



5-2003

## **Court-referred youths' views of their own psychopathy : "what's the problem?"**

Jessica Lynn Von Herbulis

Follow this and additional works at: [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_gradthes](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Von Herbulis, Jessica Lynn, "Court-referred youths' views of their own psychopathy : "what's the problem?". " Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2003.  
[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_gradthes/5312](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/5312)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jessica Lynn Von Herbulis entitled "Court-referred youths' views of their own psychopathy : "what's the problem?." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Robert Wahler, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jessica Von Herbulis entitled "Court-Referred Youths' Views of Their Own Psychopathy: 'What's the Problem?'" I have examined the final paper copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.



Robert Wahler, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:



Acceptance for the Council:

  
Vice Provost and Dean of  
Graduate Studies

COURT-REFERRED YOUTHS' VIEWS OF THEIR OWN PSYCHOPATHY:  
"WHAT'S THE PROBLEM?"

A Thesis  
Presented for the  
Master of Arts Degree  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jessica Lynn Von Herbulis  
May 2003

Thesis  
2003  
· V66

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank all those who helped me in completing my Master of Arts degree in Experimental Psychology. Thank you to my wonderful parents, family, and friends whose encouragement and faith in me made this all possible. Thank you to Dr. Bob Wahler for his endless guidance and belief in me. Thank you to Cecilia Teal and the Ridgeview Observation and Assessment Program for all of their hard work and dedication to this research. Thank you to Dr. Deb Balwin and Dr. Lowell Gaertner for serving on my committee.

## Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between youth with psychopathic tendencies, their externalizing behaviors problems, and personal narrative coherence and richness.

Participants were referred by the juvenile court system to an observation and assessment program and included 33 youth (ages 10-17 years) and their parents. The following measures were collected: Child Behavior Checklist, Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Psychopathy Screening Device, and a Personal Narrative Interview. Youths and parents were in agreement in judging the youths' externalizing problems and the youths' impulsivity, but not the youths' callous/ unemotional traits. Parents were consistent among themselves in judging associations between their youths' externalizing problems and the youths' impulsivity, as well as with the youths' callous/ unemotional traits. The youths, however, saw no connection between their externalizing problems and their impulsivity or their callous/unemotional traits. Neither personal narrative coherence nor richness correlated with verbal IQ. Callous/ unemotional traits were not correlated with narrative coherence, but were negatively correlated with narrative richness. These patterns offer important implications for future research and treatment of youth with psychopathic tendencies.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Method .....	9
3. Results .....	13
4. Discussion .....	17
References .....	23
Appendix .....	27
Vita .....	35

## 1. Introduction

Adolescence is a time of growth and discovery that is often equated with the chance to test physical and social limits. This testing of limits is occasionally linked with the appearance of conduct problems, which in many cases for adolescents follows antisocial behavior patterns.

According to Moffitt (1993), "when official rates of crime are plotted against age, the rates for both prevalence and incidence of offending appear highest during adolescence; they peak sharply at about age 17 and drop precipitously in young adulthood." However, there is a small group of antisocial individuals who do not follow that pattern. Moffitt proposes that there are two types of delinquent youth that participate in this form of antisocial behavior: life-course-persistent and adolescence-limited. About 5% of males demonstrate high rates of antisocial behavior throughout an extended period of their lives and across various situations. For these life-course-persistent antisocial individuals, "the topography of their behavior may change with changing opportunities, but the underlying disposition persists throughout the life course." Those considered to exhibit adolescence-limited antisocial behavior seem to mimic the behaviors of the life-course-persistent antisocial individuals for the attainment of desired resources; however this behavior only endures during adolescence.

It is important to distinguish between the two types of conduct problem individuals. The majority is simply youth discovering boundaries and appropriate ways of obtaining desired goals, but the remaining will become career criminals who later may be diagnosed with Antisocial Personality Disorder and may further display psychopathic characteristics.

The concept of psychopathy applies to a distinct group of individuals who display severe and chronic patterns of antisocial behavior (Hare, Hart, & Harpur, 1991; Lynman, 1996; Christian, Frick, Hill, Tyler, & Frazer, 1997). Descriptors of Psychopathic Personality Disorder include glib and superficial, lack of remorse, lack of empathy, deceitful and manipulative, impulsive, and irresponsible (Hare, et al., 1991). Frick, O'Brien, Wootton, and McBurnett (1994) extended the concept of psychopathy to a model for children that includes two basic dimensions of behavior: Impulsivity/Conduct Problems and Callous/Unemotional. Yet, further research has shown that the callous/unemotional dimension seems to better differentiate the small group of individuals with psychopathic characteristics. Callousness is described as a lack of empathy and profound manipulateness, and unemotionality is described as a lack of guilt and emotional constrictedness. This dimension seems to be an eminent part for encapsulating the construct of psychopathy (Frick, Bodin, & Barry, 2000; Barry, Frick, DeShazo, McCoy, Ellis, & Loney, 2000).

Much of the research on psychopathy has focused on adults, primarily due to the evidence linking the small number of individuals to this construct. In recent years, psychopathy has been extended to children and adolescents with caution so as not to mislabel individuals before behavioral and psychological confirmation is observed as the individual develops into adulthood.

The limited research on youth with psychopathic tendencies does shed some light on the link between conduct problems/antisocial behavior and characteristics specific to psychopathy. In a study by Christian and colleagues (1997), it was found that conduct problem children who also displayed callous/unemotional traits, exhibited significantly more, as well as a greater variety, of conduct problems than did conduct problem children who did not display callous/unemotional traits. Although frequency and severity indices of antisocial behavior are a good index of the small percentage of individuals who may later be labeled as psychopathic, the callous/unemotional index adds significantly to the prediction of psychopathy later in life (Barry, et al., 2000).

Given this pronounced unemotional characteristic of individuals with psychopathic tendencies, it is important to examine their ability to process emotional material. Blair, Colledge, Murray, and Mitchell (2001) conducted a study designed to investigate the emotional sensitivity of children with

psychopathic tendencies. The results indicated that relative to the comparison group, these children demonstrated difficulties in processing certain expressions, in particular fearful and sad expressions. They made more errors when processing fearful expressions and were less sensitive to interpreting sad expressions. In another study, "adolescents with [callous/unemotional] traits, similar to adults with psychopathic traits, exhibited a lack of facilitation to emotional words, suggesting a diminished reactivity to emotional stimuli compared to other adolescents with antisocial behavior problems" (Loney, Frick, Clements, Ellis, & Kerlin, 2003). In all, children with psychopathic tendencies have shown deficits in processing emotional material.

The role of intelligence in emotional processing among youth with psychopathic tendencies is not clearly defined. However, research has shown surprising distinctions between conduct problem children where intelligence is concerned. Children who display conduct problems and callous/unemotional traits do not differ from clinic control children in intelligence, but they had higher intelligence scores than conduct problem children who did not display these traits (Christian, et al., 1997). More specifically, "a verbal deficit may only be characteristic of children with conduct problems who do not show callous and unemotional traits" (Loney, Frick, Ellis, & McCoy, 1998). Nonverbal intellectual functioning has been

shown to have very weak or no apparent trends for conduct problem children with and without callous/unemotional traits (Loney, et al., 1998; Barry, et al., 2000).

It is also imperative to examine internalizing versus externalizing behaviors with regards to youth with psychopathic tendencies. Internalizing behaviors include shyness, fearfulness, and anxiousness, whereas externalizing behaviors include more aggressive and delinquent behaviors, such as fighting, property destruction, and stealing (Lambert, Wahler, Andrade, & Bickman, 2001). Lambert and colleagues (2001) demonstrated in a study including 984 children that those diagnosed with Conduct Disorder were high in both internalizing and externalizing behaviors. Other research shows that, more specifically, children high on callous/unemotional traits exhibit a preference for thrill and sensation seeking activities, which is commonly associated with high fearlessness (Frick, et al., 1994; Frick, Lilienfeld, Ellis, Loney, & Silverthorn, 1999; Barry, et al., 2000) suggesting high externalizing behaviors, as well. However, when it comes to internalizing behaviors, there are conflicting reports in the literature. Some research reports that children scoring high on psychopathy dimensions were not distressed by their behaviors (Frick, et al., 1994; Barry, et al., 2000). On the other hand, other research reports that state anxiety (i.e. fearfulness) and measures of psychopathy exhibit positive correlations, but trait anxiety (e.g. reluctance to

delve into personal matters) is negatively correlated with callous/unemotional traits (Frick, et al., 1999; Loney, et al., 2003).

Given the dangerousness of youth with psychopathic tendencies, it is important to distinguish these individuals from others with conduct problems. "It helps little, however, to be able to identify the psychopath in adulthood, for this is a group known to be recalcitrant to efforts at rehabilitation" (Lynam, 1996). It is believed that if youth with psychopathic tendencies can be recognized early in their life course, there is a stronger chance that treatment or therapy will produce positive effects. The question then lies in the best manner to recognize these individuals early in life and the most effective avenue to take for appropriate treatment. It is quite possible that the answer involves delving further into the mental processing of individuals with psychopathic characteristics.

Mental representations provide a template for understanding and adapting to one's environment. These templates are often formed through a description of life experiences in stories called personal narratives. Literature on personal narratives suggests "that one's capacity to summarize personal experiences will influence his or her success in managing future experiences" (Wahler & Castlebury, 2002).

The structure of one's personal narrative provides insight into other psychological functions. In van Ijzendoorn's meta

analysis of research on the Adult Attachment Interview (1995), parents' personal narratives were found to consistently correlate with their observed responsiveness to their children, which, in turn, reveals information about their mental representations of attachment. If this is true for adults, then personal narratives should also lend insight into the mental representations of youth and their capacity to be sensitive toward other people. It seems to be the structure of the narrative that is more important than the content. Narratives are scored on two dimensions: coherence (how well the story fits together and makes sense) and richness (how colorful the story is). Adults' narrative coherence correlates with sensitivity to other people (van Ijzendoorn, 1995). Yet, richness may have something to do with one's motivation to be sensitive to others (Rogers, 2000). These findings have important implications for youth considered to be psychopathic, especially since they are shown to display callous and unemotional traits.

The current study was designed to assess the personal narratives of conduct problem youth, specifically youth with psychopathic tendencies. In examining the behavior patterns of these youth, it was expected that callous/unemotional traits will positively correlate with externalizing behaviors. Since youth with psychopathic tendencies do not show deficits in verbal IQ, it seems reasonable to assume that their narratives will make sense and be at least average on coherence. However, given the

deficits in emotional processing displayed by these individuals, the richness of their narratives should be rather low displaying barren stories of their lives.

## 2. Method

### Participants

Thirty-three youth participants were recruited from an observation and assessment program in a southern U.S. region over the course of a year. The program is designed to provide an in depth psychological assessment on cognitive and emotional functioning of youth who have displayed severe conduct problems referred by the juvenile court system.

The participants ranged in age from 10 to 17 years with an average age of 15 years and 2 months ( $SD = 1.75$  years). The sample was predominantly male ( $N=24$ ) and Caucasian ( $N=31$ ). At the time of the assessment, 10 participants lived with a single biological parent, 7 lived both biological parents, 15 lived with one biological and one step parent, and 1 lived with extended family.

### Procedure

Upon referral by the juvenile court system, participants were assessed by two officials with the observation and assessment program during two closely scheduled sessions. During the sessions, the participants completed a number of batteries previously in place with the program, as well as the measures for the current research project.

Two items in use by the program were also recorded for the purposes of this project: the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS). The CBCL has been

shown to correlate with observed behavior and retains good reliability and validity. The WAIS is a commonly used measure of intelligence and also has good reliability and excellent validity. In addition, a personal narrative interview (PN) was completed by the youth and the Psychopathy Screening Device (PSD) was completed by both the youth and his/her parent or guardian.

## Measures

### Personal Narrative Interview

Participants completed an interview designed to elicit reminiscing about personal experiences. The interview included 7 unscaffolded questions to allow the youth to answer as thoroughly as desired (i.e. "What is the most interesting thing that happened at home during the last month?"), followed by 8 scaffolded questions designed to guide the participant to create a more coherent and rich narrative (see Appendix A). The interviews were transcribed and coded for coherence and richness according to the personal narrative manual (Castlebury & Wahler, 1998). The indices for coherence and richness included ten yes-no questions (see Appendix B) and the scores for each were derived from the total number of "yes" answers given for each section or "chapter" of the interview (ranging from 0-5 for each index).

## Psychopathy Screening Device

The Psychopathy Screening Device is a 20-item behavior rating scale for children designed to measure psychopathic characteristics in an individual (see Appendix C). This child version was derived from the adult version, the Psychopathy Checklist, and included all aspects that could also pertain to children (Frick, et al., 1994). This scale taps two factors: Impulsivity and Callous/Unemotional. Cronbach's alphas for the present sample are as follows: Impulsivity = .71 for the parent report and .55 for the youth report; Callous/ Unemotional = .69 for the parent report and .53 for the youth report. The total Psychopathy Screening Device has a Cronbach's alpha of .84 for the parent report and .73 for the youth report, which meets interitem reliability standards.

### 3. Results

#### Youth Behavioral Assessments

Examination of means and standard deviations presented in Table 1 offers insight into the behavior of the youth in this study (see Appendix D). The youth have a mean impulsive score of 9.55 as reported by parents and 8.36 as reported by youth (out of a maximum score of 20.00). However, the standard deviations ( $SD=3.55$  &  $2.83$ , respectively) suggest that there is wide variance among this data set. The callous/unemotional measure showed the youth to have a parent reported mean of 4.88 and a youth reported mean of 4.27 (out of a maximum score of 12.00), yet again, the standard deviations ( $SD=2.83$  &  $1.89$ , respectively) suggest much variability. As of yet there are no norms for this scale to compare this sample to other youth. Parents' reports of youths' externalizing behavior problems is in the clinical range ( $M=65.00$ ) and closely related to that, the other adult and youths' reports are in the borderline clinical range ( $M=62.89$  &  $M=60.40$ , respectively).

Inspection of the Pearson correlations presented in Table 2 reveals consistencies in parent and youth judgements and a notable disparity in the judgements of these two sets of respondents (see Appendix D). First, note that parents and youth were in agreement in judging the youths' externalizing problems ( $r=.60$ ,  $p=.007$ ) and the youths' impulsivity ( $r=.35$ ,  $p=.05$ ), but not youths' callous/unemotional traits ( $r=.26$ ,  $p=.15$ ), which

could be a problem with statistical power. Parents were consistent among themselves in judging associations between their youths' externalizing problems and the youths' impulsivity ( $r=.78, p=.00$ ), as well as with the youths' callous/unemotional traits ( $r=.52, p=.02$ ). The youths' judgements, however, differed from their parents in that youths saw no connection between their externalizing problems and their impulsivity ( $r=-.01, p=.95$ ) or their callous/unemotional traits ( $r=.01, p=.97$ ), but they did view these two latter characteristics as related ( $r=.40, p=.02$ ). Thus, youth judgements of their callous/unemotional traits and their impulsivity had little relationship to their own externalizing problem judgements. In contrast, their parents tended to view the youths' callous/unemotional traits and impulsivity as associated with youth externalizing problems, and other relevant adults' judgements of these youths supported the parent reports. That is, the other relevant adults' views of youth externalizing problems correlated  $.62$  ( $p=.007$ ) with the parent reports of externalizing problems. In addition, the other adults' reported youth externalizing problems scores correlated  $.61$  ( $p=.005$ ) with parent reports of youth callous/unemotional traits and  $.49$  ( $p=.03$ ) with parent reports of youth impulsivity. Clearly, youth callous/unemotional traits as reported by their parents are markers of the youths' antisocial behavior as reported by parents and other relevant adults. However, the

youth saw no connection between callous/unemotional traits and their own or the adults' reports of youth antisocial behavior.

#### Youth Personal Narratives

Reliability was assessed for coding the Personal Narrative interviews through computing rater agreement for a 20% subset of the interviews. Rater agreement was 93.9% for unscaffolded coherence, 88.6% for unscaffolded richness, and 100% for both scaffolded coherence and richness.

Returning to Table 1, it is instructive to notice that the youths' narratives were generally quite coherent with a mean of 3.84 (out of a maximum score of 5.00), while their richness scores were quite low with a mean of .78 (out of a maximum score of 5.00). The scaffolded scores were studied for three reasons: 1) Scaffolded and unscaffolded scores were highly correlated (for coherence,  $r=.96$ ,  $p=.00$ ; for richness,  $r=.90$ ,  $p=.00$ ); 2) The scaffolded interview gave youth narrators maximum opportunities to develop lengthier stories with more information for raters; 3) Rater agreement in scoring is higher for the scaffolded stories.

Results of the correlational analysis revealed that coherence and richness were not strongly related qualities of the youth narratives ( $r=.27$ ,  $p=.12$ ), which is as expected from previous research (Rogers, 2000). Secondly, verbal IQ was unrelated to coherence ( $r=.16$ ,  $p=.38$ ) or to richness ( $r=.21$ ,  $p=.23$ ), again as expected from previous research (van Ijzendoorn,

1995). One side note in examining the mean IQ scores in Table 1 reveals generally average intelligence for this sample of youth, but the variance is relatively high suggesting a wide range of intelligence scores. Also, as expected from the hypotheses, coherence was unrelated to the youth narrators' callous/unemotional traits ( $r=-.20$ ,  $p=.26$ ), but richness was significantly correlated with these traits ( $r=-.32$ , one-tailed  $p=.03$ ). No other significant correlations were found between either coherence or richness narrative scores and other youth and adult measures of youth externalizing behavior.

#### **4. Discussion**

The current study examined the psychological status of conduct problem youth, particularly the presence of psychopathic characteristics. Externalizing or antisocial behaviors as reported by parents, the youth, and other adults were analyzed in relation to impulsivity and callous/unemotional traits. Youth psychological status was also extended to personal narrative coherence and richness, a factor not previously examined in the literature.

Given that youths, parents, and other relevant adults all provided reports on measures, it proved important to examine agreement or lack thereof. Agreement existed for youths and parents in judging youths' externalizing problems and impulsivity. However, there was not a strong relationship for callous/unemotional traits, which could be an issue of statistical power due to the small sample size. One possible explanation for this is like the externalizing behavior problem items on the CBCL, the majority of the items used in rating impulsivity are observable behaviors that are more salient and less likely to be misinterpreted by the raters (i.e., engages in illegal activities and brags excessively about his/her abilities, accomplishments, or possessions). Along the same lines, the items used in rating callous/unemotional traits are not necessarily observable behaviors and include more emotional or motivational indicators of behavior, and may thus be more widely

open to interpretation (i.e., his/her emotions are shallow and not genuine and he/she is concerned about the feelings of others).

Youths and adults seem to have different views of the youths' psychopathy. When examining the relationship between behaviors and the psychopathy measures it is shown that parents and other adults made a connection between youths' externalizing behaviors and both youths' impulsivity and callous/unemotional traits. On the other hand, the youths did not make a connection between their externalizing problems and either their impulsivity or callous/unemotional traits. For youths, their psychopathy is unrelated to the trouble they get into, suggesting that their emotions are not integrated with their behavior. Whereas parents recognize these characteristics as bad or harmful to others, youth may not make a connection between their externalizing problems and callous/ unemotional traits because they do not see anything wrong with these psychopathic characteristics, but they do recognize that their externalizing behaviors are bad. This leads to the question of why adults make a connection that youth do not, more specifically what is it about psychopathic traits that are so alarming to parents, but not to youth.

Psychopathic "mindlessness" could explain this discrepancy. This lack of interest in processing emotional information and integrating that with behavior may be addressed through narrative richness. Examining personal narratives provides evidence that

these youths' stories, in general, were quite coherent, but low in richness. Coherence was not related to callous/unemotional traits, but richness was related to this psychopathy index, which provides support for the hypothesis. There are a couple of possible explanations for the relationship between psychopathic tendencies and richness. Those who display callous/unemotional traits may not perceive or comprehend emotional information due to deficits in emotional processing, which is a possible explanation supported by other research (Blair, et al., 2001; Loney, et al., 2003). In contrast, if those with psychopathic tendencies truly do not display deficits in emotional processing, these youth may simply not see it as important to portray emotional content to others through personal narratives. According to Rogers (2000), narrative richness is an index of one's motivation to explain personal information to a listener. Despite the attempts on the part of the interviewer through the scaffolded questions, youths' narratives still lacked richness, which lends evidence that youth with psychopathic tendencies may lack motivation, be unable to integrate emotional and cognitive facets of their experience, or some combination of the two.

The findings of this research may be applied to treatment of antisocial youth. First, given that the adults and youth do not agree on certain connections between behavior and psychopathic traits, it is important to understand this discrepancy. Youth agree that their externalizing behaviors are

bad, but they seem to be mindless of the relevance of their psychopathic characteristics to their antisocial behavior. They are not going to “work” on aspects of their behavior that they see as innocuous like callous/unemotional traits, but they may be more willing to work on something like impulsivity where they see more eye-to-eye with their parents and can recognize its harmful effects. Second, more extensive research on personal narrative richness may provide further implications for emotional processing that would be very important in working with youth with psychopathic tendencies.

Three limitations stand out in the current research. First, the sample size is small and a complete data set only existed for 17 participants. Therefore, it is difficult to contend for strong relationships amongst some data due to low statistical power. Secondly, the study is not generalizable to the general population because the sample was pooled from a southern U.S. region and did not include a variety of ethnic backgrounds. Finally, this is a correlational study and causality cannot be inferred from the findings leaving many questions unanswered.

Given that significance was found for key variables, this provides promising implications for replications and extensions of this study in the future. It is suggested that replications should aim to include a more diverse sample of youth (i.e. more ethnic diversity and extend beyond conduct problem youth). Other

relationships should be further examined, as well. One of these is the association between parents and youths' reports of youths' callous/unemotional traits to try to explain the lack of agreement between the two sources. It would also be interesting to further investigate the lack of a relationship between youths' reports of callous/unemotional traits and all reports of externalizing behavior problems where the relationship is significant for parents' reports of callous/unemotional traits. Since a very puzzling feature of psychopathy is the unique contribution of callous/unemotional traits, it may be interesting to study the level of importance each item on the Psychopathy Screening Device has for the individual in order to examine how popular acquiring a certain characteristic may be amongst the population.

The puzzling nature of psychopathy proposes many questions for psychologists. Previous literature sets the path for expanding psychopathy research beyond adults to include more with children and youth and to provide a better understanding of its essence. The current research project provides implications for extending the concept of psychopathy and youth to examining behavior problems and personal narrative coherence and richness. The callous/unemotional characteristics that underlie this concept are shown to be related to antisocial behavior patterns, as well as deficits in emotional processing. With all of this in mind, it is important to understand that antisocial behavior and

psychopathy can be very detrimental and identifying this early in a youth's life can help deter their course. However, the youth must first recognize these as harmful characteristics instead of asking, "What's the problem?"

## References

- Barry, C. T., Frick, P. J., DeShazo, T. M., McCoy, M. G., Ellis, M., & Loney, B. R. (2000). The importance of callous-unemotional traits for extending the concept of psychopathy to children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 109*, 335-340.
- Blair, R. J. R., Colledge, E., Murray, L., & Mitchell, D. G. V. (2001). A selective impairment in processing of sad and fearful expressions in children with psychopathic tendencies. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 29*, 491-498.
- Castlebury, F. D. & Wahler, R. G. (1998). *Guidelines in coding the personal narratives of children, parents, and teachers*. Unpublished manuscript. The University of Tennessee.
- Christian, R. E., Frick, P. J., Hill, N. L., Tyler, L., & Frazer, D. R. (1997). Psychopathy and conduct problems in children: implications for subtyping children with conduct problems. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 36*, 233-241.
- Frick, P. J., Bodin, S. D., & Barry, C. T. (2000). Psychopathic traits and conduct problems in community and clinic-referred samples of children: further development of the psychopathy screening device. *Psychological Assessment, 12*, 382-393.

- Frick, P. J., Lilienfeld, S. O., Ellis, M., Loney, B., & Silverthorn, P. (1999). The association between anxiety and psychopathy dimensions in children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 27, 383-392.
- Frick, P. J., O'Brien, B. S., Wootton, J. M., & McBurnett, K. (1994). Psychopathy and conduct problems in children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103, 700-707.
- Hare, R. D., Hart, S. D., & Harpur, T. J. (1991). Psychopathy and the DSM-IV criteria for antisocial personality disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100, 391-398.
- Lambert, E. W., Wahler, R. G., Andrade, A. R., & Bickman, L. (2001). Looking for disorder in conduct disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 110, 110-123.
- Loney, B. R., Frick, P. J., Clements, C. B., Ellis, M. L., & Kerlin K. (2003). Callous-unemotional traits, impulsivity, and emotional processing in adolescents with antisocial behavior problems. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 32, 66-80.
- Loney, B. R., Frick, P. J., Ellis, M., & McCoy, M. G. (1998). Intelligence, callous-unemotional traits, and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 20, 231-246.
- Lynam, D. R. (1996). Early identification of chronic offenders: who is the fledgling psychopath? *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 209-234.

- Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: a developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, 100, 674-701.
- Rogers, D. T. (2000). The validity of eliciting and coding personal narratives: understanding the properties of coherence and richness. Master's Thesis. University of Tennessee.
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1995). Adult attachment representations, parental responsiveness, and infant attachment: a meta-analysis on the predictive validity of the adult attachment interview. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 387-403.
- Wahler, R. G. & Castlebury, F. D. (2002). Personal narratives as maps of the social ecosystem. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 22, 297-314.

## **Appendix A**

### Personal Narrative Youth Interview

1. What kind of things do you do at home?
2. What do you like best about being at home?
3. What are some things that you don't like about being at home?
4. What is the most interesting thing that happened at home during the last month?
5. Who do you usually do things with at home?
6. What is the last thing that you did with that person?
7. Can you tell me about a time that your feelings were hurt by a family member?
8. When was that? How long ago?
9. Do you remember what you were feeling or thinking when this happened?
10. Did you let them know how you were feeling?
11. Why do you think he/she did that?
12. Did he/she do something to make it better or try and fix things?
13. Did you do something to try and fix things?
14. Is there anything he/she could do now to make it better?
15. If I had him/her here, talking about the same situation, what do you think he/she would say?

## Appendix B

### Personal Narrative Youth Interview Scoring

Each youth's narrative is segmented into "chapters" according to the number of questions (the answer to each question represents one chapter). Each chapter is coded with the following questions and the number of yes answers are tallied and recorded.

#### COHERENCE:

1. Upon reading the narrative do you as the listener *clearly* get the *point (or points)* made by the narrator?
2. Are all the ideas or happenings presented by the narrator *relevant* to the question being asked?
3. Does the narrator's response follow a *clear* progression (beginning, middle, end)?
4. Is the narrator's response free of *tangential* remarks?
5. Do the *parts* of the narrator's response fit together to form a *sensible whole*?

#### RICHNESS:

1. Is at least *one idea* or happening introduced by the narrator *elaborated* beyond its initial introduction?
2. Is at least one *specific* or *concrete* event described?
3. Is the narrator's response free of *vague* or *ambiguous* thought?
4. Does the narrator support a presented idea or happening with *evaluative* remarks?
5. Does the narrator provide information with regard to *others*?

## Appendix C

### Psychopathy Screening Device - Youth Version

ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Please read each statement and decide how much it describes your child. Mark your answer by circling the appropriate number (0-2) for each statement. Do not leave any statements unrated.

	Not at All True	Sometimes True	Definitely True
1. You blame others for your mistakes	0	1	2
2. You engage in illegal activities	0	1	2
3. You care about how well you do at school or work	0	1	2
4. You act without thinking of the consequences	0	1	2
5. Your emotions are shallow and fake	0	1	2
6. You lie easily and skillfully	0	1	2
7. You are good at keeping promises	0	1	2
8. You brag excessively about your abilities, accomplishments or possessions	0	1	2
9. You get bored easily	0	1	2
10. You use or "con" other people to get what you want	0	1	2
11. You tease or make fun of other people	0	1	2
12. You feel bad or guilty when you do something wrong	0	1	2
13. You engage in risky or dangerous activities	0	1	2
14. You act charming and nice to get things you want	0	1	2
15. You get angry when corrected or punished	0	1	2
16. You think that you are better or more important than other people	0	1	2
17. You do not plan ahead or you leave things until the "last minute"	0	1	2
18. You are concerned about the feelings of others	0	1	2
19. You hide your feelings or emotions from others	0	1	2
20. You keep the same friends	0	1	2

## Appendix C (continued)

### Psychopathy Screening Device - Parent Version

ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Please read each statement and decide how much it describes your child. Mark your answer by circling the appropriate number (0-2) for each statement. Do not leave any statements unrated.

	Not at All True	Sometimes True	Definitely True
1. Blames others for his/her mistakes	0	1	2
2. Engages in illegal activities	0	1	2
3. Is concerned about how well he/she does at school or work	0	1	2
4. Acts without thinking of the consequences	0	1	2
5. His/her emotions are shallow and not genuine	0	1	2
6. Lies easily and skillfully	0	1	2
7. Is good at keeping promises	0	1	2
8. Brags excessively about his/her abilities, accomplishments or possessions	0	1	2
9. Gets bored easily	0	1	2
10. Uses or "cons" other people to get what he/she wants	0	1	2
11. Teases or makes fun of others	0	1	2
12. Feels bad or guilty when he/she does something wrong	0	1	2
13. Engages in risky or dangerous activities	0	1	2
14. Can be charming at times, but in ways that seem insincere or superficial	0	1	2
15. Becomes angry when corrected or punished	0	1	2
16. Seems to think that he/she is better or more important than other people	0	1	2
17. Does not plan ahead or leaves things until the "last minute"	0	1	2
18. Is concerned about the feelings of others	0	1	2
19. Does not show feelings or emotions	0	1	2
20. Keeps the same friends	0	1	2

## Appendix D

**Table 1:** Means & Standard Deviations of  
Adult & Youth Measures

	Mean	SD
Referral Severity of Offense Index	3.24	1.09
Impulsivity (parent report)	9.55	3.55
Impulsivity (youth report)	8.36	2.83
Callous/Unemotional (parent report)	4.88	2.83
Callous/Unemotional (youth report)	4.27	1.89
Externalizing Behavior (parent report)	65.00	11.25
Externalizing Behavior (other adult report)	62.89	8.28
Externalizing Behavior (youth report)	60.40	8.83
Coherence (scaffolded)	3.84	0.59
Richness (scaffolded)	0.78	0.44
Verbal IQ	98.34	13.00
Performance IQ	93.77	10.70
Full Scale IQ	95.78	12.53

## Appendix D (continued)

**Table 2:** Correlations for Impulsivity, Callous/Unemotional Traits, & Externalizing Behaviors

	Callous/ Unemotional		Impulsivity		Externalizing Behavior		
	(parent report) n=33	(youth report) n=33	(parent report) n=33	(youth report) n=33	(parent report) n=19	(adult report) n=19	(youth report) n=19
Callous/Unemotional (parent report)	-	0.26	0.55**	-0.13	0.52*	0.61**	0.28
Callous/Unemotional (youth report)		-	0.29	0.40*	0.11	-0.16	0.01
Impulsivity (parent report)			-	0.35*	0.78**	0.49*	0.56*
Impulsivity (youth report)				-	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01
Externalizing Behavior (parent report)					-	0.62** (n=17)	0.60**
Externalizing Behavior (other adult report)						-	0.39 (n=18)
Externalizing Behavior (youth report)							-

2-tailed significance levels: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01

## **Vita**

Jessica Lynn Von Herbulis was born in Orlando, Florida on September 24, 1978 and was raised in Central Florida. She attended Idywilde Elementary School, Deltona Lakes Elementary School, and Deltona Middle School. She graduated from Pine Ridge High School in 1997. From there, she attended Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. She received a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in psychology and a minor in sociology in 2001. She then attended the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and earned a Master of Arts degree in Psychology in 2003.

5897 9063 26  
08/27/03 MAB 