Our April meeting saw a return to forensic psychology when Dr Lynsey Gozna, Lecturer in Forensic Psychology and Clinical Psychology at the University of Surrey, addressed us. Ann Rodrigues reports.

Lynsey’s experience includes research and consultancy in forensic and military psychology. She has worked in probation hostels, psychiatric units and hospitals, and with many police forces in the UK and abroad. Currently she is working with the Homicide Prevention Unit of Metropolitan Police, and is also conducting research on the interviewing of police suspects and training detectives on interview strategies. Addressing the Group on “Assessment in Forensic Settings”, Lynsey introduced us to her world - honour killings, prostitute murders, arson + homicide and sexual offences, her specialist subject being arson!

For the forensic psychologist in criminal investigations there are six opportunities for intervention in what she referred to as the Intervention Cycle i.e. the Offence [offender profiling] → Police Investigation → Trial of suspect → Dispersal [where they are sent for treatment or incarceration] → Assessment & Treatment → Release.

**Methods of assessment**

Offenders vary by age and gender, and crimes cover a broad spectrum. Therefore investigators have to evaluate such underlying factors as mental health issues - the understanding of which is low in the police service - offence behaviour and personality (Characteristics, Disorders, Psychopathy). It's crucial to think ahead about how offenders are likely to react to questions.

In looking at Personality, a wide battery of psychometric instruments is used, often based on the ‘Big 5’ factors. Some of these may be known to members, such as the Beck battery (measures depression, hopelessness, suicidal thoughts), others being more specialised (e.g. MCMI-II Millon and PCL-R).

In using psychometrics, there are complex issues to take into account - e.g. some offenders are familiar with many of the tests, and considerations with which we are all familiar, such as Social Desirability/Deception and base rates/norm grouping, take on a critical significance in criminal investigations.

**Assessment interviews**

Lynsey helps carry out structured clinical interviews to understand risk levels (suicide, violence etc) and the
offending behaviour. The A-B-C approach is used - Antecedents, Behaviour and Consequences. 

Assessing / treating Arson

The rest of Lynsey’s fascinating talk fired us up on the subject of arson, in which she is a leading specialist.

Not surprisingly, an early requirement in the process is to understand the motivations and intent of the client. This usually entails examining factors such as, history (some are as young as 11), fantasies about fire and fire-setting, extent of offending and relationship with other offences and wider factors and, lastly, motivation for treatment. The A-B-C functional analysis gives information on how offenders’ feel before and after the fire setting; social attention, anger, aggression, self-stimulation and revenge frequently crop up. Alcohol also has a large part to play [perhaps we should stop offering wine with lunch at our meetings!].

Anger is a huge topic in its own right, and this powerful emotion clearly plays a major role in much criminal behaviour, including arson. Lynsey’s comprehensive slide presentation, which she kindly made available to us and which has been circulated separately amongst members, gives us an insight into the range of instruments used to measure anger in its various forms and degrees. One of the most important, the MMPI-II has 568 questions!

Although forensic psychology is a departure from the 16PF Users Group’s usual themes of psychometrics and occupational psychology, the Group aims occasionally to cover wider topics that may aid our comprehension of that huge mystery, human personality. Lynsey’s talk certainly introduced us to an area of human behaviour of which we thankfully have little direct experience, and was immensely thought provoking and stimulating. Thank you, Lynsey!

Ann Rodrigues
ann@acer-hr.co.uk

Teresa Payerle, is an American writer and broadcaster living in Berlin, and describes herself as an ingénue regarding psychometrics. But from the title she chose, it seems she might be acquainted with TA. You’ll all remember I’m OK, You’re OK, of course.

I’m ENTP, You’re ESFJ

I always hoped I was special, a nice word for an oddball glasses-wearing nine-year-old who thought about things like how interesting it would be if rooms were turned upside down and we walked on the ceiling. I kept a diary, hated movies and liked grammar. A summer piano class final report included the comment: 'I hope Teresa can continue. She shows talent.' As a teenager I thought watches should have alarms just like clocks. Then along came electronic watches, featuring beeping alarms. I could be a zillionaire by now. Used or wasted, quirky ideas and childhood talents turn us into interesting adults. The very fortunate earn their livelihoods
by them. This idea finally prompted me to take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

I answered some 90-odd questions with my #2 pencil, puzzling over why some seemed to be the same questions differently stated, but answering gamely nonetheless. Using a scale of 1 to 5, it queried such things as behavior at parties or in crowds, the willingness to be spontaneous or the need for order. I had strong indicators for both of the latter. What would the poor tester make of me?

The post arrived. I wasn't an adult weird child - I was Extroverted Intuition with Introverted Thinking! I dived into the envelope's contents: Quick, ingenious, good at many things ... may argue for fun ... resourceful...

But the test doesn't serve to flatter. Hates uninspired routine, might drop a project before it's finished. May put off making decisions. May have no clear sense of long-term direction.

Of the careers suggested for my type, I had never thought of mortgage broker or credit investigator, possibly photographer. But I have always been interested in psychiatry and research, two others on the list. And two of the jobs I have actually done: writer/journalist and artist/entertainer.

The assessment was strikingly accurate and confirmed what I had long secretly hoped: that those things that made me different actually made me special. Seeing my peculiarities as a unique combination of desirable talents was a revelation. My funny little ways are in fact my strongest asset.

Teresa Payerle

We live in an age that is obsessed with ‘personality’. I put it in inverted commas because most people use the word very loosely; enough to make Freud and Adler roll over. It is unlikely that during the course of a week’s reading of the national press – be they ‘quality’ dailies or ‘red top’ tabloids – you will avoid some loosely worded comments about someone’s personality.

But as a reader of this Newsletter, you like to do the job properly. So you will be well used to sitting down to administer a test battery. And then of course you have to score it and write up a decent report. That’s the rest of the day gone and a good chunk of tomorrow as well.

You probably wish there might be a quicker and easier way to do all this. Well, if we believe some of the latest research, there is. In fact there are two ways in which to do it. Tell me more, I hear you say.

You may have heard your granny say that ‘the eyes are the windows to the soul’. * Well, maybe she was right. Swedish researchers say that it may be possible to read aspects of a person’s personality through their eyes. They have detected patterns that show warm-heartedness and trust, or neuroticism and impulsiveness. The research team read pits and lines in the irises of 428 people. Close up pictures were taken of the participants’ irises and they also filled out a questionnaire about their personalities. (I wonder which one? Anybody know?) Those with more pits were likely to be tender, warm and trusting, while
those with furrows were more likely to be neurotic, impulsive, and to give in to cravings.

Researchers say it is all down to a gene called PAX6 that could be playing a major role. This gene is known to control the development of the iris in an embryo. Previous research has shown that a mutation of this gene is linked to impulsiveness and poor social skills.

Apparently airports are already testing iris scanning to identify people, but they are not checking personality traits. Yet.

Now for the second blast. A recent survey found that 57% of the British public believe that they can assess the personality of others by what they are reading. Yes! It gets worse: 42% also believe that a person’s choice of book is also an effective measure of intelligence. You might wonder whether this was a silly little straw poll done in a local pub or bingo hall. Or a lunatic asylum. No! Borders, a major bookselling chain, commissioned the survey and 2,000 adults took part. Their spokesman said, “Choosing the right book could be the key to projecting aspects of your personality.”

Apparently President Bush’s reading last summer was Albert Camus’s The Stranger. The White House said he found it to be an interesting book and a quick read. He also read Macbeth and Hamlet. Now come on psychometricians, what do you make of that?

Tony Blair’s favourite book we are told is Ivanhoe. Famously, and perhaps apocryphally, he is said to have met Ian McEwan at a party and told him that he had several of his pictures hanging at Number Ten.

So there you have it. The day seems not too far away when the interviewer gazes into the candidate’s eyes, makes some notes, and then, as validation, asks what book he or she is reading.

Will the BPS introduce a Level B in these methods?

*If you put this phrase into Google, you will see that the science of iridology goes back to the 19th century.

David Roberts
Editor

**STATEMENT BY YOUR COMMITTEE**

The members’ survey carried out last year, and discussed at our February meeting, showed that a majority of members would be happy for the group’s interests to continue to expand across the range of psychometric instruments whilst still retaining the focus on the 16PF. Our intention at this stage is for the Group to widen our understanding and coverage of tests that are based on The Big Five and which are accredited by the BPS.

To this end, the committee will endeavour to invite a broader range of test practitioners to discuss the pros and cons of their main tests, highlighting difficult or interesting situations in which their favoured test has been useful.

Progress will be reported at future meetings.

The 16PF User Group Committee
Once again, your committee were successful in engaging a top speaker for our April meeting. Professor Vince Egan of Glasgow Caledonian University addressed us on Personality Dimensions and Personality Disorders.

Professor Egan treated us to a very thorough investigation of the links between the Big Five personality dimensions and the 11 standard personality disorders (PDs). In this article I am going to report only on the core of Vince’s presentation and then go on to discuss the relationship between the PD’s and what Bob Hogan terms ‘management derailment factors’.

For the Big Five Personality Dimensions Vince used NEO PI-R and 16PF users need to know the correlations between these and 16PF5 Global Factors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF5 Label</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>NEO Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra-version</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>Extra-version (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>Neuroticism (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
<td>- .56*</td>
<td>Openness (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>- .42*</td>
<td>Agreeableness (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>Conscientiousness (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Conn and Rieke (1998, p 142)¹

Vince then gave us brief definitions of DSM-IV (the American diagnostic manual) personality disorders:

- **Paranoid**
  - Distrust and suspicion; others’ motives are seen as malevolent.
- **Schizoid**
  - Detachment from social relationships and restricted emotional expression.
- **Schizotypal**
  - Acute discomfort in social relationships, cognitive and perceptual distortions, eccentricities of interest and behaviour.
- **Antisocial**
  - Disregard, violate other people’s rights; generally criminal.
- **Borderline**
  - Instability in interpersonal relationships, self-image, affect and marked impulsivity.
- **Histrionic**
  - Excessive emotionality and attention-seeking.
- **Narcissistic**
  - Grandiosity, need for admiration, lack of empathy.
- **Avoidant**
  - Social inhibition, feelings of inadequacy, hypersensitive to negative evaluation.
- **Dependent**
  - Submissive and clinging behaviour related to an excessive need to be taken care of.
- **Obsessive-Compulsive**
Pre-occupation with orderliness, perfectionism and control

Prof Egan then showed us correlations that he had obtained between NEO Big Five dimensions and IDPE-SQ, a diagnostic questionnaire for personality disorders. Plus signs '+' indicate a positive correlation and minus signs '-' a negative one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Disorder</th>
<th>NEO Big Five Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizotypal</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+/- p < .05; ++/- p < .01; +++/--- p < .001

*After Egan et al. (2003)*

Despite the fact that some of these correlations were quite high (e.g. Borderline/N = r.67), Vince warned against making the assumption that personality disorders were simply the extremes of the personality dimensions, suggesting that there was often a qualitative difference. He also told us that two of the PDs - Schizotypal and Antisocial were 'categorical' rather than quantitative conditions (i.e. similar to the categorical distinction between, say, males and females).

Discussion centred around how Prof Egan’s findings might be used in occupational selection and there was some disquiet about a suggestion to substitute the word ‘tendencies’ for disorders where an individual’s Big Five profile matched the matrix above (e.g. suggesting that a candidate with extremely high Anxiety/Neuroticism, Low Extraversion, Low Agreeableness and Low Conscientiousness might display ‘paranoid tendencies’). On reflection, Bob Hogan has already done something similar by equating characteristics of the 11 standard PDs with what he calls ‘management derailment factors’, as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Disorder</th>
<th>Derailment Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td>Sceptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizotypal</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social</td>
<td>Mischievous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic</td>
<td>Colourful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>Bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>Excitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>Cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive</td>
<td>Diligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Dutiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizoid</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-aggressive</td>
<td>Leisurely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A glance at the list of derailment factors might prompt a response that some of these are more of a quality than a handicap. Hogan argues that a certain level of each can be regarded as a strength. It is only at the extremes that they become problematic. For instance, the moderately Mischievous manager is unafraid of risk but the excessive case is reckless and deceitful; the moderately Bold manager is courageous and energetic, the extreme one may be overbearing and manipulative.

Most of us look for personality factors that contribute to performance but we need also to
consider the risks in the dark side of personality-combinations associated with personality disorders that can disrupt organisations and inhibit performance.

References

Hugh McCredie

Oh, no. Not another trip to The Introvert Arms...

It is some time since I have taken you to The Introvert Arms where we discuss fascinating topics such as correlations of factors between psychometric tests. And between pints of Pedigree. You will recall that my two fellow geeks are the wimpish Hubert and the ever-aggressive and assertive Angus. (Philologists might like to know that the word ‘geek’ has three meanings: 1: a carnival performer often billed as a wild man whose act usually includes biting the head off a live chicken or snake 2: a person often of an intellectual bent who is disliked 3: an enthusiast or expert especially in a technological field or activity. Please opt for definitions 2 or 3. Although Angus loves biting heads off, he has never done that to a chicken or a snake. He says.)

Anyway having plumbed the depths of regression analysis we turned to lighter subjects, like crime. More specifically, crime writers. Even more specifically, why are so many of the popular crime writers female?

You may wonder what this has to do with 16PF. Not a lot really, except to say that as psychometricians you ought to be interested in any phenomena that seem to distinguish between race, class, occupation or sex. We know that writing has always appealed to women; their personality traits lend themselves to it. But why crime?

Once the thought came into my head, I asked Hubert and Angus for their views. Angus assaulted me with opinions more fitting for Glasgow’s Sauchiehall Street late on a Saturday night. Hubert looked uncomfortable, like a gay actor who has just landed the role of Crocodile Dundee. Since neither of them had any solid answer to give me, I decided to look into the matter myself.

The following piece is an extract from a longer article to be published later this year. Read on:

Where Have All The Hearts And Flowers Gone?

We love reading about a murder. George Orwell’s essay Decline of the English Murder was correct in that
regard. We could explore the psychological basis for this: the fact that crime literature is more widely read than any other class of fiction; that readership cuts across class and income. But what a pity Orwell did not go on to speculate as to why women crime writers have been so successful.

This is a far more interesting topic to probe than to simply ask why we read it. To try to answer my own question, I looked at the biographies of some of the most popular female crime writers: Agatha Christie; Dorothy L Sayers; Margery Allingham; Ngaio Marsh; Patricia Highsmith; Ruth Rendell, and PD James. In this piece, I shall concentrate on Highsmith, Rendell and James.

Women write about half of all crime novels. And a survey in Woman & Home magazine found that modern women prefer blood and guts to hearts and flowers. Half of the respondents said that the crime thriller was their favourite genre, with science fiction and romance the least popular.

So what might be the root cause of this fondness for crime, blood and guts? In the small village of personality testing, it is well known that women differ from men in the strength of two personality traits in particular. We know that women are more sensitive, and more in touch with their feelings. We see that on Factor I, sensitivity, females score 6.6 points higher than males (therefore more subjective, more sentimental). They are also warmer, with Factor A score being 3.2 above males (that is, they are more attentive and warm towards others.) When relating these psychological differences to female crime writers, it would appear that they are going in the ‘wrong’ direction. Sentimentality and warmth are hardly the drivers of dark and murderous thoughts. One might suppose female crime writers to be less sentimental, less sensitive, less warm. So these differences do nothing to explain why women dominated the Golden Age of crime writing. Let’s look at some of the factors that might have shaped them.

The one most worthy of study, is Texan Patricia Highsmith, born to parents who separated and divorced five months before her birth, and whose mother had tried to abort her by drinking turpentine. This writer of 22 novels and 7 books of short stories was raised by her grandmother until the age of six, at which time she joined her mother and stepfather, both commercial artists, in New York. She did not meet her father until aged twelve and apparently felt no connection to him.

Her grandmother taught her to read at an early age and she made good use of the extensive library at home. At the age of eight, she discovered Karl Menninger’s The Human Mind and was fascinated by the case studies of patients afflicted with mental disorders. Strangers on A Train launched her career as a crime writer of disturbing
psychological mysteries. She had kept a diary since she was a child, writing entries in which she fantasized that her neighbours had psychological problems and murderous personalities, behind an outwardly normal demeanour. She was to take this idea to its extreme in her Ripley novels.

Highsmith was an alcoholic and a bisexual who had difficulty in maintaining long-term relationships. Asked in a 1980 interview why she didn’t love her mother, she replied, “First, because she made my childhood a little hell. Second, because she herself never loved anyone, neither my father, my stepfather, nor me.” Here, we seem to have a cocktail of creative motivators – emotional turmoil, early encouragement to read and be curious, festering resentment that needed an expressive outlet, and early writing experiences. Perhaps one might also add the lack of the close family ties that can be so distracting.

If Highsmith was open about her hellish childhood, Ruth Rendell is the opposite – she is protective about her personal life, and when asked about her childhood, she once said, “No, I don’t want to do that, not doing that, never describe my childhood, no, I’m not going to talk about that.”

Ruth Rendell doubles as Barbara Vine, but her work has three strands to it. Her Wexford novels feature a steady and reliable Chief Inspector, and alongside this work, are psychological crime novels involving sex crimes, and which explore the characteristics of the criminal mind. Her Barbara Vine novels form the third strand and although these are also psychological novels, they explore at a deeper level such things as family misunderstandings, secrets and past crimes committed. It would seem that her early life – born to two unhappily married schoolteachers, a lonely childhood, and the early death of her mother – might have shaped, at the very least, the subject matter of her Barbara Vine novels. Although she divorced her husband in 1975, she remarried him two years later.

For this writer of 60 novels and many awards, success did not come immediately. She wrote 6 novels before her first publication, and her early career as a journalist on a local paper ended when she was due to attend a tennis club dinner and report on the after dinner speech of the chairman. She failed to attend, but wrote an account based on a copy of the speech that had been handed to her. Unfortunately the speaker had dropped dead halfway through his speech – a fact that she had not reported. She decided that journalism was not right for her, and started to write fiction.

In a radio interview, she was asked about her fascination with crime.

“Well, I don’t know that I am fascinated with crime. I’m fascinated with people and their characters and their obsessions and what they do.

---

5 She has said that writing about the family was very important to her (Rowland, 2001, Palgrave, *From Agatha Christie to Ruth Rendell*)
And these things lead to crime, but I’m much more fascinated by their minds.”  
In another interview, she said, “I’m more interested in the motivation than the crime itself. I’m fascinated by what makes people do dreadful things, not by how they do them.”

These comments give strong clues about some of the ingredients that might contribute to the making of a successful crime writer: interest in motivation, early childhood experiences that can be utilized (and fictionalized?) might be two of them.

Ruth Rendell sits in the House of Lords, as does her contemporary, PD James and both share an interest in motivation. Reading comments made by PD James have brought me somewhat nearer to explaining the question posed at the outset. This popular author of more than 20 novels, and winner of many awards, said in an interview, “...women ...certainly do excel in the traditional classical detective story. This may be because women have an eye for detail, and clue-making demands attention to the minutiae of everyday living. Women, too, are interested in emotions and motives rather than in fast action and weaponry.”

When questioned about the extent to which she can feel the emotions of some of her characters, she said, “...I seem able to imagine what the feeling would be. Sometimes that feeling is almost universal – we’ve all felt fear. Every woman knows the fear of feeling that she’s being followed in the dark, so it’s not difficult. We’ve all felt jealousy. Most of us have felt a murderous rage at one time. Yes, the writer does find the emotion within herself.”

Mulling over these mini-biographies, some points seem to stand out; many have had family, financial, or emotional difficulties – or combinations of these. To what extent did these shape their writing lives? It is of course tempting to provide a hook on which to hang everything that might support a particular viewpoint. And one could just as easily take a number of male writers and slot them into the same categories.

It seems that the main determinants of success for female crime writers are: deep interest in people and their motivations; heightened sensitivity; close observation of detail; an ability to empathize; to be in touch with one’s feelings, and to be able to translate these feelings to the character on the page.

David Roberts  
Editor
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