



CRIMINOLOGICAL RISK FACTORS, PARENTING STYLE, AND PARENTAL BONDING AS PREDICTORS OF PSYCHOPATHY AMONG PRISON INMATES

ABIODUN, Yetunde Racheal

Department of Psychology

University of Ibadan,

Ibadan, Nigeria

rachealyabiodun@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Crime and criminal activities have been increasing globally every day. Studies have shown an association between psychopath and criminal conduct. In fact, adult psychopath have been shown to be responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime in society and are among the most violent and persistent offenders. Studies on psychopath have consistently focused on the prevalence of the act, not on the predictive factors that could lead to such behavioral tendencies among the psychopath have not been adequately explored. The objective of this study therefore, was to investigate the psychological (parenting bonding, parenting style) and criminological (gross income prior to imprisonment, age of emancipation, numbers of times in prison) factors predicting psychopathy among prison inmates. The study was anchored on attachment theory and the psychodynamic theory. The study was cross sectional survey with ex-post factor design. 200 prison inmates were purposively sampled from Agodi prison, Ibadan participated in the study. Data were collected using Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ), Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI) and Hare Psychopathy checklist. Collected data were analyzed using descriptive, Anova, T Test and Hierarchical regression at $P < .01$ and $.05$. Five hypotheses were tested in the study.

The 200 participants were 12 females and 188 males with mean age (30.40 years, $SD=9.32$). The result shows that criminological risk factors, parenting style and parenting bonding predict psychopathy ($F(9,195)=2.76$ $P(0.001)$) with 49% variance accounted for by joint prediction of criminological risk factors, parenting bonding and parenting style in the study. Age of emancipation independently predict psychopathy ($=.09$ $P>0.05$). Age of first imprisonment ($=.15$, $P>0.05$), authoritative parenting style ($=.04$ $P>0.05$), authoritarian parenting style ($=.24$, $P>0.05$) permissive parenting style ($=.06$ $P>0.05$) and parental Bonding ($=.06$ $P>0.05$) do not independently predict psychopathy among prison inmates.

Criminological risk factors, parenting bonding and parenting style were significantly predictors of Psychopathy among prison inmates. These factors should be taken into consideration in the development of intervention programs for psychopaths. The intervention program should also be among parents.

Keywords: Psychopathy, Criminological Risk Factors, Parental Bonding, and Parenting Styles

INTRODUCTION

The concept of psychopathy has a long history in clinical psychology research which has fascinated researchers for many years. There has been much debate about what characteristics make up a psychopathic personality. Current conceptualizations of psychopathy, based on both clinical and empirical work, suggest that it is a personality disorder defined by a specific constellation of interpersonal, affective, and behavioral characteristics (Hare, 1998, Hart & Hare, 1998). In adults based on both clinical and empirical work suggests that Psychopathy is a personality disorder characterized by persistent antisocial behavior, impaired empathy, and bold and egotistical traits. However, similar antisocial traits are also common, yet less pronounced, in people who are well-off psychologically and socially. There is a strong association between psychopathy and criminal conduct in adult. Psychopaths are responsible for a misappropriate amount of crime in society and are among the most violent and persistent offenders (Fourth & Burke 1998; Newman, Schmidt & Voss 1997). There is an unprecedented upsurge of violent crimes and the gruesome killing of innocent people worldwide (Ayokunle 2020). The pervasive nature and stability of psychopathic traits throughout adulthood have led some researchers to question whether its origins lie within an earlier point of development. Psychopaths are rare among the "normal population" found in perhaps 1% but represented 25% of prison inmates because of the danger keeping them among the population, a diagnosable mental illness that afflicts about 25%



of a nation's population that translates to approximately 250,000 psychopaths. However, just as only 5% of these mentally ill populations are so severely impaired they cannot work, they are dangerous, and their cruelty or desire to harm others may reflect more personality traits and mental illness. The crimes of psychopaths are usually stone-cold, remorseless killings with no apparent reason. These are people who cannot contain their urge to harm (kill) people for no apparent reason and often suffer from some mental illness.

Psychopathy is an important forensic concept in the 21st century.

Psychopaths are wonderful at lying and manipulating, which allows them to gain the confidence of future victims. In addition, these individuals are impulsive and seemingly strive for excitement while disregarding any responsibility for their actions. This is often displayed through chronic antisocial acts (those which deviate from the socially acceptable norms of society and violate the right of others) because the psychopath also seems to lack the ability to conceptualize the consequences of his or her actions. Yet, this does not mean that psychopaths do not know right from wrong; it is more a matter of not caring whether it is right or wrong. Many of the concepts presented thus far are also indicative of reactive attachment disorder, which may help explain why psychopaths seem to have difficulty forming meaningful relationships with others. The lack of attachments can often be seen in the lives of serial murderers through studies (Reseler et al. 1988) that have reported a high incidence of isolation, lack of significant relationships, or several short-term relationships in the histories of these individuals

Other indicators of psychopathy include a parasitic lifestyle and the use of superficial charm to succeed in these ventures. Although psychopaths have difficulties with relationships, they are more than willing to put on their masks or criminal activities that require them to be charming or demonstrate a sense of caring. Again, this is an act; one that can change very quickly because psychopaths lack the behavioral cool over; they have sudden feelings of rage. Psychopathy is an enduring pattern of behavior. The first signs of psychopathy may be seen in childhood with early behavior problems, juvenile delinquency, and lack of long-term life goals or planning. This can and does continue into adulthood where many will meet the criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder (ASPD) as indicated in DSM-5 section II ASPD diagnosis.

Furthermore, most often in the literature, psychopathy is described as a pathology—a disorder that has been linked to a variety of biological deficits and environmental risk factors like parenting styles. Parenting style is a psychological construct representing standard strategies that parents use in their child-rearing. Many parents create their style from a combination of factors, these may evolve as children develop their personalities and move through life changes. A major risk factor is parenting style, particularly harsh and inconsistent parenting, which research has shown is associated with child behavior problems (Jennifer Cox & Megan Kopkin, 2018). Other factors that feed into this, directly and indirectly, include domestic violence, parental drug abuse, maternal depression, family poverty, parents with low education, stressed families, and single-parent status (Webster-Stratton & Reid 2008).

Parents can vary on how overprotective or responsive they are to the needs and concerns of their children. These parental practices can significantly affect the temperament, relationships, personality, motivation, and progress of their children and these can persist throughout life. For example, compared to individuals whose parents were inconsistent-occasionally supportive and warm, but sometimes neglectful, critical, and unfair individuals whose parents are almost supportive, war, and responsive to their needs and concerns are less sensitive to rejection. Baumrind (1978) who is commonly considered a pioneer researcher into parenting styles, introduced three parenting styles to describe differences in normal parenting behavior; the authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting styles. Authoritative parenting as



characterized by Baumrind (1978) is often demanding, manifesting elevated expectations and standards for their children and encouraging compliance with their rules and directives. Nevertheless, they encourage discussion about these rules as well as independence, autonomy, and freedom inviting children to think about their own lives and behavior. The parents also exhibit warmth and a responsive manner. That is, the parents are sensitive to the needs and concerns of their children and forgiving when standards are not fulfilled.

Like authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting also coincides with expectations of compliance with firm and high standards. However, in contrast to authoritative parenting, authoritarian parents discourage dialogues about these rules, exhibiting rigidity and inflexibility. They do not justify the rules with reason or argument. In addition, these parents are not responsive to the needs and concerns of their children. The capacity of these children to reach suitable decisions in social settings might also be impaired and they might merely follow social norms. These problems might represent limited opportunities to choose which behaviors they would like to pursue early in life. Rebellion might also be common in these children.

Permissive parents are not demanding and do not expect compliance with stringent rules or elevated standards. These parents, however, are warm and responsible, usually sensitive to the needs and concerns of their children. Often, these parents might be driven by a need to be liked by their children. These children, purportedly, are often impulsive because they do not develop the capacity to regulate their behavior effectively, especially in social relationships. These children are more likely than their peers to be victimized at school. Later they might exhibit misconduct.

Also, other factors that have been seen to relate to the development of psychopathic behavior include Parental Bonding. Parental Bonding refers to the inbuilt ability of humans to form strong attachments of affection to significant others in their lives in infancy, adulthood as well as childhood. The bonding system plays a significant role in maintaining proximity between an infant and caregivers that protect them from danger and threats and thus increase the chance of survival. Some parents tell their young sons "Don't be a crying baby" if the children cry. Other parents try to hide their feelings so the children grow up believing that any expression of true feelings is somehow unacceptable. They learn to repress their feelings just like their parents had done. Such people can arrive at a completely unfeeling state, at least as far as outward manifestations are concerned.

Parental conflict and family disruption predicted the antisocial but not the affective component of psychopathy (Farrington, 2002). Several explanations have been advanced for the link between family disruption and psychopathy. The first explanation states that this happens as the loss of a parent can have damaging effects on the attachment between the lost parent and the child (trauma theory). Life course theories state that multiple stressors like parental conflict and loss, reduced economic circumstances, changes in parental figures, and maladaptive child-rearing methods have adverse effects on the growing child, selection theories focus on the issue that disrupted families produce such children because of pre-existing differences on various risk factors.

METHOD

Design: The study utilized a non-experimental study that adopted a cross-sectional survey with an ex-post factor research design. The design examines multiple independent variables as predictors of one dependent variable while it controls for the extraneous variable. Non-experimental research is utilized, with no manipulation of the independent variable. The independent variables are parental bonding, parental style, criminological risk factor; the age of first imprisonment, age of the first imprisonment, age of emancipation, time spent in prison, number of times in prison, the severity of offense, income, and length of sentence. The dependent



variable is psychopathy. A purposive sampling technique was employed for this study. The sample for the study was drawn from the prison inmates of Agodi prison. The choice of the sampling technique was a result of the representative sample which is a large population (prison inmates) and it is not possible to specify which of the large population psychopaths are, thereby it is using the member of the population that is available.

Measures:

Demographic Information:

The demographics of the respondents include sex, age, marital status, and religion.

Criminological risk factors; The following items were used to measure criminological risk factors; gross income before imprisonment, years of sentence, age of emancipation, the severity of the offense, number of times in prison and number of years in prison.

Parental style

The Parental style of mothers

This questionnaire was developed by Buri (1991) to measure parental style of mothers. It is a 30 items scale. The scale is a self-report questionnaire eliciting information on how a person perceives the parenting style of his/her mother developed by Buri (1991) which are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "Disagree Strongly=" to "Agree strongly=5. Various studies have established the Cronbach alpha at 0.77.

The Parental style of fathers

This questionnaire was developed by Buri (1991) to measure the parental style of fathers. It is a 30 items scale. The scale is a self-report questionnaire eliciting information on how a person perceives the parenting style of his/her father developed by Buri (1991) which is rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'Disagree strongly=1 to Agree strongly =5. Various studies have established the Cronbach alpha at 0.77

Parental bonding scale

This questionnaire was developed by researcher to measure parental bonding. It is a 20 item scale. The scale is a self-report questionnaire eliciting information on how a person perceives the level of bond to his/her parents. It is rated on a five-point scale ranging from "Disagree strongly=1 to Agree strongly=5 reliability coefficient of the scale was high with Cronbach Alpha 0.72.

Psychopathy scale

This questionnaire was developed to measure psychopathic behavior. It is 36 items scale. The items in this scale cover the affective and interpersonal dimensions of Hare's Revised Psychopathy checklist, which possess a very high Alpha coefficient ($\alpha = .84$) (Hare, 2003). This checklist is lowly correlated ($r < .30$) with intelligence, anxiety and depression tests. This is indicative of the instrument's validity and reliability (Campbell & Russo, 2001; Gracia-Cadena 2009)

RESULTS

TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF T-TEST OF INDEPENDENCE SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN OLDER AND YOUNGER INMATES ON PSYCHOPATHY

Years	N	X	SD	df	T	P
Long stayed	78	90.15	12.39			
				90.15	1.91	>.05
Short Stayed	122	93.56	12.22			

This result shows that There is a significant difference between long stayed and short stayed prison inmate on psychopathy $T(198) = - . (198) = 1.91; P>.05$. The mean score of long stayed inmate was ($X=90.15$) while that of the short-stayed inmates was ($X=93.56$) while that of the short stayed was ($X=93.56$). This shows that there will be a significant influence of age of emancipation on psychopathy. This means short stayed prison inmates have more psychopathic behavior than long stayed prison inmates.

TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF T-TEST OF INDEPENDENCE SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EARLY SEPARATION FROM PARENT (S) AND LATE SEPARATION FROM PARENT(S) ON PSYCHOPATHY

Separation from parent	N	X	SD	df	T	P
Early	73	92.96	11.23			
				170	1.43	<0.05
Lately	99	90.22	13.23			

In the result above, there was a significant difference between early and lately separation from parent(s) on psychopathy $t(170)-1.43; P>.05$. The mean score of early separation ($X=92.96$) while that of the late separation was ($X=90.22$). This means that prison inmates that leaves parent early are more psychopathic than prison inmates that leaves lately.

TABLE 3 SHOWING TABLE 3 THE DESCRIPTIVE OF ONE TIME, TWO TIMES AND THREE TIMES IN PRISON ON PSYCHOPATHY

	X	SD	N
First time prison inmate	88.51	12.99	73
Two -time prison inmate	12.28	12.28	22
Three-time prison inmate	7.60	7.59	10
Total	89.00	12.36	105

TABLE 4 SHOWS THE EFFECT NUMBERS OF TIME IN PRISON ON PSYCHOPATHY

Psychopathy	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Between Group	66.99	2	33.50	216	<.05
Within group	15829.01	102	155.17		
Total	15896.00				

The tables above shows that numbers of times in prison have a significant effect on psychopathy $f(2,102)=216 p>.05$. However, the descriptive statistics shows that first time prison inmate ($X=88.51, SD=12.00$) have more psychopathic behavior than two times prison inmates ($X=12.28, SD=12.28$) and three times prison inmates ($X=7.60, SD=7.59$).

TABLE 5 SUMMARY OF HIERACHICAL REGRESSION SHOWING CRIMINOLOGICAL RISK FACTORS, PARENTAL BONDING AND PARENTING STYLE ON PSYTCHOPATHY

Variables	B	SE B	B	R	R	R	F
Block 1				.43	.19	.14	3.82***
Criminological risk factors							
Age of Emancipation	-0.83	.29	-.33***				
No. of time in prison	-1.45	1.45	-.11				
Age of first imprisonment	-0.33	.24	-.15				
Time spent in prison	1.25	6.5	.20				
Severity of offense	-.50	.58	-0.9				
BLOCK 2				.48	.23	.16	3.10***
Parental style							
Age of Emancipation	-.83	.29	-.33***				
No. of time in prison	-1.78	1.45	-.13				
Age of first imprisonment	-.33	.25	-.15				
Time spent in prison	1.10	.66	.17				
Severity of offense	-.54	.57	-.10				
Authoritarian Parenting style	4.12	2.25	.25				
Authoritative Parenting Style	-.34	1.81	-.02				
Permissive Parenting style	-.04	.17	-.03				
BLOCK				.49	.24	.15	2.76***
Parental Bonding							
Age of Emancipation	-.80	2.9	-.31**				
No. of time in prison	-1.59	1.49	-.12				
Age of first imprisonment	-.33	2.5	-1.5				
Time spent in prison	1.15	.67	.18				
Severity of offense	-.52	.58	-.09				
Authoritarian Parenting style	3.94	2.28	.24				
Authoritative Parenting Style	-.62	1.87	-.04				
Permissive Parenting style	-.08	.19	-.06				
Parental Bonding	.09	.14	.08				

Result in table 5 above shows that criminological risk factors identified in the study significantly and jointly predict psychopathy (F (5,195)-3.82, P<0.001). However, 43% variance observed among psychopathic prison inmates are accounted for by the criminological risk factors identified in the study. Also, the table revealed that age of emancipation independently predicts psychopathy ($\beta=.33$, $p<0.001$) while numbers of time imprisoned ($\beta=.11$, $p>0.05$), age of first imprisonment ($\beta=.15$, $p>0.05$), time spent in prison ($\beta=.20$, $p>0.05$) and severity of offence ($\beta=.09$, $p>0.05$) do not independently predict psychopathy

Furthermore, in block B of the table above shows that criminological risk factors and parenting style identifies in the study significantly and jointly predict psychopathy among prison inmate (F (8,195)=3.10, $p<0.0001$). However, 48% variance observed among psychopathic prison inmates are accounted for by the criminological risk factors and parenting style in the study. Also, the table revealed that age of emancipation independently predicts psychopathy ($\beta =.33$ $p<0.001$), while numbers of time imprisoned ($\beta=.13$, $p>0.05$), age of first imprisonment ($\beta=.15$, $p>0.05$), time spent in prison ($\beta=.17$, $p > 0.05$), and severity of offence ($\beta=.01$, $p>0.05$), authoritarian parenting style ($\beta=.25$ $p>0.05$), authoritative parenting style, ($\beta=.02$ $p>0.05$), and permissive parenting style, ($\beta=.03$, $p>0.05$), do no independently predict psychopathy among prison inmate

Also, in block C of the table above shows that criminological risk factors, parenting style and parental bonding identified in the study significantly and jointly predict psychopathy among prison inmates (F (9,195)=2.26 $p<0.0021$). However, 49% variance observed among psychopathic prison inmates are accounted for by the criminological risk factors, parenting style and parental bonding in the study. Also, the table revealed that age of emancipation independently predicts psychopathy($\beta=.31$, $p<0.0001$), while numbers of time imprisoned($\beta=.12$, $p>0.05$), age of first

imprisonment($\beta=.15$, $p>0.05$, time spent in prison($\beta=.18$, $p>0.05$ and severity of offense($\beta=.09$, $p>0.05$, authoritarian parenting style($\beta=.24$, $p>0.05$) authoritative parenting style($\beta=.04$, $p>0.05$), permissive parenting style($\beta=.06$, $p>0.05$) and parental bonding($\beta=.08$, $p>0.05$) do not independently predict psychopathy.

In sum, this shows that criminological risk factors, parental bonding and parenting style will jointly and independently predict psychopathy but that only age of emancipation individually predict psychopathy.

TABLE 6 SHOWING THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN LEVEL OF PSYCHOPATHY BETWEEN INMATE WITH LOW PARENTAL BONDING AND HIGH PARENTAL BONDING

DV	Parental Bond	N	X	SD	df	t	P
	Low	117	89.44	10.01			
psychopath					198	2.82	<.05
	High	83	94.36	14.73			

T test table above shows that there is a significant difference in the level of psychopath between prison inmate with high parental bond and inmates with low parental bond ($T(198) = 2.83$, $P<.05$). However, the mean scores in the table shows inmates with high parental bonding($X=89.44$).

Table 7 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS SHOWING THE DEMOGRAPHIS VARIABLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Variables		X	SD	N	N%
Age		30.40	9.32		
	Minimum			17	
	Maximum			77	
	Total			200	
Gender		1.06	0.24		
	Male			188	94%
	Female			12	6%
	Total			200	100%
Marital status		1.94	0.97		
	Single			72	35.8%
	Married			80	40.0%
	Divorced			28	14.0%
	Separated			20	10%
	total			200	100%
Religion		1.56	0.65		
	Christian			104	52.05
	Muslim			78	39.0%
	Traditional			17	8.5%
	Total			199	99%

Source; field study survey in Nigeria Prison, Agodi, Ibadan, Oyo state 2013

Two hundred participants used in the study responded to the demographic information presented in the descriptive table. This table showed that none of them was below 17years and above 77years. The age descriptive statistics showed that the participant minimum age was 17 and the maximum age is 77, the mean age is 30.40. The gender distribution in the study involves 12 females (6%) and 188 males (94%). 72 participants were identified as single (35.8%) by marital status, 80 participants were married (0.0%), 28 participants were divorced (14.0%), 20 participants were separated (10%). The religion distribution shows that 104 participants were Christian by religion (52.0%), 78 participants were Muslim (39.0%) 17 participants were identified as traditional (8.5%).



DISCUSSION

The study investigated parenting style, parenting bonding and criminological factors as predictors of psychopathy. The independent variables of the study were parenting style, parenting bonding and criminological risk factors. Parenting bonding has two levels; the two levels are High and low, parenting style has three dimensions authoritative parenting style authoritarian parenting style, permissive parenting style, and authoritative parenting style. Criminological risk factors is of seven dimensions level of sentence, age of emancipation, age of first imprisonment, severity of offence, length of sentence, numbers of times in prison times spent in prison early

Five hypotheses were tested in the study. There are several other findings as presented earlier in Chapter four; this chapter is therefore to discuss the findings in line with each of hypotheses. Apart from this, the summary, conclusion, implication of findings, recommendations, limitation of study and suggestion for further studies were made in this chapter.

Times spent in prison and psychopathy

The hypothesis which states that long stayed prison inmate will have a significant higher score on psychopathy than short stayed prison inmate was not supported. The result of the findings shows that short stayed prison inmate scored higher than long stayed prison inmate. This shows that short stayed prison inmate have psychopathic behavior than long stayed prison inmate. This reveals that times spent in prison inhibit psychopathy.

Separation from parents on Psychopathy

The outcome of hypothesis two shows that there is a significant difference in the level of psychopathy between prison inmate with early separation from parents and inmates with late separation from parents. However, prison inmate with early separation from parents ha significant higher score on psychopathy than prison inmate with late separation from patents which supported the stated hypothesis two. This shows that inmates who separated early from parents have more psychopathic behavior than those who separated from their parent lately.

This is in support of saltaris (2002) he found out that insights from clinical accounts suggest that the emotional detachment shown by psychopathic individuals is so fundamental and pervasive that it is likely to originate from the first few months of a child's life, and that it is relatively independent of later inadequacies in the rearing environment (Saltaris, 2002). In particular insecure avoidant and disorganized attachments have been linked to early hostile behavior problems (Lyons-Ruth, Alpern & Repacholi, 1993). Furthermore, the relationship between avoidant attachment and antisocial behavior has been shown to be stronger in high-risk samples of children than in low risk samples (Greenberg, Speltz, & Deklyen, 1993).

Most explanations of personality disorders focus on early stages of development and assume problems in child rearing and family structure that resulted from the loss of one of the parents through divorce or death (Rutter, 2005). According to attachment theory, children lacking the attachment to a significant adult figure are unable to empathize and care about others (Van der Horst, 2011). It is difficult to objectively track down early experiences and even more difficult to measure the effects of those experiences on people's current thoughts and feelings. This study found a significant association between the age at which prison inmates left their parents' home and psychopathy among a group of prison inmates in a medium security prison in Apodaca, Nuevo Leon, Mexico. Findings suggest that the lesser the time subjects spent in at their homes of origin, the higher their level of diagnosed as psychopathy will be. The subgroup of subjects' psychopaths lived at their homes of origin an average of 13 years while inmates not psychopaths lived at their homes of origin an average of 18 years. This finding suggests the possibility that the previously mentioned 5 year difference enabled inmates without psychopathy to develop the capacity to empathize and care about others, even though there study design does not enable to form a clearly establish cause and effect relationships. It is possible that separating too early from the protection of one's family of origin may be a risk factor for psychopathology and more specifically for psychopathy. It would be worth discovering to what extent the prolonged lack of access of children to attachment figures may contribute to psychopathy and to what extent



psychopathy may lead to criminal behavior. By attachment figures we mean persons to which normally children become attached and who children prefer over other individuals. Links have been made between avoidant attachments and conduct problems and disorganized attachment and aggression (Carlson, Sampson, & Sroufe, 2003; Sroufe, 2005). Furthermore, research has shown a link between attachment classification and specific DSM-IV diagnoses (American Psychiatric Association, 1994) of personality disorders (Fonagy et al., 1996).

Numbers Of Times In Prison On Psychopathy

The research outcome of the third hypothesis shows that numbers of times in prison has significant influence on psychopathy. However, first time prison inmate exhibit high psychopathy than two and three times prison inmates, which confirmed the stated hypothesis three.

This is also on agreement with Mokri (2002), in his study in Iran prison. he reported about 20% of prison inmates are sentenced for violent crimes which constitute 1-2% of the general population, he believed that this is because many of them possess psychopathic trait that could make them too dangerous to the society if place in among the normal population he also said that prisoners with 'immoral act' sentences are the smallest group, constituting 4% of inmates and that is the very much reason why some inmates stays longer than the other in the prison and if some are released they still have to detain them back because they are very dangerous to the society. Cirilo H. Garcia et al, (2012) found and reported that there is a significant positive association between psychopathy and frequency of imprisonment, they reported that frequency in imprisonment and also the in and out of some inmates in the prison is because they possess psychopathic behaviour and traits which makes some to come in and out of the prison.

The findings of this study about number of times in prison is also against studies conducted in English speaking countries showing a negative association between age of initial imprisonment and the degree of psychopathy, and a positive association between psychopathy and the number of imprisonments and the recidivism of juvenile delinquency (Hart & Hare, 1997, Hemphill, Hare, & Wong, 1998

There is a strong association between psychopathy and criminal conduct (Blackburn, 1998). In fact adult psychopaths have been shown to be responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime in society and are amongst the most violent and persistent offenders (Fourth & Burke 1998; Newman, Schmidt, & Voss, 1997)

Criminological Risk Factors, Parenting Style And Parental Bonding On Psychopathy

The outcome of the study also shows that criminological risk factors parenting style and parental bonding jointly predicts psychopath among prison inmate, contrary to the independent prediction, the findings revealed that age of emancipation times spent in prison, severity of offence, number of times in prison, age of first imprisonment, authoritative parenting style, authoritarian parenting style, authoritative parenting style and parental bonding jointly predict psychopathy, but only age of emancipation independently predict psychopathy.

The findings about the negative associations between psychopathy and the severity of criminal offenses, the length of the sentence, and the actual length of time spent in prison are consistent with those reported by Verona et al. (2004) and support their conclusions that there is no cause and effect relationship between psychopathy and violence, that the delinquent acts of psychopaths tend to be instrumental in nature and they do not necessarily cause harm to their victims.

The findings of this study also support studies conducted in English-speaking countries showing a negative association between the age of initial imprisonment and the degree of psychopathy, and a positive association between psychopathy and the number of imprisonments and the recidivism of juvenile delinquency (Hart & Hare, 1997, Hemphill, Hare, & Wong, 1998). However, the age of emancipation shows a significant predicts psychopathy, this shows that the age at which inmates leave last with parents have a lot to do with what they become in life, the moral, -



social support and all the various types of parental support they need are not well embedded in them before they got separated from them. With this, it could lead to very severe risk for them because the environment in which they find themselves could inculcate another behavior in them which will make them have psychopathic traits and behavior.

Parental Bonding and Psychopathy

The result shows that inmates with high parental bonding score higher on psychopathy than inmates with low parental bonding. The study found that high maternal care was the aspect of bonding most associated with psychopathic traits. This study is in support of Kirshenbaum, Farber, & Sroufe, 1989, the key finding from the study was that disrupted parental bonding was significantly associated with an increased level of adult psychopathic personality. Research has shown that familial influences may be more relevant to the interpersonal affective features of psychopathy, with societal influences being more relevant to antisocial lifestyle and behavioral features (Marshall & Cooke, 1999).

It is against Lyons-Ruth, Alpern & Repacholi 1993 that found that Low maternal care was the aspect of bonding most associated with psychopathic traits. This was true for total psychopathy scores and both interpersonal/affective and behavioral/antisocial psychopathy scores. These associations remained significant following analysis to control for the effects of sex, social adversity, ethnicity, and history of physical abuse. In contrast, there were no significant associations between paternal care and psychopathy. However, low paternal overprotection was significantly associated with both total psychopathy scores and the emotional detachment factor of psychopathy. These results remained significant even after the effects of maternal care were accounted for.

These results are also against Flight and Forth (2007) who found that antisocial boy's lack of attachment with the father was most associated with psychopathic traits. One of the strengths of this study was that it looked at the impact of both maternal and paternal care on the development of psychopathic traits. Results indicate that low maternal care was the parental variable most strongly associated with both factors of psychopathy, perhaps an indication of the relatively greater impact of mothers on infants' emotional development. However, results also highlighted the potential role of paternal involvement in the development of psychopathic traits. Low paternal overprotection scores, which were associated with psychopathic traits in this study, reflect a lack of paternal supervision, monitoring and involvement. Such factors have previously been associated with the affective component of psychopathy (Farrington, 2006). Gao et al (2010) proposed that lack of involvement and monitoring might impair the child's capacity for bonding. Further, they suggest that the experience of a protective father may aid the emotional connection between father and child, which in turn may act as a protective factor in relation to the development of affective psychopathic traits.

Summary

The study provided a means of finding answers to the problem identified in the beginning of this study. The cause of psychopathy was investigated, criminological risk factors, parental bonding an parenting style were tested using five hypothesis, three of them was upheld, one was partially accepted and one was not supported by the findings. The study shows that short stayed prison inmate have more psychopathic behavior than long stayed prison inmate, prison inmate with early separation from parents are more psychopathy than prison inmate with late separation from parents, first time prison inmate exhibit high psychopathy than two and three times prison inmates, the study shows that age of emancipation has a significant relationship on psychopathy, criminological risk factors, parenting style and parental bonding jointly predict psychopathy

Conclusion



The study concludes that long stayed prison inmate have significant high score on psychopathy than short stayed prison inmate. The result of the findings further shows that short stayed prison inmate scored higher than long stayed prison inmate. This shows that short stayed prison inmate have psychopathic behavior than long stayed prison inmate. Meanwhile, the study also shows that there is a significant difference in the level of psychopathy between prison inmate with early separation from parents and inmates with late separation from parents. However, prison inmate with early separation from parent has significant higher score on psychopathy than prison inmate with late separation from parent. The study further evaluates the influence of frequency criminal behavior on psychopathy, numbers of times in prison was found to have significant influence on psychopathy. Furthermore, various independent variables such as criminological risk factors, parenting style and parental bonding was showed to have jointly predicts psychopath among prison inmate, independently, the findings revealed that age of emancipation, times spent in prison, severity of offence, number of times in prison, age of first imprisonment, authoritative parenting style, authoritarian parenting style, authoritative parenting style and parental bonding jointly predict psychopathy, but only age of emancipation independently predict psychopathy. Finally, parental bonding was found to have significantly predicted increase of adult psychopathic personality. The study found that high maternal care was the aspect of bonding most associated with psychopathic traits.

Implication of the Findings

The findings of this study seem to have profound implications for clinical psychology and forensic disciplines on one hand, as well as care givers on the other hand. From the findings, age of emancipation is a strong predictor of psychopathy because it is discovered that age at which an individual stops living with parent will result into psychopathy, parents and caregivers must ensure that they train their child appropriately and shouldn't leave allow them to decide to leave a solitary life at a very tender age and they shouldn't be neglected. The study will bring to the knowledge of the parents how separation timing between them and the children affects the psychological functioning of the child in the later future.

Another implication of the study is that inmates who have just been imprisoned are more psychopathy, counseling sessions should be organized in the prison among the prison inmates for those who have just been imprisoned so as to decrease the psychopathic behavior in them. Also parental bond tends to influence psychopathy. This study discovered that the extreme end of parental bonding influence psychopathy, therefore parent should learn, how correct when necessary and also appreciate when things are done appropriately.

Another implication of this study is that parenting style thus predict psychopathy, this by implication means that parenting shouldn't be too authoritative but also learn to balance between and also listen to their child opinion.

Recommendation

There are important implications of these findings for both researchers and practitioners with respect to attempting to ameliorate the negative trajectory associated with psychopathy. It is critical to pay attention to and work with children and adolescents, especially boys, who have had early disruption to parental care giving arrangements. Additionally, it is equally important to work with to-be adoptive or foster parents on how to handle and support potentially emotionally damaged children.

Therapy sessions such as Group therapy; Group psychotherapy is intended to provide education, encouragement and support for inmates who are psychopathy so as to secure an environment in which information can be exchanged and opinions heard, with this, inmates will be able to examine their difficulties in a situation reflecting the family and the social networks in which their problem developed so that a solid emotional and interpersonal foundation could be improved on which psychopathy inmates really need.



Behaviour therapy or the use of behaviour modification techniques which is an attempt to apply the results of learning theory and experimental psychology to the problems of maladaptive behaviour

Limitation of the Study

- The findings of the current study may not generalize to other populations, including students, psychiatric patients and also non-Africa prison inmates because of cultural differences. i.e. the findings is restrictive to Nigeria prison inmates.
- The sample size used in the study is relatively too small to the general population of prison inmates in Ibadan. Therefore, subsequent researchers should as much as possible integrate much population to the study to have a sizable sample size.
- The scale used for the study is relatively standardized to Nigeria context, researchers are implore to utilize the use of the scales into other population and not limited to prison inmates.

Despite the limitations described above, the-current study contributes new information to our understanding of psychopathy among prison inmates and forensic vulnerability among youths in Nigeria.

**REFERENCES**

- Ainsworth M.D. S" & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development *American Psychologist*, 46, 333-34.1.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, (4th ed.) . Washington, DC
- American Psychiatric Association. (1968). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.
- Author. American Psychiatric Association. (1987). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (3rd ed., rev.). Washington, D.C.
- Ansbro, M. (2008). Using attachment theory with offenders. *Probation Journal. The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 55, 231-244. doi: 10.1177/0264550508092812
- Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2004). Maternal affection moderates the impact of psychological control on a child's mathematical performance. *Developmental Psychology*, 40, 965-978
- Bae, Y. (1999). Human development: Theories and learning futures. *Futurics*, 23(3), 12-33.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/219813343?accountid=13380>
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4(1, Pt. 2), 1-103.
- Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. *Youth and Society*, 9, 238-276
- Blair RJR (2006). The emergence of psychopathy: implication!, for a neuropsychological approach to developmental disorders, *Cognition*.101.414-442.
- Blair, R. J. R., Mitchell, D., & Blair, K.(2005). What is Psychopathy? In, *The Psychopath Emotion and the Brain* (pp, 1-17). Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Bowlby J. *Attachment and Loss*. (1982 Volume 1: Attachment. 2nd edn. New York: Basic Books
- Cirilo H. Garcia, Jose Moral, Martha Frias, Juan A, Valdivia, & Hector L. Diaz (2012). Family and soda-demographic risk factors for Psychopathy among prison inmates *The European journal of psychology applied to legal context* 4(2),1889-1861
- Cleckley, H. (1955). *The Mask of Sanity* (2nd Ed.). St. Louis, Mosby, 1941
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The Mask of Sanity: An Attempt to Clarify Some Issues About the So Called Psychopathic Personality*. Augusta, Georgia: Emily S. Cleckley
- Clements(C. B.1996) Offender classification: Two decades of progress. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*,.23:121-143
- Douglas KS, Vincent GM, Edens JF.(2006)Risk for Criminal Recidivism: The role of psychopathy. In: Patrick CJ,(ed). *Handbook of Psychopathy*. New York: Guilford Press; ed.).Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Dunst, C. J., & Kassow, D. Z. (2008). Caregiver sensitivity, contingent social responsiveness, and secure infant attachment. *Journal of Early and Intensive Behavioral Intervention*, 5(1), 40-56
- Erikson, H. E. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York. Norton.
- Farrington, D. P. (2002). Key results from the first 40 years of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. In T. P. Thornberry & M. D. Krohn (Eds.). *Thinking stock of delinquency* (pp. 137-183). New York: Kluwer/Plenum Press.
- Farrington, D. P. (2006). Family background and psychopathy. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychopathy* (pp . 229-250). New York: The Guilford Press
- Farrington, D. P., Jolliffe, D., Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber M., & Kalb, L. M. (2001). The concentration of offenders in families and family criminality in the prediction of boys' delinquency. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 579-596.



- Finzi-Dottan, R., Bilu, R., & Golubehik, P. (2011). Aggression and conduct disorder in former Soviet Union immigrant adolescents: The role of parenting style and ego identity. *Children and Youth Services Review, 9*, 33(6) 918 – 926
- Gunter, T. D., Vaughn, M. G., & Philibert, R. A. (2010). Behavioral genetics in antisocial spectrum disorders and psychopathy: A review of the recent literature. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 28*, 148-173. doi: 10.1002/bs1.923
- Hare, R. D. (1993). *Without conscience: The disturbing world of the psychopaths among us*. New York, NY: Pocket Books
- Hare, R.D. (1999). *Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the psychopaths among us*. New York: Guilford Press
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Psychopathy Checklist—Revised technical manual* (2'd edition) Toronto: Multi Health Systems
- Harms, L. (2010). *Understanding Human Development — A multidimensional approach* (2nd ed). Melbourne, Victoria. Oxford University Press
- Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1997). Psychopathy: Assessment and association with criminal conduct. In D. M. Stoff, J. Breiling, & Maser, J. D. (Eds.), *Handbook of antisocial behavior* (pp. 22-35). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Heaven, P C. L., & CiarroLhi, J. (2008). Parental Styles, conscientiousness_ and academic performance in high school: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 451-461.
- Hemphill, J. F., Hare, R. D., & Wong, S. (1998). Psychopathy and recidivism: A review. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 3*, 139-170. doi: 10.11116.2044- 8333.1998.tb00355.x
- Hiatt, K. D., & Newman, J. P. (2007). Behavioral evidence of prolonged interhemispheric transfer time among psychopathic offenders. *Neuropsychology, 21*, 313-318.
- Human Behaviour." Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2008. Encyclopdia Britannica Online. 7 Jan. 2008 <<http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-24935>>.
- James S. Fleming (2004), Ph.D.Erikson's Psychosocial Developmental Stages
- Jennifer Cox, Megan R. Kopkin, C. Adam Coffey (2018) The Relationship between parental psychopathic traits and parenting style *Journal of Child and Family Studies,27*, 2305-2314
- Kent A. Kiehl and Joshua W. Buckholtz (2010) Inside the Mind of a Psychopath *Scientific American Mind, 21(4)* 22- 29
- Kernberg, O. (1996). A psychoanalytic theory personality disorder. In J. F. Clarkin & M. F. Lenzenweger (Eds) *Major Theories of Personality Disorder*. New York: Guilford Press
- Kestenbaum, R., Farber, E., & Sroufe, L. A. (1989). Individual differences in empathy Among preschoolers' concurrent and predictive validity. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Empathy and related emotional responses: No. 44. New directions for child development* (pp. 51- 56).San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ketterlinus & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Adolescent problem behaviors* (pp. 127-164). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence (1958). "The Development of Modes of Thinking and Choices in 'tears 10 to 16". *Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago*.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence (1973). "The Claim to Moral Adequacy of a Highest Stage of Moral Judgment". *Journal of Philosophy* 70: 630-646.
- Lauri Nummenmaa, Lasse Lukkarinen, Lihua Sun, Vesa Putkinen, kerttu Seppala, Tomi Karjalainen, Henry K. Karlsson, Mathew Hudson, Niina Venejoki, Marja Salomaa, Paivi Rauio, Jussi Hirvonen, Hannu Lauerma, Jari Tihonen,(2021) *Brain Basis of Psychopathy in criminal offenders and General Population . Cerebral Cortex, 31(9)* 4104 – 4114 DOI: 10.1093/cercor/bhab072
- Lenzonweger (Eds.) ,117a *theories of personality disorder* (pp Widows, 106-140). New York, Criilli,rd



- Lilienfeld, S. O. M. R. (2005). *Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised Professional Manual*. Lutz, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources. Inc.
- Lykken, D.T. (1995). *The antisocial persona. lilies*. Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lykken, D. T. (1996). Psychopathy, sociopathy, and crime. *Society*, 34(1), 29-38.
- Lyons-Ruth, K., Alpern, L., & Repacholi, B. (1993). Disorganized infant attachment classification and maternal psychosocial problems as predictors of hostile—aggressive behavior in the preschool classroom. *Child Development*, 64, 572— 585.
- Maccoby, EE and Martin, JA. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent—child interaction. In P. Mussen and E.M. Hetherington, (eds), *Handbook of Child Psychology, volume IV: Socialization, personality, and social development*, chapter 1, pages 1-101. New York: Wiley, 4th edition
- Marcus, R. F. & Betzer, P. D. S. (1996). Attachment and Antisocial Behavior in Early Adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 16 (2), 229-148
- Meloy, J.R. (1992). *Violent Attachments*. Northvale, NJ: Aronson Inc
- Morash, M., & Rucker, L. (1989). An exploratory study of the mother's age at child bearing to her children's delinquency in four data sets. *Crime and Delinquency*, 35, 45-93.
- O'Toole, M. E. (2007). Psychopathy as a behavior classification system for violent and serial crime scenes. In H. Herve & R. D. Yuille (Eds.), *The Psychopath: Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 301-325). USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Parker G, Tupling M, Brown L.B. (1979) A parental bonding instrument, *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 52: 1-10
- Patrick C.J, (ed). (2006) *Handbook of Psychopathy*. New York: Guilford Press; pp. 172-192
- Poythress N, & Skeen, J.L. (2006) Disaggregating psychopathy: Where and how to look for subtypes. *Handbook of Psychopathy*, 172 - 192.
- R., Farrington, D. P StOuthaMer-LOeber, M., & van Kammer, W. B. (1998). *Antisocial behavior and mental health problems*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Raine, A., Lencz, T., Taylor, K., Hellige, J. B., Bihrl, S., Lacasse, L., Lee M, et al . (2003). Corpus callosum abnormalities in psychopathic antisocial individuals. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 11, 1134-1142.
- Rebecca P. Ang, Vivien S. Huan, Wan Har Chong, Lay See Yeo (2013), Gender as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Early Separation from Parents and Psychopathic Traits in a Sample of At-Risk Adolescents
Psychopathic Traits in a Sample of At-Risk Adolescents, *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(6), 1027 – 1033
- Ressler, R.K., Burgess, A.W. & Douglas, J.E. (1988), *Sexual homicide: Patterns and motives*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Rutter D. R., Quine L. Albery. I. P.(1998). Perception of risks in motorcyclist: Unrealistic Optimism, relative realism and predictions of behaviour. *British journal of Psychology*, 89, 681-696
- Rutherford, M.J., Cacciola, J.S., & Alterman, A.I. (1999). Antisocial personality disorder and psychopathy in cocaine-dependent women. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156, 849-856
- Rutter, M. (2005). Commentary: What is the meaning and utility of the psychopathy concept? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33, 499-503. doi: 10.1007/s 10802005-5730-2
- Sue, D., Sue, D., & Sue, S. (1997). *Understanding Abnormal Behavior* (5th cd.) . Boston. MA. Houghton Mifflin.
- Scott, S. (2008). Parenting programmes for attachment and antisocial behaviour. *Psychiatry*. 7 (9) 367- 370.



Smith, C. A., Krohn, M. D., Lizotte, A. J., McCluskey, C. P. Stouthamer-Loeber, & Weiher A.I (2000). The effect of early delinquency and substance use on precocious transitions to adulthood among adolescent males. *Families, Crime and Criminal Justice*. 2, 233-253).

University of Turku. New study reveal brain basis of Pscychopathy. 'Science Daily, 14th April 2021

Van der Horst, F. C. P. (2011). *John Bowlby - From psychoanalysis to ethology: Unraveling the roots of attachment theory*. Chichester, England: Wiley. doi: 10.1002/9781119993100.fmatter

Verona, E., Patrick, C. J, Curtin, J. J. Bradley, M M., & Lang, P. J. (2004). Psychopathy and physiological response to emotionally evocative sounds. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 113, 99-108. DOI: 161.1037/0021-843X.113.1.99

Weiler, B. L., & Widom, C. S. (1996). Psychopathy and violent behavior in abused and neglected young adults. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 6, 253-271.

West, D. J., & Farrington, D. P. (1973) *Who becomes delinquent?* London: Heinemann

Widom, C. S. (1994). Childhood victimization and adolescent problem behaviors. In R. D. Ketterlinus & M.E. Lamb (eds), *Adolescent Problems Behaviour: Issues and Research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc