect and mood) in the causation of violent behavior and he considered hostility, often associated with frustrations in childhood; a desire for control and dominance; neurotic experiences; and life monotony to be important causes of violence. Such basic neurotic hostility can eventuate not only in somatic disorders but also in disruptive behavior. Palermo differentiated between the biologically determined instinctive aggression and the hostile type of aggressiveness often developed as a result of frustrated childhood experiences during the period of the child's dependency on his mother. He noted that the aggressiveness is usually combined with impulsivity and a child's inability to reflect on and act out his feelings. This is often observed in psychopaths and antisocial personalities. Referring to work done by Bowlby, Ammon, Hartmann, and others, he underlined the important role of primary disturbances of early maternal-child relations in the psychological development of the child and opined that hostility, aggressiveness, and violence should be considered as the progressive manifestations of perceived frustrations of early childhood attachments or bonds.

Aggression may be differentiated as *primary* and *reactive*. Primary aggression is at the basis of hostile self-assertion and a destructive character. A reactive type of aggression, on the contrary, is usually concomitant and part of an emotional response to a frustrating or hostile experience. This distinction in the types of aggressiveness—instinctive and hostile, and primary and reactive—is not only of theoretical interest but is of practical importance in a forensic psychiatric assessment because it is of help in differentiating the degree of arbitrariness and guilt of the aggressive criminal behavior. The effectiveness of such an evaluation will be significantly enhanced if the examiner takes into consideration not only theories of aggression but also the way in which the offender developed his aggressive mechanisms and his self-regulatory system. In such a case, the diagnosis acquires not only forensic psychological importance but also criminological importance.

Also, whereas it facilitates the forensic psychological evaluation, it allows for the determination of a measure of its arbitrariness and, therefore, of the legal responsibility of the offender being examined.

In addition, a knowledge of the psychological mechanisms at the basis of the offense will facilitate a primary or secondary corrective approach toward treatment and the prevention of future criminal aggressive violence. Such an approach to the solution of the problems of criminal aggression was used in the work presented here.

OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

The objective of this study was to define an empirical psychological classification of criminal homicidal aggression. To achieve this objective, the authors conducted a thorough examination of the personality and individual psychological characteristics of subjects accused of committing aggressive/violent crimes who were undergoing composite forensic psychological/psychiatric evaluation (CFPPE). Furthermore, a study of the characteristics of the functioning of their self-regulatory mechanisms as related to their commission of their crimes was undertaken.

MATERIALS AND PROCEDURE

The group of subjects examined comprised 180 males ranging in age from 18 to 45 years and having a secondary (high school) or higher (university) education. Ninety-one percent of the evaluatees were accused of intentional homicide and 9% of causing severe bodily injuries. According to the findings of a commissions of experts, all the subjects had been found responsible for their criminal acts.

The diagnostic distribution was as follows: 26% were found to be mentally healthy; in 47% of the evaluatees, signs of organic brain pathology were found (of that group, 14% were associated with personality disorders of a psychopathic type). Fifteen percent of the examinees had a diagnosis of psychopathy and in 12% of the examinees, the presence of psychopathic traits were found (see Table 1).

Standard sets of examinations included psychological tests, clinical interviews with the offenders, and observation of their behavior during the examination as well as the analysis of medical and investigative documentation available. The findings were qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed.

Perceptive and cognitive processes were tested by standard tests. In addition, the following tests were employed: (a) Cattell's 16-Personality Factor (PF) Questionnaire (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970); (b) Luscher's (1971) Colour Test; (c) Wagner's (1971) Hand Test; (d) Questionnaires of Volitional Self-Control

TABLE 1
PRIMARY STATISTICAL FINDINGS

	<i>Group 1</i> (n = 15)		<i>Group 2</i> (n = 17)		<i>Group 3</i> (n = 14)		<i>Group 4</i> (n = 10)		<i>Group 5</i> (n = 14)		<i>Group 6</i> (n = 9)	
	μ	β	μ	β	μ	β	μ	β	μ	β	μ	β
Hand test, general	8.60	3.96	3.59	2.55	1.50	3.52	0.20	4.05	-0.64	2.85	2.22	3.93
Hand test, percentage	45.47	11.40	36.59	6.81	33.57	8.62	24.70	9.70	26.86	8.18	33.22	9.80
Questionnaire of Volitional Self-Control (VSC)	8.30		12.40		5.60		31.30		15.10		79.10	
Level of subjective control (LSC), general (Io)	3.13	2.23	3.94	2.05	2.71	2.02	4.20	2.70	3.28	2.53	4.78	2.33
LSC, achievement (Id)	4.33	2.41	5.11	1.20	4.07	2.62	5.30	2.87	5.00	2.60	6.78	2.17
LSC, failure (In)	3.20	1.93	3.47	2.21	2.29	1.49	4.60	2.01	3.57	2.53	4.00	2.55
16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16-PF), Factor A	5.30	2.31	5.08	1.85	4.57	1.70	5.80	1.55	5.71	2.13	5.44	1.67
16-PF, Factor C	2.87	1.85	3.00	1.67	2.50	1.50	3.60	2.17	3.21	1.58	5.00	2.55
16-PF, Factor E	5.07	1.79	6.06	1.89	5.64	2.10	4.50	1.87	4.21	1.97	6.11	1.62
16-PF, Factor G	4.67	2.13	4.24	1.92	4.14	1.65	4.60	1.71	5.29	2.02	6.11	1.67
16-PF, Factor H	4.00	1.93	4.35	2.23	4.00	2.25	3.00	1.70	3.64	1.39	5.89	2.62
16-PF, Factor L	7.13	1.77	7.65	1.85	7.79	1.63	6.10	1.91	5.57	2.41	6.78	2.44
16-PF, Factor N	5.53	2.13	5.35	1.62	4.21	2.01	6.10	2.69	5.86	2.07	7.11	1.90
16-PF, Factor Q ₁	5.67	2.19	4.35	2.62	6.57	1.99	5.70	2.16	5.38	1.95	4.89	1.90
16-PF, Factor Q ₂	7.07	1.49	6.53	2.03	7.29	2.16	6.90	1.97	6.07	2.02	6.56	2.07
16-PF, Factor Q ₃	5.13	2.20	5.59	2.62	4.93	2.46	6.50	3.14	6.57	1.74	6.33	2.45

NOTE: VSC test findings correspond to the median because the calculation of primary results was done in percentiles. For definitions of factors, see note 2.

(VSC) (Zverkov, 1990); and (e) the Level of Subjective Control (LSC) (Bazhin, Golyunkins, & Etkind, 1983).

The Cattell test is a questionnaire that diagnoses the personality traits selected by the authors on the basis of factor analysis and independently from one another.¹ The Hand Test employs projective methods aimed at the identification of the subject's aggressiveness level and the presence of destructive motives in him. The Luscher Colour Test shows the aspects of the subject's actual state, his characteristic ways of adaptation when responding to stressful situations, and other characteristics of the emotional and motivational spheres. The VSC questionnaire is aimed at the assessment of an individual level of volitional control such as the subject's ability to control his actions, states, and motives. The LSC questionnaire is an adapted version of Rotter Internal-External Control Scale (Rotter, 1966). This test reveals the subject's tendency to attribute important life events to his own activity (internal Locus of Control [LOC]) or to attribute the responsibility to external forces and circumstances (external LOC).

Criminal case materials included the following: (a) the analysis of documents containing data regarding the personality of the subject, including testimony from friends, relatives, and colleagues; and information regarding military service character; and (b) the examination of the circumstances surrounding the criminal episode itself, its credibility, evidence from witnesses and from the subject himself, and the investigative dynamics of the criminal offense.

A semistandardized interview was done consisting of two groups of questions. The first group concerned the personal history of the interviewee, and was aimed at discerning his general social orientation, his habits, and his usual manner of approaching and resolving interpersonal conflicts. The second group of questions was aimed at determining the personality type of the offender, with special attention paid to his emotional state at the moment of the criminal act. The examiners attempted to ascertain the offender's behavior and capacity for self-control at the time of the offense as well as any possible discrepancy between his conduct at that time and his habitual manner of behaving. The subjects were assigned to various groups on the basis of their disruptive activity and their self-control at the time of the offense.

Because of the small sample size of the present pilot study, multivariate statistical techniques (such as Cluster Analysis and Multiple Linear Discriminant Function Analysis) that develop empirically derived quantitative-based typologies could not be performed. Therefore, a qualitative/psychometrically based typology procedure had to suffice for this study. In addition, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was not used because the findings would not have disclosed significant differences because the changing of indices was gradual in character, as can be seen by the classification the authors propose and from the composition of the groups. For this reason, significant differences can be seen and are discussed only in regard to Groups 1 and 2 and Groups 5 and 6.

RESULTS

Type 1—significant aggression. Subjects belonging to this group exhibited the highest values of aggressiveness of the entire cohort (Hand Test general index $\mu = 8.6$), greatly exceeding the mean standard indices. Tendencies to confrontation in this group were 47% of the total responses according to the Hand Test, which was the maximum of all subjects examined. A violent/dominating style of interpersonal interaction was dominant in these examinees. Their contact with others was based principally on a position of strength, and their relation to others was mistrustful, suspicious, and hostile (16-PF, L factor $\mu = 7.13$).

These subjects also exhibited disturbances of the moral-ethical sphere, devaluation of human life, and emotional detachment. It is significant that often in the course of questioning, their anamnesis (past history) showed episodes of early manifestations of cruelty (mockery of peers, torturing animals, etc.).

Characteristic traits in these subjects were affective rigidity, rancor combined with marked emotional instability, a tendency to become easily angered with outburst of fury (16-PF, C factor $\mu = +2.87$), and acting out in a destructive manner with no intention to repress or control their actions.

Volitional self-control and responsibility in the subjects of the first group were the lowest level in the cohort (VSC median was 8.3; and in the LSC test, general (Io) $\mu = 3.13$, achievement (Id) $\mu = +4.33$, failure (In) $\mu = 3.20$).² These findings reflected their tendencies to self-justification and to assigning their responsibility and guilt to others.

The psychological analysis together with the past history of these subjects showed that their expressed aggressiveness was an integral part of their personality and a determinant of their behavior. Aggression for these persons was primarily of self-value. As a rule, their criminal offenses had been initiated by the aggressors and often without any preceding conflictual interaction with the victim(s), whose role was usually exclusively passive. The victim(s) either did not provoke the aggression at all or their actions were not commensurate with the severity of the reaction of the aggressor. The crimes were often associated with particular cruelty and sometimes the aggression was of an extended type, such as overkilling. A psychological study of the criminal behavior of the subjects in this group showed that such behavior occurred on a relatively neutral emotional background. The criminal activity itself was sometimes preceded by planning. Analysis of the criminal behavior showed that the offenders were aware of their acting out and corrected their actions in accordance with conditions, changing them when necessary. They were able to establish adequate verbal contact with others and to anticipate the end results. Thus, their criminal activity had the characteristics of behavior regulated by their personality and their expediency and motivated by their ideas and values.

Type 2—functional-utilitarian aggression. Offenders of this type were found to possess a number of traits similar to those in the first group, together with some distinct differences. They exhibit asocial or antisocial tendencies. Their conduct did not follow existing social standards (16-PF, G factor $\mu = 4.24$), and they were principally interested in pursuing their own interests and desires. They evaluated each situation following their own inner criteria (16-PF, Q₂ factor $\mu = 6.35$).³

Their interpersonal relations, similar to the Type 1 subjects, were based on a show of strength and confrontation. Their aggressiveness level, although inferior to the corresponding indices of the first type of aggressors, considerably exceeded the mean standard (Hand Test general index $\mu = 3.59$; categories of aggression and dominance aggregated 37% of answers). Their attitude toward others was characterized by hostility and suspiciousness (16-PF, L factor $\mu = 7.65$).

As in Type 1, the level of emotional stability in Type 2 subjects was extremely low (16-PF, C factor $\mu = 3.00$). And, they were not inclined to curb outward manifestations of negative emotions. At the same time, their potential ability for self-control was higher than in the first group (VSC median was 12.4; 16-PF Q₄ factor $\mu = 5.59$).⁴ Type 2 subjects had a sufficient repertoire of behavior strategies and were capable of indirect forms of interactions (16-PF, N factor $\mu = 5.35$). Thus, the aggressive variant of interpersonal interaction was not the only one available to them but was the preferred one.

The criminal situations in which these subjects committed their offenses were characterized by interpersonal conflict. However, these situations were not of an extreme character and were not acutely traumatic or subjectively hopeless for the aggressors. The emotional state of these persons was not pronounced. The leading role in the development of their interpersonal conflicts rested with themselves. Type 2 subjects intentionally chose an aggressive manner of conflict solution from a number of others available to them as being the most effective and personally satisfactory. They were capable of restraint if the situation created insignificant frustration.

The first and second types differed most significantly in the type of criminal aggression. The first type of aggressor was significantly motivated by his own character, whereas the second type of aggressor assumed a more utilitarian character. Aggressors in the second group chose behavior or action in accordance with their predetermined goal. Their criminal behavior developed with orderly planning and control on the basis of their capacity for adequate self-regulation and sufficient anticipation of the possible consequences of their actions, regardless of the presence of some emotional tension. Thus, in persons with the second type of aggressive criminal behavior, there was complete awareness of their intentional acting out and of the goal they wanted to achieve.

Type 3—habitual noncontrolled aggression. The criminal aggression of the persons comprised in the third type was principally determined by defects in their

emotional-volitional sphere and a weakness of self-control. Their emotional stability was the lowest for the entire cohort (16-PF, C factor $\mu = 2.50$). Their fits of irritation occurred at an extremely low level of frustration. At the same time, they achieved the maximum value of L factor in the 16-PF ($\mu = +7.79$), reflecting a nonharmonious combination of emotional instability and marked affective rigidity traits.

Type 3 subjects were rather poorly aware of existing social standards (16-PF, G factor $\mu = +4.14$). Generally accepted standards of social interaction were poorly internalized and familiarized with and did not exercise control on real behavior. Their volitional capacity was at a minimum in all the observed results of the cohort. The VSC median was only 5.6; findings of the LSC test were also extremely low ($Io\mu = 2.71$; $Id\mu = 4.07$; $In\mu = 2.29$). Thus, these subjects perceived their behavior as independent of their volition. It can be said in general that the behavior of the subjects with Type 3 aggression was principally motivated by situationally emerging impulses and drives, and was affectively conditioned rather than rationally planned.

The subjects attributed to this type were, as a rule, characterized by a rather primitive type of personality, low reflective ability, and poor understanding of others. They also demonstrated insufficient ability to constructively analyze complex situations, inadequate past experiences that would enable them to solve them, and extreme narrow-mindedness in their ways of interpersonal interaction. Their behavior was typically characterized by straightforwardness and inflexibility (16-PF, N factor $\mu = 4.21$).

The level of aggressiveness itself in these subjects was not especially high (Hand Test general index $\mu = 1.50$); however, because of their inherent individual characteristics, they were inclined to perceive acutely the extremely wide spectrum of social environment effects. These subjects thought a great number of situations, including objectively relatively neutral ones, to be conflictual, provoking them personally. Under the influence of frustrating situations, these persons demonstrated the partial curling up of the activity structure that acquires, in formal regulation, some traits of field behavior, behavior that is determined by the external objective environment but not by internal motives (volition). This resulted in some deformation of goal setting, producing rather feebly integrated emotionally loaded goals consistent with their general motivational system. Type 3 subjects also showed extreme narrowing and stereotyping in their choice of behavior, inconsistent with the objective conditions of the actual situation. Their emotional control weakened further in their acting out.

Type 4—situation-protection aggression. Although the determining factors in the genesis of criminal behavior of Type 4 subjects were their personality and their individual psychological characteristics, the situation factor assumed the determining role in their aggressive behavior. The various indices examined in these subjects showed them to be close to the average statistical standard. Indeed, they

were sufficiently oriented in social interaction, they generally accepted rules, and they were inclined to behave in a rather accepted manner (16-PF, G factor $\mu = 4.60$; Q_3 factor $\mu = 6.50$).⁵ These subjects had a sufficiently diverse repertoire of interpersonal interactions and were capable of behaving correctly (16-PF, N factor $\mu = 6.10$). They were inclined to coordinate their actions with group standards and to take into account the opinion of others (16-PF, Q_2 factor $\mu = 6.90$). Tendencies to confrontation were insignificantly represented in them (25% of responses according to the Hand Test), and the level of aggressiveness corresponded to mid-standard values (Hand Test general index = -0.20). Their interplay of affective rigidity traits (16-PF, L factor $\mu = 6.10$) and lowered emotional stability (16-PF, factor C $\mu = 3.60$) was less marked than in the previously described groups.

Type 4 subjects tended to control their behavior (16-PF, Q_3 factor $\mu = 6.50$). The decisional quality indices associated with the control of volitional behavior were somewhat lower than the median statistical values but significantly higher than in the three previous types (VSC median = 31.1; LSD test $I_o\mu = 4.20$; $I_d\mu = 5.30$; $I_n\mu = 4.60$).

Thus, it may be concluded that these subjects in general were capable of differentiated adaptive social interactions and formal and acceptable conduct and that they had the capacity to resolve possible interpersonal conflicts. They possessed sufficient personality resources to solve the majority of the problematic difficulties they encountered. Their self-regulatory system became dysfunctional only under acute traumatic stress situations that suddenly threatened the values felt by them to be most important. Such situations, as a rule, forced them to make immediate, nonstandard, and unreasonable decisions because of the simultaneous involvement of the two most vulnerable links in their personality structure. On one hand, facing what they perceived as complex situations, they became emotionally unstable, lessening their ability to deliberate their reaction; on the other, their basic affective rigidity made it more difficult to reach a good operative choice to obtain adaptive results. Decisions made in those unfavorable conditions prompted the formation of a highly charged affective reaction to protect the values they believed to be in danger. Of consequence, their goals and the usual moral/ethical and social standards used in achieving them diminished considerably. Also, the prediction of the potential consequences of their actions, both for themselves and their victims, was limited and somewhat reduced. Although realizing the aggressive character of their offenses and the physical consequences of them, such as the objective importance of their actions, at the height of their emotional state, Type 4 persons did not seem to realize the social aspects of their destructive activity and the probability that they would incur legal sanctions. In the majority of cases, the conflict was provoked by the victim with antagonistic and clear aggression that tended to lower the offenders' personal dignity and/or their valued ideas; this motivated their unreasonable use of physical force. Because of this, their violent solution to the problem was perceived by these offenders as subjectively justified.

The analysis of the criminal behavior of these persons reveals a sufficient preservation of the dynamics of their actions (congruity of goal setting and achievement) at the time of the conflictual situation significant to their person. It allows one to conclude that the personality of the Type 4 offenders was capable of self-regulation and that their acts of aggression were congruous with the general context of the incident. This type of aggression itself was affectively conditioned and was of instrumental value.

Type 5—aggression conditioned by affective goals. The fifth type of aggression was characteristic of subjects who committed their offenses in a state of marked emotional excitation. Those examined were characterized by a prosocial personality orientation, observant of generally accepted standards and rules (16-PF, G factor $\mu = 5.29$). Their behavior prior to their acting out was usually socially adapted and they possessed a sufficiently wide repertoire of interpersonal interaction strategies (16-PF, N factor $\mu = 5.86$). Persons composing this type were characterized by low aggressiveness. The Hand Test general index ($\mu = -0.64$) was significant for the predominance of social-cooperative tendencies over confrontational ones. In conflict situations, these subjects tried to compromise in an attempt to resolve the controversy and they were inclined to take into account the interest of the other party and not to press their own position on to them (16-PF, E factor $\mu = 4.21$).

Type 5 subjects, as were all of those examined, were characterized by lowered emotional stability and poor stress tolerance (16-PF, C factor $\mu = 3.21$). At the same time, affective rigidity traits were the least expressed (16-PF, L factor $\mu = 5.57$). This prevented the accumulation of negative experiences and contributed to higher flexibility of behavior under normal circumstances. These subjects were characterized by the pronounced intention to control their actions, to curb spontaneous reactions, and to correlate their conduct with generally accepted norms and standards (16-PF, Q₃ factor $\mu = 6.63$), even in relatively low potential resources of self-control (VSC test median = 15.1), and an inclination to perceive their actions as depending on external circumstances (LSC Io $\mu = 3.28$)

As a rule, a conflictual exchange with the victim preceded the offense in which the Type 5 person was involved. These offenders attempted nonphysical solutions to the confrontation, trying to minimize any show of physical force. The victim had typically provoked the offender, either through aggressive acting out or by threats, blackmail, or other manifestations of hostility. This resulted in growing emotional tension in the offenders, who considered the situation to be genuinely dangerous either to themselves or to the values they upheld and they were unable to see a way out. The behavior of the Type 5 subjects was first determined by an affectively determined goal congruous with the principal motivational principles of their personality. As the conflict situation progressed to a point of confrontation, however, the offenders recognized the impossibility of achieving their hoped-for goal of a nondestructive solution to the problem. At the height of the

emotional outburst, the behavior acquired an ultra-important character, becoming autonomous and resulting in a “displacement of the motive to the goal” (Leontiev, 1975). Thus, a disturbance of the operational provisions of the goal and of the selectivity of the choices for achieving that goal took place and was replaced by extremely destructive acting out behavior. The subject’s consciousness in the description of the offense was characterized by marked narrowing and fixation on the affectogenic object. A considerable number of situational elements not directly associated with the object fell out of the offenders’ field of perception. As a result, their ability for integral comprehension and assessment of the situation was essentially disturbed, and the quality of the control of the actions and the prediction of their potential aftereffects were abruptly lowered. In the heat of confrontation, as the result of acute frustration and emotional excitation, the initial motivation aimed at overcoming the conflict in an expedient manner rapidly diminished in importance. Once the offender’s activity had lost this expediency, they gave vent to their criminal behavior. This conduct was carried out through the mechanism of a much lower hierarchical personality level.

Type 6—catastrophic aggression. Type 6 subjects included those persons whose criminal aggression took place in a state of acute emotional excitement provoked by the illegal actions of their victims. Their personality was characterized by distinctly marked prosocial attitudes, a tendency to conformity, and an inclination to follow traditional rules and standards (16-PF, G factor $\mu = 5.63$). These subjects were characterized by the lowest level of aggressivity of the entire cohort (Hand Test general index $\mu = 1.75$); in addition, their confrontational tendencies were also the lowest (25% in Hand Test responses). They were capable of establishing friendly and empathic relations with others and were inclined to share their experiences. They exhibited no tendency to dominate others and they tended to take into account the interests and opinions of others (16-PF, E factor $\mu = 4.38$). The repertoire of behavior strategies in the Type 6 person was more limited than in the two previous types; however, their strategies were also of a nonconfrontational and constructive type.

The level of emotional stability in Type 5 subjects was higher than in all other types (16-PF, C factor $\mu = 3.88$). At the same time, traits of affective rigidity were characteristic to a greater degree in those with Type 6 aggression (16-PF, L factor $\mu = 6.63$). These persons had a tendency to a prolonged accumulation of and fixation on negative experiences.

The level of volitional self-control in Type 6 aggressive offenders was second in the entire cohort (VSC median = 31.45). These subjects also were to a greater extent inclined to confess their responsibility for their actions and the consequences of them (LSC Io $\mu = 4.00$). Objectively, their resources of self-control were sufficiently limited but they showed a good degree of intention to comply with standard rules of conventional behavior (16-PF, Q₃ factor $\mu = 6.63$). They were usually successful in this in the everyday interpersonal conflicts they faced.

In this type of offender, the aggressive conduct took place in situations thought by them to be vitally dangerous or in those that endangered their most significant values. The victims, as a rule, were the initiators of the conflict or were the source of its escalation, and their actions exhibited direct aggressive provocation and were the source of real danger. Attempts made by the subjects to resolve the conflict through nondestructive methods proved to be ineffective.

It is worth noting that at the initial stages of the offensive criminal interaction, the behaviors of the Type 6 persons were similar to those in the Type 5 group. The difference consisted in the fact that the Type 6 offenders preserved their self-control for a longer period of time, were able to withstand great emotional stress, and behaved themselves properly to the last, using all their available resources of self-control. However, later, the breakdown of their self-regulatory mechanisms was of a more profound and destructive character. In a situation of acute unbearable stress, during which they perceived themselves to be helpless and in serious danger, they underwent total affective disorganization with disintegration of their previously acceptable behavior. They acted reflexively, losing all of their previously held motivational values. Their disturbed behavior appeared chaotic and their aggressive tendencies were nonspecific in nature. Their choice of ways and means of acting out did not include the objective appraisal of the circumstances and was devoid of any planning. Their decreasing self-control was accompanied by frantic activity, and the termination of their aggressive behavior was usually unpredictable. It was determined not by the achievement of some consciously set goal of cessation of their physical activity but resulted from external conditions or from natural inertia. Later, they often recognized their own wrongdoing.

Thus, the most disturbed acting out with severe personality disintegration was observed in persons with Type 6 aggression. And, as distinct from the previously described type in which actions were to some extent regulated and organized by an affectively conditioned goal accompanied by a relatively preserved operational control and a purposeful goal, these offenders exhibited severe disorganization and disintegration of responsible behavior.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of psychological and behavioral variables, including the capacity for self-control, of aggressive violent criminal offenses may enable mental health experts to establish the foundations for differentiated criteria in the evaluation of such offenses. The results of the present study show that the potential ability to govern one's actions is determined by the formation of various levels of the self-regulatory system and mainly depends on the subject's personality tendency and his actual intention to control his behavior and to restrain or direct his aggressive manifestations in socially acceptable ways. This primarily depends on the capability for self-control, the affective tendency and state, and the impact of the conflict situation on the ego of the subject at the moment of the offense. On the basis

of the criteria of capability for social control, Type 1 and Type 2 offenders may be classified as offenders without diminished criminal responsibility that might warrant legal leniency. Contrary to those groups, those without a homicidal intention in the genesis of their crime but with a substantial limitation of the ability for self-regulation at the time of the offense belong to Type 5 and, in particular, to Type 6. In these offenders, their limited self-control is partially determined by the provocation of the victim or other interfering and uncontrollable factors and results primarily from a situational reaction. In such cases, diminished criminal responsibility (imputableness) may be applied. The typology of Type 3 or Type 4 offenders may be considered by the court in the determination of their individual legal responsibility and consequent possible mitigation of penalty at sentencing.

NOTES

1. C, E, G, L, N, and Q factors represent Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16-PF) factors describing individual personality traits (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970). They were selected as the most pertinent for the objectives of the present study. High C factor indices are indicative of ego strength, low indices of ego weakness (emotional stability or instability). High E factor indices refer to dominance and low factors to submissiveness. High G factor indices indicate superego strength and a regard for existing moral and social norms/standards, whereas low indices represent a disregard for or discounting of moral standards. High L factor indices indicate suspiciousness and affective rigidity and high indices indicate trustfulness. High N factor indices refer to discernment, accuracy of interpersonal perceptions, and flexibility of behavior; low indices indicate naivete and straightforwardness. High Q factor indices indicate high intellectual/volitional control over the subject's behavior and low indices indicate weak control. In the authors' description of each type, these factors were applied. Their numerical values varied from group to group, with a maximum difference in the polar groups.

2. $In\mu$, $Io\mu$, and $Id\mu$ indices represent subscales of the Level of Subjective Control (LSC) Test. $Io\mu$ is a general index of internality-externality; that is, such as the tendency of a subject to attribute the responsibility for events to himself (internality) or to external factors (externality); μ is the index of a mean value. $In\mu$ is an index that represents to whom or what (himself or others) a subject attributes the reason for his failures. A high index indicates the failures are attributed to himself and a low index indicates that they are attributed to environmental circumstances. The $Id\mu$ index refers to whom or what a subject attributes the reason for his successes. High indices indicate that they are attributed to himself and low indices indicate that they are attributed to others or to circumstances.

3. A low 16-PF Q_2 value indicates that the individual is group dependent, sociable, and dependent. A high value indicates group independence and a preference for making his own decisions.

4. A low 16-PF Q_4 value indicates inertness, quietness, and reservedness. A high value indicates strength and irritability.

5. A low 16-Pf Q_3 factor indicates that the subject is noncontrolled, negligent, follows his own impulses, and does not respect generally accepted standards. A high value indicates an individual who is controlled, punctual, and volitional.

REFERENCES

- Bazhin, E. F., Golyukina, E. A., & Etkind, A. M. (1983). Method of the study of the level of subjective control. *Psychological Journal (Russian)*, 5(3), 152-162.

- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). *Handbook for the sixteen personality factor questionnaire (16-PF)*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Leontiev, A. N. (1975). *Work, consciousness, personality*. Moscow.
- The Luscher Colour Test. (1971). London and Sydney: Pan Books.
- Osuna, E., & Luna, A. (1989). Impulsivity and attention-perception features in relation to juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 34, 1235-1245.
- Palermo, G. B. (1994). *The faces of violence*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Palermo, G. B., & Simpson, D. (1994). At the roots of violence. The progressive disintegration of the primary social agency: The family. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 38, 105-116.
- Pollock, V. E., Briere J., Schneider, L., Knop, J., Mednick, S. A., & Goodwin, D. W. (1990). Childhood antecedents of antisocial behavior: Parental alcoholism and physical abusiveness. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 147, 1290-1293.
- Ratinov, A. R., & Sitkovskaya, O. D. (1990, March). Violence, aggression, brutality as the objects of a criminal-psychological study. *Violence, Aggression, Brutality*, 4-15.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 609.
- Voloshina, L. A. (1990, March). The genesis of aggressive-violent crimes. *Violence, Aggression, Brutality*, 15-40.
- Wagner, E. (1971) The hand test. Projective test used as a predictor of overt aggression. In *Psychology Tests*. New York.
- Widom, C. S. (1989). The cycle of violence. *Science*, 244, 160-164.
- Zverkov, A. G. (1990). Diagnosis of Volitional Self-Control (VSC): Questionnaires of Volitional Self-Control. In *Practice on psychodiagnosis: Psychodiagnosis of motivation and self-regulation* (pp. 116-124). Moscow.

Joseph A. Kudryavtsev, M.D., Moc. Med. Sci., D.Sc.

Head, Laboratory of Psychology
Serbsky National Research Centre for Social and Forensic Psychiatry
23 Kropotkinsky Pereulok
119839 Moscow
Russia

Natalia A. Ratinova, Ph.D.

Scientific Collaborator, Laboratory of Psychology
Serbsky National Research Centre for Social and Forensic Psychiatry
23 Kropotkinsky Pereulok
119839 Moscow
Russia