

Research Article

Personality Type, Psychopathy and Violence among Political Workers

Saad Ullah¹, Salman Ayyaz², Dr. Sher Dil^{3*}

Saad ullah

Visiting Lecturer,

Department of Psychology, Hazara University Mansehra KP, Pakistan

saadkhattak577@gmail.com

Salman Ayyaz

M.Phil. Scholar

Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology D.I.Khan, KP, Pakistan

Salmanayyaz99@gmail.com

Dr. Sher Dil

Assistant Professor

Department of Psychology, Hazara University Mansehra, KP, Pakistan

Abstract

The objective of the current research focuses on the personality type, psychopathy and violence among political workers. It also examines age and gender differences on personality type and psychopathy among 280 political workers ($M=23.78$, $SD=4.92$). Four scales such as Big-Five Personality Measurement Instrument-An Urdu Translation, Urdu Psychopathy Scale, Attitude towards Interpersonal Peer Violence Scale, and Attitude toward Guns and Violence Scale were used. Findings showed that psychopathy was significantly positively associated with interpersonal peer violence, agreeableness and conscientiousness; while significantly negatively associated with extraversion and neuroticism among political workers. Results also revealed that age had significant positive association with psychopathy and agreeableness; while significant negative association with extraversion and conscientiousness. Significant gender differences were observed on psychopathy, extraversion and conscientiousness; that female political workers had higher scores on these variables compared to male counterparts in the current sample. This study has contributed considerably in the field of psychology, criminology, forensics, and criminal justice system, by finding the association of personality type, psychopathy and violence; and their incidence in the people of various ages and also their differences in male and female.

Keywords: Personality type. Psychopathy. Violence. Age. Gender. Political workers.

Introduction

Personality has characters and traits that make you different from everyone. It is somehow more complex to define in psychological studies. American Psychological Association (APA) defined personality is an individual differences in cognition, affection, and behavior (APA, 2019). It is the design of mental processes and affections that lead to actions (Revelle & Wilt, 2013). Mayer (2006) was on the view that personality is the pattern of psychological processes appeared from thinking, feelings, and motives. So as to know clearly what is personality? We must take a glance of five factors model of personality (McCrae, Costa, Pervin, & John, 1999). Dimensions of this model are; openness to experience, conscientiousness (CON), extraversion (EX), agreeableness (AG), and neuroticism (NE; using acronym for these damnations is OCEAN). According to Rossberger (2014), currently this model is extensively recognizable. A brief description of the FFM is given here;

Openness to experience is the degree to which a person displays rational interest, mindfulness, and individuality/nonconformity (Rossberger, 2014). Wang and Yang (2005) suggested that a person having the trait of openness to experience will be curious, visionary, inventive, change with experiences and easily adopt different cultures. One high in this trait is art enthusiast, like and appreciate to learn new things, participate in creative work, and love to make new friends; while low in this trait is just the opposite and most likely favours activities of daily routine and do not want varieties, sticky, and do not enjoy fun and enjoyment (Lebowitz, 2016; Pappas, 2017).

CON is the degree, to which a person gives importance to a plan or an idea, has perseverance, and focus on goals (Rossberger, 2014). One high in this trait become trained, stable, arranger and is responsible of his job, while low in this trait is unplanned, impulsive, and carefree. It is useful and good to possess this characteristic because it is associated with an attainment of goals (Lebowitz, 2016; Pappas, 2017).

EX is the degree to which a person involves in the outside environment, experiencing excitement and optimistic emotions (Lebowitz, 2016). EX vs introversion is perhaps the most familiar trait of the personality. One high in this trait mostly talkative, friendly, seek and take energy from throng, engage in public gatherings, confident and joyful being in festivity. While an introvert prefer to live lonely and is taciturn (may be his/her mental processes operate social gatherings in a different way). People are confused while differencing between introversion and shyness. An introvert become pleasant in gatherings but has a preference of many individuals in the group or party, while a person feeling shyness has an anxiety of being in gatherings and do not participate easily (Lebowitz, 2016; Pappas, 2017).

Abbreviations: PSY = Psychopathy; IPV = Interpersonal Peer Violence; GV = Guns and Violence; NE = Neuroticism; EX = Extraversion; AG = Agreeableness; CON = Conscientiousness; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit.

Pappas (2017) suggested that AG is the degree to which a person feels love and kindheartedness. According to Lebowitz (2016) AG is the degree to which a person prefers helping others, sincerity, truthfulness, politeness, and has optimism. One high in this trait is mostly cooperative, sympathetic, and trustful, while a disagreeable person become unfriendly, don't help and engage with others, and has suspiciousness about others (Lebowitz, 2016; Pappas, 2017). Lebowitz (2016) defined the NE is

the degree to which a person feels destructive, unhealthy emotions, impulsivity. Moreover, a neurotic person shows different type of behaviors due to social pressure. One high in this trait often feels anxious and depressed, even when everything is fine then a neurotic will search new situation/thing to feel anxious about. While one low in this trait become bold, self-assured, and emotional stability (Lebowitz, 2016; Pappas, 2017).

Five factors of personality have been strongly associated to psychopathy (Hare and Neumann 2008; Lilienfeld et al., 2012; Lynam et al., 2005; Miller & Lynam, 2003; Skeem, Polaschek, Patrick, & Lilienfeld, 2011). One of the core construct of personality is labeled psychopathy (PSY) that is widely researched personality disorder (Patrick, 2018). Verona and Patrick (2015) defined PSY- marked by antisocial and impulsive behavior having distinctive affective as well as interpersonal features resulting in dominant and powerful social style. Psychopaths exhibit cruelty, callousness, emotional insensitivity and manipulation. Neumann, Hare, and Pardini (2015) categorized psychopathic personality as severe multifaceted personality disorder having many traits and based on four distinct dimensions: behavior/lifestyle, affective, interpersonal, and antisocial.

Edens (2006) reported a prevalence rate of 1% among general population and 15-30% among criminals (see also Glenn & Raine, 2008; Kiehl, 2006). Salekin (2008) reported that people scores more on psychopathy (severe psychopaths) commit a disproportionate amount of crimes having poor response to treatments, and have high rates of recidivism. The third major variable of the current study is violence- an intentionally exercises physical force or power is considered as violence. It includes threatening or actual physical force that is directed towards oneself or others may be directed against group or community, and there is a likelihood injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation (WHO, 2002). Violence can also be classified as acts of omission or neglect along with physical or psychological violence (Rutherford, Zwi, Grove, & Butchart, 2007).

There is a large body of research that identified PSY as one of the risk factors for violence (Guy, Douglas, & Hendry, 2010); and has considerable impact on the violence (Coid & Yang, 2011; Farrington, Ullrich, & Salekin, 2010). Schraft, Kosson, and McBride (2013) pointed out that psychopaths inflict damage to society by causing emotional abuse, psychical and emotional neglect. They also proposed that violence within home and community relate to higher levels of PSY. Research evidences suggest that PSY is a predisposed personality that increases the likelihood of perpetration of chronic and severe violent crimes (Reidy, Kearns, & DeGue, 2013). Researchers have demonstrated the association between PSY, persistent aggressive traits and violent behavior (Anderson & Kiehl, 2013; Brook, 2015). Blais, Solodukhin, and Forth (2014) found the moderate association between PSY and violence.

The current study also proposed to check age and gender differences on personality type and PSY. Age is positively related with AG and CON (Costa & McCrae, 2006; Donnellan & Lucas, 2008; Kawamoto et al., 2015; Lehmann, Denissen, Allemand, & Penke, 2013). Lehmann et al. (2013) revealed that in adolescence the level of EX increases with age. Consistently, Slobodskaya and Kornienko (2021) suggested that age is positively associated with AG, CON and NE. Age and neurotic experiences are positively related (Lindner, Aschwanden, Zimmermann, & Allemand, 2021). Lehmann and Ittel (2012) said that both males and females have psychopathic traits, and there are gender differences on PSY (Hicks, Vaidyanathan, & Patrick, 2010; Lee & Salekin, 2010). Many studies noted gender differences on big five personality traits (Klimstra, Hale-III, Raaijmakers, Branje, & Meeus, 2009; Weisberg, DeYoung, & Hirsh, 2011).

Rational of the study

Many studies investigated the relationship of PSY with different variables like; personality factors, alexithymia and stress (e.g., Singh, Arteché, & Holder, 2011), violent criminal behaviour (e.g., Shagufta, 2020), PSY in forensic-psychiatric sample (e.g., Decuyper, De-Fruyt, & Buschman, 2008; Hildebrand & de-Ruiter, 2004), vulnerable narcissism and borderline personality disorder (e.g., Miller et al., 2010). Present study focused on personality type, PSY and violence among political workers. Secondly, it investigated age and gender differences on personality type and PSY; and no study has been found on these variables in Pakistani culture as well as in political workers, so the current study will fill the gap in the literature. In the present study, the authors included four personality types (CON, EX, AG and NE) and dropped openness.

Objectives

The objectives of the current study were to explore the association of personality type, PSY and violence among political workers. Moreover, it was proposed to find out demographic differences (age and gender) on personality type and PSY among political workers.

Hypotheses

1. PSY will have positive relationship with violence, NE, EX, AG and CON.
2. Age will have positive association with PSY, NE, EX, AG and NE.
3. Gender will have significant differences on PSY, NE, EX, AG and CON.

Method

Sample

A sample of 280 political workers was selected from different areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and categorized into male ($n = 247$) and female ($n = 33$).

Table 1

Distribution of Demographic Characteristics

Gender	N	%
Male	247	88.21%
Female	33	11.79%

Note. Demographic characteristics of gender.

Assessment Measures

Big-Five Personality Measurement Instrument-An Urdu Translation (BFI). The Big Five Personality Instrument an Urdu version is 120 (Khan, Khan, Ghani, & Shafi, 2013) items scale used to measure personality type in relation to five major domains: neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness. Higher scores on the scale indicate high level of personality type. In the current study the alpha reliabilities for neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness are .61, .61, .61, and .74 respectively.

Urdu psychopathy Scale (UPS). The scale comprises of 70 items rated on a five-point Likert-type scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree) and alpha reliability of the scale was .90 (Dil & Kazmi, 2016). Reverse coded items included 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 25, 36, 37, 39, 42, 52, 55, and 59. The alpha reliability for the scale is $\alpha = .85$ in the current study.

Attitude towards Interpersonal Peer Violence Scale (IPVS). The scale was developed by Slaby (1989) to assess violent attitude orientations. The scale has 14 items and the reliability was .80. The reverse coded items were 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 12. Higher score indicate high level of orientation. In the current study the alpha reliability for the scale is $\alpha = .58$.

Attitude toward Guns and Violence Scale (GVS). An attitude toward guns and violence scale is 23 items scale and reported alpha reliability was .88 (Shapiro, Dorman, Burkley, Walker, & Clough, 1997) used to measure attitude or inclination to use guns and violence. Item no 1, 4, and 6 are reverse coded items. Higher scores on this scale is indicative of attraction towards guns and violence. In the current the alpha reliability for this scale is $\alpha = .73$.

Procedure

A conveniently selected sample of 280 political workers was approached individually and handed over informed consent form, demographic sheet and questionnaires. Prior to research they were told about nature and purpose of research and were requested to cooperate by giving honest responses. They were guaranteed regarding the confidentiality of their provided information and updated them that the collected information would be used for the research purposes only. They were instructed to fill the questionnaires. Soon after, the participants were decently thanked and esteemed for their precious involvement in the study.

Analysis and Interpretation

SPSS-23 version was use to analyze the data based on the objectives and hypotheses of the study. To check internal consistency alpha reliability was computed. Descriptive statistics was used to explain the mean psychometric properties of all scales. Correlational analyses were performed to check strength and direction of relationship between variables, and t-test was applied to check gender differences on study variables.

Results

Table 2

Alpha Reliability Coefficient of Urdu Psychopathy Scale (UPS), Interpersonal Peer Violence Scale (IPVS), Guns and Violence Scale (GVS), Neuroticism (NE), Extroversion (EX), Agreeableness (AG), and Conscientiousness (CON; N=280)

Scales	N	SD	M	α	Range		Skew	Kurtosis
					Actual	Potential		
UPS	70	24.96	200.98	.851	140-25	70-350	.142	-0.64
IPVS	14	4.41	36.56	.583	21-48	14-56	-.394	0.44
GVS	23	6.18	39.81	.734	28-54	23-69	.141	-0.76
NE	23	8.92	68.9	.616	48-90	23-115	.075	-0.51
EX	21	8.01	51.3	.617	28-83	21-105	.392	1.07
AG	24	8.77	63.6	.615	48-89	24-120	.508	-0.17
CON	24	11.24	64.1	.764	31-108	24-120	.108	0.27

Note. UPS = Urdu Psychopathy Scale; IPVS = Interpersonal Peer Violence Scale; GVS = Guns and Violence Scale; NE = Neuroticism; EX = Extraversion; AG = Agreeableness; CON = Conscientiousness.

Table 2 describes that alpha reliability coefficients for UPS, ATIPVS, ATGVS, NE, EX, AG and CON are .851, .583, .734, .616, .617, .615, and .764 respectively, which indicates that these scales are reliable and have above average level of internal consistency.

Table 3

Correlation matrix of age with Urdu Psychopathy Scale (UPS), Interpersonal Peer Violence Scale (IPVS), Guns and Violence Scale (GVS), Neuroticism (NE), Extraversion (EX), Agreeableness (AG), and Conscientiousness (CON; N = 280)

S. No	Variables	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	M	SD
I	Age	-	.01	-.01	.06	-.08	-.00	.03	-.01	23.78	4.92
II	UPS	-	-	.04	.10	-.31**	-.00	.44**	.28**	192.23	23.3
III	IPVS	-	-	-	.03	-.07	-.06	-.10	-.03	36.54	4.42
IV	GVS	-	-	-	-	.02	.10	.03	.07	39.80	6.18
V	NE	-	-	-	-	-	-.11	.24**	-.50**	68.97	8.92
VI	EX	-	-	-	-	-	-	.12*	.42**	51.34	8.01
VII	AG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.48**	63.72	8.77
VIII	CON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64.10	11.2

Note. UPS = Urdu Psychopathy Scale; IPVS = Interpersonal Peer Violence Scale; GVS = Guns and Violence Scale; NE = Neuroticism; EX = Extraversion; AG = Agreeableness; CON = Conscientiousness.

Table 3 indicates that age has significant positive correlation with PSY and AG, shows non-significant positive correlation with GV, shows significant negative correlation with IPV, EX and CON, and shows non-significant negative correlation with NE. PSY shows significant positive correlation with IPV, AG and CON, non-significant positive correlation with GV, significant negative correlation with EX and NE.

Table 4

Mean, Standard Deviation, and t- values of Gender on Urdu Psychopathy Scale (UPS), Interpersonal Peer Violence Scale (IPVS), Guns and Violence Scale (GVS), Neuroticism (NE), Extraversion (EX), Agreeableness (AG), and Conscientiousness (CON; N = 280)

Scale	Male (n = 247)		Female (n = 33)		T	p	95% CI		Cohen's D
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL	
UPS	199.2	25.03	213.81	20.53	-3.2	.002	-23.5	-5.6	-0.37
IPVS	36.48	4.59	36.93	2.78	-.56	.58	-2.07	1.15	-0.06
GVS	39.87	6.25	39.30	5.73	.49	.62	-1.68	2.83	0.05
NE	69.17	8.60	67.51	11.02	1.00	.32	-1.59	4.91	0.11
EX	50.93	7.62	54.45	10.05	-2.4	.02	-6.42	-.62	-.02
AG	63.69	8.54	63.45	10.50	.14	.88	-2.96	3.45	0.01
CON	63.57	10.57	68.06	14.98	-2.2	.03	-8.6	-.40	-0.25

Note. UPS = Urdu Psychopathy Scale; IPVS = Interpersonal Peer Violence Scale; GVS = Guns and Violence Scale; NE = Neuroticism; EX = Extraversion; AG = Agreeableness; CON = Conscientiousness.

The results in Table 4 indicates significant differences between males and females on PSY, EX and CON; shows non-significant difference between males and females on IPV, GV, NE and AG.

Discussion

The present study was aimed to find out the relationship of personality type, psychopathy and violence among political workers. It was also intended to check age and gender differences on selected variables. Four scales were used on 280 political workers. Firstly, the researchers computed the alpha reliability estimates for the used scale and were found satisfactory as; UPS, IPVS, GVS, NE, EX, AG and CON have .851, .583, .734, .616, .617, .615 and .764 respectively.

The data analysis revealed that PSY has positive correlation with violence (see Table 3), which supported first hypothesis of the study. The results are in line with previous literature. PSY was found to have association with youth violence (Baskin-Sommers & Newman, 2012; Blair & Lee, 2013; Skeem et al., 2011). Thomson, Towl, and Centifanti (2016) suggested that the association of PSY with violence is well known in adults. Psychopaths are more violent than non-psychopaths (Murrie, Cornell, Kaplan, McConville, & Levy-Elkon, 2004); and PSY is a strong predictor of violent behaviors in prisoners (Theobald, Farrington, Coid, & Piquero, 2016).

Results of the current study showed that PSY has a significant positive association with AG and CON (see Table 3), which supported the first hypothesis of the study. Findings of Paulhus and Williams (2002) supported results of the current study that PSY and AG are positively related. Lynam and Miller (2015) suggested that psychopaths are somewhat high in all facets of AG (except trust). PSY is strongly related to CON (Decuyper et al., 2008; Harpur, Hart, & Hare, 2002; Knap, 2000). The results of Singh et al. (2011) found that CON predicted PSY.

Results of the ongoing study indicated that PSY has a significant negative relationship with EX and NE (see Table 3). Previous studies noted this association, such as, negative association was seen between PSY and EX (Berg, Hecht, Latzman, & Lilienfeld, 2015; Ross, Benning, Patrick,

Thompson, & Thurston, 2009; Smith, Edens, & Vaughn, 2011). There are mixed results in the literature regarding the association of PSY and NE, such as Miller and Lynam (2015) revealed that in 18 PSY scales 4 were negatively, 4 were positively, and 10 were unrelated with NE.

The data analysis of the current study also revealed that age has a positive relationship with PSY (see Table 3). Previous researcher found relationship between the two such as Conradi, Boertien, Cavus, and Verschuere (2016) found that age had a positive relationship with PSY. Current findings indicated significant positive association between age and AG; significant negative association with EX and CON; while showed non-significant negative association with NE (see Table 3). These results found support in previous literature, such as, age and AG are positively correlated (Lehmann et al., 2013). Age is negatively correlated with EX (Donnellan & Lucas, 2008). Consistently, age is negatively associated with EX and NE (Costa & McCrae, 2006; Lehmann et al., 2013). In some cases CON do not change with age or even decrease with age (Ludtke, Roberts, Trautwein, & Nagy, 2011).

The results also showed that gender differences exist on PSY and female political workers have higher rate of PSY compared to male counterparts (see table 4). Results of the current study are contradictory with previous studies that suggested that males scored significantly higher on PSY than females (Cima & Raine, 2009; Dil & Kazmi, 2016; Hicks et al., 2010). Finally, results of the ongoing study concluded that females scored more than males on EX and CON; while no gender differences were noted on AG and NE (see Table 4). These results are in line with some earlier researches that suggested that females have higher levels of EX (Kawamoto et al., 2015; Lehmann et al., 2013; McCrae et al., 2002), and CON (Branje, Van-Lieshout, & Gerris, 2007). Branje et al. (2007) revealed that there are no gender differences on AG and NE.

Conclusion

The results indicated that as the level of PSY increases, the IPV also increases in political workers. Psychopaths are high on AG and CON traits of personality while low on EX and NE. It is also concluded that PSY is increases with age in political workers. As political workers get older their AG traits increases while EX and CONS traits of personality decreases. Further, the current study also revealed that female political workers have high level of PSY, and they scored more on AG and CON traits of personality. This study has few limitations and are important to mention here for consideration of future research. In this study the sample size was small, studied only age and gender differences on personality type and PSY, and the scales that are administered to collect data were not specific to measure political violence. So, it is recommended for other researchers to increase sample size, must focus on other demographic differences as well (birth order, income, caste, etc.), and only specific scales should use to measure political violence. Nowadays, everywhere in the world politicians and political workers are arguing, hating, and fighting each other due to which even ordinary citizens fight with the slaves of each other's party; and disturb the daily life and peace of society as a whole. Therefore, this study was necessary to see as there's any link among personality type, PSY and violence among political workers. Findings of this study are very helpful for psychologists, social workers, policy makers, and police so that they can know the association between the study variables, to figure out whether with age it is increasing or not as well as to determine its level of prevalence in men and women political workers respectively.

References

1. American Psychological Association. (2019). *Personality*. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/topics/personality#>.

2. Anderson, N. E., & Kiehl, K. A. (2013). Psychopathy and aggression: when paralimbic dysfunction leads to violence. In *Neuroscience of aggression* (pp. 369-393): Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/7854_2013_257
3. Baskin-Sommers, A. R., & Newman, J. P. (2012). Cognition–emotion interactions in psychopathy: implications for theory and practice. *Psychopathy and the law*, 79-98. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781119944980#page=96>
4. Berg, J. M., Hecht, L. K., Latzman, R. D., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2015). Examining the correlates of the coldheartedness factor of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Revised. *Psychological assessment*, 27(4), 1494-1499. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000129>
5. Blair, R. J. R., & Lee, T. M. (2013). The social cognitive neuroscience of aggression, violence, and psychopathy. *Social Neuroscience*, 8(2), 108-111. 0.1080/17470919.2012.757869
6. Blais, J., Solodukhin, E., & Forth, A. E. (2014). A meta-analysis exploring the relationship between psychopathy and instrumental versus reactive violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(7), 797-821. [10.1177/0093854813519629](https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813519629)
7. Branje, S. J., Van-Lieshout, C. F., & Gerris, J. R. (2007). Big Five personality development in adolescence and adulthood. *European Journal of Personality*, 21(1), 45-62. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.596>
8. Brook, M. (2015). The role of psychopathic and antisocial personality traits in violence risk assessment: Implications for forensic practice. *Psychiatric Annals*, 45(4), 175-180. 10.3928/00485713-20150401-05
9. Cima, M., & Raine, A. (2009). Distinct characteristics of psychopathy relate to different subtypes of aggression. *Personality and individual differences*, 47(8), 835-840. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.031>
10. Coid, J., & Yang, M. (2011). The impact of psychopathy on violence among the household population of Great Britain. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 46(6), 473-480. [10.1007/s00127-010-0212-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-010-0212-4)
11. Coid, J., Yang, M., Ullrich, S., Roberts, A., & Hare, R. D. (2009). Prevalence and correlates of psychopathic traits in the household population of Great Britain. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, 32(2), 65-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2009.01.002>
12. Conradi, H. J., Boertien, S. D., Cavus, H., & Verschuere, B. (2016). Examining psychopathy from an attachment perspective: The role of fear of rejection and abandonment. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 27(1), 92-109. 10.1080/14789949.2015.1077264
13. Costa Jr, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2006). Age changes in personality and their origins: Comment on Roberts, Walton, and Viechtbauer (2006). *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 26-28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.26>
14. Decuyper, M., De Fruyt, F., & Buschman, J. (2008). A five-factor model perspective on psychopathy and comorbid Axis-II disorders in a forensic–psychiatric sample. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 31(5), 394-406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2008.08.008>
15. Dil, S., & Kazmi, F. (2016). Psychopathic inclination among incarcerated youth of Hazara Division Pakistan. *SAGE Open*, 6(3). 2158244016671558
16. Donnellan, M. B., & Lucas, R. E. (2008). Age differences in the Big Five across the life span: evidence from two national samples. *Psychology and aging*, 23(3), 558-566. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012897>
17. Edens, J. F. (2006). Unresolved controversies concerning psychopathy: Implications for clinical and forensic decision making. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 37(1), 59. [10.1037/0735-7028.37.1.59](https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.37.1.59)
18. Farrington, D. P., Ullrich, S., & Salekin, R. T. (2010). Environmental influences on child and adolescent psychopathy. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119944980.ch10>

19. Glenn, A. L., & Raine, A. (2008). The neurobiology of psychopathy. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 31(3), 463-475. [10.1016/j.psc.2008.03.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psc.2008.03.004)
20. Grann, M. (2000). The PCL–R and gender. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 16(3), 147-149. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.16.3.147>
21. Guy, L. S., Douglas, K. S., & Hendry, M. C. (2010). The role of psychopathic personality disorder in violence risk assessments using the HCR-20. *Journal of personality disorders*, 24(5), 551-580. [10.1521/pedi.2010.24.5.551](https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2010.24.5.551)
22. Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2008). Psychopathy as a clinical and empirical construct. *Annu. Rev. Clin. Psychol.*, 4, 217-246. Retrieved from <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091452>
23. Harpur, T. J., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (2002). Personality of the psychopath. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2001-05663-019>
24. Hicks, B. M., Vaidyanathan, U., & Patrick, C. J. (2010). Validating female psychopathy subtypes: Differences in personality, antisocial and violent behavior, substance abuse, trauma, and mental health. *Personality Disorders: Theory, research, and treatment*, 1(1), 38-57. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018135>
25. Hildebrand, M., & de-Ruiter, C. (2004). PCL-R psychopathy and its relation to DSM-IV Axis I and II disorders in a sample of male forensic psychiatric patients in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 27(3), 233-248. [10.1016/j.ijlp.2004.03.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2004.03.005)
26. Jackson, C. L., Hanson, R. F., Amstadter, A. B., Saunders, B. E., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (2013). The longitudinal relation between peer violent victimization and delinquency: Results from a national representative sample of US adolescents. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 28(8), 1596-1616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512468328>
27. Kawamoto, T., Oshio, A., Abe, S., Tsubota, Y., Hirashima, T., Ito, H., & Tani, I. (2015). Age and Gender Differences of Big Five Personality Traits in a Cross-Sectional Japanese Sample. *Japanese Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 26(2), 107-122. Retrieved from <https://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=09159029&AN=108400723&h=VD4RQq3qwjjOdfoq0XfKf4MapHET>
28. Khan, A., Khan, A., Ghani, K., & Shafi, M. (2013). Big five personality measurement instrument: An urdu translation. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences*. Retrieved from <https://dlwqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/39609695/BMSS-I.pdf?1446469618=&response->
29. Kiehl, K. A. (2006). A cognitive neuroscience perspective on psychopathy: Evidence for paralimbic system dysfunction. *Psychiatry research*, 142(2-3), 107-128. [10.1016/j.psychres.2005.09.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2005.09.013)
30. Klimstra, T. A., Hale-III, W. W., Raaijmakers, Q. A., Branje, S. J., & Meeus, W. H. (2009). Maturation of personality in adolescence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 96(4), 898-912. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014746>
31. Knap, M. A. (2000). The Five-Factor Model of personality and psychopathy. Retrieved from <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=5447590>
32. Lebowitz, S. (2016). The'Big 5'personality traits could predict who will and won't become a leader. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Lebowitz%2C
33. Lee, Z., & Salekin, R. T. (2010). Psychopathy in a noninstitutional sample: Differences in primary and secondary subtypes. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 1(3), 153. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019269>
34. Lehmann, A., & Ittel, A. (2012). Aggressive behavior and measurement of psychopathy in female inmates of German prisons—A preliminary study. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 35(3), 190-197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2012.02.007>
35. Lehmann, R., Denissen, J. J., Allemand, M., & Penke, L. (2013). Age and gender differences in motivational manifestations of the Big Five from age 16 to 60. *Developmental psychology*, 49(2), 365-383. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028277>

36. Lilienfeld, S. O., Waldman, I. D., Landfield, K., Watts, A. L., Rubenzer, S., & Faschingbauer, T. R. (2012). Fearless dominance and the US presidency: Implications of psychopathic personality traits for successful and unsuccessful political leadership. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *103*(3), 489-505. [10.1037/a0029392](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029392)
37. Lindner, S., Aschwanden, D., Zimmermann, J., & Allemand, M. (2021). How do personality traits manifest in daily life of older adults?. *European Journal of Ageing*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-020-00598-z>
38. Ludtke, O., Roberts, B. W., Trautwein, U., & Nagy, G. (2011). A random walk down university avenue: life paths, life events, and personality trait change at the transition to university life. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *101*(3), 620-637. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023743>
39. Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2015). Psychopathy from a basic trait perspective: The utility of a five-factor model approach. *Journal of Personality*, *83*(6), 611-626. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12132>
40. Lynam, D. R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Raine, A., Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (2005). Adolescent psychopathy and the Big Five: Results from two samples. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, *33*(4), 431-443. doi:[10.1007/s10648-005-5724-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-005-5724-0)
41. Mayer, J. D. (2006). A classification of DSM-IV-TR mental disorders according to their relation to the personality system. Retrieved from https://scholars.unh.edu/psych_facpub/369/
42. McCrae, R. R., Costa Jr, P. T., Terracciano, A., Parker, W. D., Mills, C. J., De Fruyt, F., & Mervielde, I. (2002). Personality trait development from age 12 to age 18: Longitudinal, cross-sectional and cross-cultural analyses. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *83*(6), 1456-1468. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1456>
43. McCrae, R., Costa Jr, P., Pervin, L., & John, O. (1999). A Five-Factor theory of personality Handbook of personality: Theory and research, (pp. 139-153). In: New York, NY, US: Guilford Press. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2008-11667-005>
44. Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2003). Psychopathy and the five-factor model of personality: A replication and extension. *Journal of personality assessment*, *81*(2), 168-178. [0.1207/S15327752JPA8102_08](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327752JPA8102_08)
45. Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2015). Understanding psychopathy using the basic elements of personality. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *9*(5), 223-237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12170>
46. Miller, J. D., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Searching for a vulnerable dark triad: Comparing factor 2 psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of personality*, *78*(5), 1529-1564. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00660.x>
47. Murrie, D. C., Cornell, D. G., Kaplan, S., McConville, D., & Levy-Elkon, A. (2004). Psychopathy scores and violence among juvenile offenders: a multi-measure study. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *22*(1), 49-67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.573>
48. Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D., & Pardini, D. A. (2015). Antisociality and the construct of psychopathy: Data from across the globe. *Journal of Personality*, *83*(6), 678-692. [10.1111/jopy.12127](https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12127)
49. Pappas, S. (2017). Personality traits & personality types: What is personality. *Live science contributor*. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Pappas%2C
50. Patrick, C. J. (2018). *Handbook of psychopathy*: Guilford Publications.
51. Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of research in personality*, *36*(6), 556-563. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
52. Reidy, D. E., Kearns, M. C., & DeGue, S. (2013). Reducing psychopathic violence: A review of the treatment literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *18*(5), 527-538. [10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.008)

53. Revelle, W., & Wilt, J. (2013). The general factor of personality: A general critique. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(5), 493-504. [10.1016/j.jrp.2013.04.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.04.012)
54. Ross, S. R., Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Thompson, A., & Thurston, A. (2009). Factors of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Criterion-related validity and relationship to the BIS/BAS and Five-Factor Models of Personality. *Assessment*, 16(1), 71-87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191108322207>
55. Rossberger, R. J. (2014). National personality profiles and innovation: The role of cultural practices. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 23(3), 331-348. [10.1111/caim.12075](https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12075)
56. Rutherford, A., Zwi, A. B., Grove, N. J., & Butchart, A. (2007). Violence: a glossary. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 61(8), 676-680. [10.1136/jech.2005.043711](https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.043711)
57. Salekin, R. T. (2008). Psychopathy and recidivism from mid-adolescence to young adulthood: Cumulating legal problems and limiting life opportunities. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 117(2), 386. [10.1037/0021-843X.117.2.386](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.117.2.386)
58. Schraft, C. V., Kosson, D. S., & McBride, C. K. (2013). Exposure to violence within home and community environments and psychopathic tendencies in detained adolescents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(9), 1027-1043. [10.1177/0093854813486887](https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813486887)
59. Shagufta, S. (2020). Psychopathy Predicting Violent Criminal Behaviour among Adult Offenders. *Psychologia. Avances de la Disciplina*, 14(1), 75-83. <https://doi.org/10.21500/19002386.4316>
60. Shapiro, J. P., Dorman, R. L., Burkes, W. M., Welker, C. J., & Clough, J. B. (1997). Development and factor analysis of a measure of youth attitudes toward guns and violence. *Journal of clinical child psychology*, 26(3), 311-320. [10.1207/s15374424jccp2603_10](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp2603_10)
61. Singh, K., Arteché, A., & Holder, M. D. (2011). Personality factors and psychopathy, alexithymia and stress. *Asian journal of psychiatry*, 4(1), 35-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2011.01.003>
62. Skeem, J. L., Polaschek, D. L., Patrick, C. J., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2011). Psychopathic personality: Bridging the gap between scientific evidence and public policy. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(3), 95-162. [10.1177/1529100611426706](https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611426706)
63. Slaby, R. (1989). An evaluation of a violence prevention program. Health program for urban youth. *Newton, Massachusetts: Education development center*. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Slaby%2C+R.+%281989%29.+An+evaluation+of+a+violence+
64. Slobodskaya, H. R., & Kornienko, O. S. (2021). Age and gender differences in personality traits from early childhood through adolescence. *Journal of Personality*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12624>
65. Smith, S. T., Edens, J. F., & Vaughn, M. G. (2011). Assessing the external correlates of alternative factor models of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Short Form across three samples. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 93(3), 244-256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2011.558876>
66. Theobald, D., Farrington, D. P., Coid, J. W., & Piquero, A. R. (2016). Are male perpetrators of intimate partner violence different from convicted violent offenders? Examination of psychopathic traits and life success in males from a community survey. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 31(9), 1687-1718. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515569061>
67. Thomson, N. D., Towl, G. J., & Centifanti, L. (2016). The habitual female offender inside: How psychopathic traits predict chronic prison violence. *Law and human behavior*, 40(3), 257-269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000178>
68. Verona, E., & Patrick, C. J. (2015). Psychobiological aspects of antisocial personality disorder, psychopathy, and violence. *Psychiatric Times*, 32(3), 49. Retrieved from scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Verona%2C+E.%2C+%26+Patrick%2C+C.+J.+%282015%29.

69. Verona, E., Sprague, J., & Javdani, S. (2012). Gender and factor-level interactions in psychopathy: Implications for self-directed violence risk and borderline personality disorder symptoms. *Personality Disorders: Theory, research, and treatment*, 3(3), 247-262. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025945>
70. Wang, H.-I., & Yang, H.-L. (2005). The role of personality traits in UTAUT model under online stocking. *Contemporary management research*, 1(1), 69-82. [10.7903/cmr.73](https://doi.org/10.7903/cmr.73)
71. Weisberg, Y. J., DeYoung, C. G., & Hirsh, J. B. (2011). Gender differences in personality across the ten aspects of the Big Five. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2, 178. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00178>