

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Investigating the personality construct of self-control  
as defined in the General Theory of Crime.

A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

at

Massey University, Albany, New Zealand.

Anja Isaacson

2004

*“He is gregarious and affectionate, but has a recurrent pattern of risk-taking behaviours. Look, for example, at his impulsive sampling of unknown substances (honey, haycorns and even thistles) with no knowledge of the potential outcome of his experimentation. We find him climbing tall trees and acting in a way that can only be described as socially intrusive.”*

- An analysis of Tigger <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Shea, S., Gordon, K., Hawkins, A., Kawchuk, J., & Smith, D. (2000). Pathology in the Hundred Acre Wood: a Neurodevelopmental Perspective on A.A. Milne. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 163, 1557 – 1559.

## Abstract

Over the decades, “self-control” has generated much theoretical debate and research across the disciplines of human science. Although intuitively understood, the concept of self-control remains slippery as it can be viewed from various perspectives. As a consequence, it has been defined and measured in different ways which are not all consistent with one another. Self-control, or the lack thereof, has been implicated in criminality, psychopathology and various deviant behaviours. The General Theory of Crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990) has attracted much interest and continues to be a major influence in understanding crime and deviance. At the core of this theory is the construct of self-control. Although the authors argue that their theory denies the existence of “an enduring criminal disposition”, their definition of self-control appears fully compatible with the concept of “trait” as used in personality psychology. However, there have been few attempts to establish explicit connections between personality traits and the self-control construct as defined in the General Theory of Crime.

This research investigated the personality construct of self-control as defined in The General Theory of Crime. The sample consisted of 63 faculty staff members and 126 young students located at the Albany, Palmerston North and Wellington campuses of Massey University. Quantitative data were collected via a postal survey questionnaire comprising scales measuring individual differences relating to (a) personality (Francis, Brown & Philipchalk (1992) Abbreviated form of the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire), (b) self-control (Grasmick, Tittle, Bursik & Arneklev (1993) Self-Control Scale), (c) imprudent behaviours (an adaptation of Marcus (2003) Retrospective Behavioural Scale), and (d) impulsivity (Dickman (1990) Functional and Dysfunctional Impulsivity Inventory). Results from the present study indicated that incorporating personality variables into a model of self-control explained more of the variance, strengthened the prediction of imprudent behaviours and indicated better goodness –of-fit statistics. Furthermore, the components of self-control, as defined in the general theory of crime, were better explained by the conceptually distinct latent constructs of Dysfunctional and Functional impulsivity. Limitations of this research and recommendations for further research are considered.

## Acknowledgements

My sincere gratitude is extended to:

All participants, for gifting their valuable time and completing the research questionnaire.

Mei Wah Williams, my patient and committed supervisor. With gentle challenging and calm guidance you helped me to stay focussed.

Dr. Paul Barrett, in great appreciation for your valuable input at the eleventh hour.

Dr. Pat Sandbrook, for his assistance in accessing a targeted student population.

Denny Meyer, for helping me to find my way through the statistical analyses jungle.

Linda in the psychology department, for being so approachable and helpful.

My children, Mikaiah and Aaron, who have patiently waited for me to complete this journey.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	iii
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	iv
<b>Table of contents</b>	v
<b>List of Tables</b>	x
<b>List of Figures</b>	xi
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Issues in the conceptualisation of self-control</b>	<b>4</b>
Understanding self-control	4
The influence of competing theoretical paradigms	5
Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory of self-control	7
A psychological perspective	8
Toward a better understanding	9
Summary	10
<b>Literature and research review</b>	<b>12</b>
Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime (GTC)	12
On crime and analogous behaviours	12
On criminality	14
On opportunity	18
Summary	20
Wrestling with self-control	21
The problem of measurement	21
Empirical measurement of GTC self-control	23

Self-control in the Psychological tradition	26	26
The problem of definition and measurement		26
Insights from personality theory		29
Eysenck's theory of personality		32
Impulsivity as an important correlate of crime		36
Crime and personality		38
Toward conceptual clarification of self-control		39
<b>Aim and general hypothesis</b>		<b>41</b>
<b>Method</b>		<b>44</b>
Participants and Setting		44
Setting of the study	44	
Population sample	44	
Sample characteristics	45	
Measures		47
Self-administered questionnaire	47	
Demographic information	47	
Personality	48	
Self-control	51	
Imprudent behaviour	52	
Impulsivity	54	
Procedure		57
Ethics approval	57	
Pilot study	57	
Obtaining participants	57	
<i>Students</i>	58	
<i>Faculty staff</i>	59	

Analyses	60
Statistical analyses using SPSS-11	60
Statistical analyses using AMOS 4.01	60
<b>Results</b>	<b>62</b>
Data Entry	62
Missing Data	62
Data Screening	63
Assumption Testing	64
Internal consistency reliability analyses	64
Personality scale (EPQR-A)	66
Grasmick self-control scale (GRAS)	67
Imprudent behaviour scale (RBS)	68
Dickman's Impulsivity Inventory (DII)	69
Comparative analyses of groups	69
Age groups	69
Gender groups	70
Correlation analyses	71
Factor Analyses	75
Exploratory factor analyses (EFA)	75
<i>EPQR-A</i>	77
<i>GRAS</i>	78
<i>RBS</i>	80
<i>DII</i>	80



Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA)	81
<i>EPQR-A</i>	83
<i>GRAS</i>	85
<i>RBS</i>	86
<i>DII</i>	87
Structural Equation Modeling	89
Conceptual Model	89
Measurement Model	91
<i>EPQR-A</i>	93
<i>GRAS</i>	94
<i>RBS</i>	96
<i>DII</i>	97
Structural Model	98
<i>Hypothesised Model (Model 1)</i>	98
<i>Respecified Model (Model 2)</i>	99
<i>Parsimonious Model (Model 3)</i>	100
<i>Alternative Models</i>	103
<i>Interpretation of estimates</i>	104
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>105</b>
Aim and purpose of the present study	105
Expected relationships	106
Findings based on the data in the present study	107
Present findings in light of previous research	109
The personality construct of self-control	111
Evaluation of shortcomings and implications for future research	112

<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>114</b>
Conclusions	114
Contributions to knowledge	115
Future directions	115
<b>References</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>131</b>
List of Appendices	131
Appendix A: Information Sheet	132
Appendix B: Demographic information survey	133
Appendix C: Personality Measure (EPQR-A)	134
Appendix D: Self-control Measure (GRAS)	135
Appendix E: Imprudent Behaviour Measure (RBS)	136
Appendix F: Impulsivity Measure (DII)	137
Appendix G: Correlations between the components of self-control and all other variables	138
Appendix H: Structural Model with indicator variables	139
Appendix I: Model 1, Hypothesised Model	140
Appendix J: Model 2, Respecified Model	141
Appendix K: Model 4, Alternative Independence Model	142
Appendix L: Model 5, Alternative Impulsivity Model	143

## List of Tables

	<b>Page</b>
Table 1. <i>Participant Demographic Characteristics</i>	46
Table 2. <i>Summary of Measures</i>	48
Table 3. <i>Cronbach's alpha coefficient, Mean and score range for all measures</i>	65
Table 4. <i>Inter-item correlation values</i>	66
Table 5. <i>Comparison of scores for Age groups</i>	70
Table 6. <i>Comparison of scores for Gender groups</i>	71
Table 7. <i>Correlations between measures</i>	73
Table 8. <i>Matrix for a forced four-factor solution of the EPQR-A</i>	78
Table 9. <i>Matrix for a forced six-factor solution of the GRAS</i>	79
Table 10. <i>Matrix for a forced eight-factor solution of the RBS</i>	80
Table 11. <i>Matrix for a forced two-factor solution of the DII</i>	81
Table 12. <i>Description of fit indices</i>	82
Table 13. <i>Obtained fit statistics for CFA models</i>	83
Table 14. <i>Obtained fit statistics for the measurement models</i>	94
Table 15. <i>Obtained fit statistics for the structural models</i>	100
Table 16. <i>Comparison of fit statistics for alternative models</i>	101

## List of Figures

	<b>Page</b>
<i>Figure 1.</i> A conceptual model of low self-control as defined in GTC	21
<i>Figure 2.</i> A conceptual model of Eysenck's theory of Personality and Impulsivity	34
<i>Figure 3.</i> 24-Item model of factorial structure of the EPQR-A	84
<i>Figure 4.</i> 24-Item model of factorial structure of the GRAS	86
<i>Figure 5.</i> Behaviour category model of the RBS	87
<i>Figure 6.</i> 23-Item model of factorial structure of the DII	88
<i>Figure 7.</i> Conceptual model of the Personality construct of Self-control	89
<i>Figure 8.</i> Measurement model of the EPQR-A	93
<i>Figure 9.</i> Measurement model of the GRAS	95
<i>Figure 10.</i> Measurement model of the RBS	96
<i>Figure 11.</i> Measurement model of the DII	97
<i>Figure 12.</i> Model 3, Parsimonious and Final model	102

## Introduction

Since its formulation over a decade ago, Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) General Theory of Crime (GTC) continues to stimulate theoretical debate and research. In particular, re-focussing attention on understanding why some individuals engage in criminal and analogous acts whilst others, in similar situations, do not. The core concept of GTC is "self-control", postulated to be the essential barrier between an individual engaging in criminal, or analogous, behaviour or refraining from such. According to GTC, ineffective parenting practices result in low self-control, which, in interaction with situational opportunities, results in criminal or deviant acts. As such, levels of self-control are determined at a young age and remain relatively stable throughout life. Gottfredson and Hirschi contend that, the identification of individuals low in self-control is possible by studying other non-criminal, analogous, behaviours with long-term adverse consequences, however the measurement of self-control remains contentious.

Gottfredson and Hirschi argue that their theory denies the existence of "an enduring criminal disposition", yet their definition of self-control appears fully compatible with the concept of "trait" as used in personality psychology. In psychology, personality trait is defined as a predisposition to respond in a particular way to certain situations, objects or persons (Aiken, 1999). Controlling these responses entails a consideration of the long-term personal and social consequences of behaviour for oneself and others, the self-control of immediate reactions and impulses. Furthermore, GTC and trait theory both conceptualise self-control as being stable over time and generalised across situations.

Self-control is an important facet of personality. Although various psychological theories implicate self-control, or the lack thereof, in criminality, psychopathology and deviant behaviours, there is little consensus regarding the exact definition and measurement of the concept. However, most omnibus or multi-trait personality inventories include a measure of self-control in one form or another. For example, the California Psychology Inventory (Gough, 1975); the Eysenck Personality Questionnaires (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975); the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality

Inventory (Hathaway, & McKinley, 1940); the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (Tellegen, 1982); the NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992); and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Cattell & Eber, 1962).

Support for self-control as an important variable in the prediction of crime has come from investigations of GTC. However, to date there have been few attempts to establish explicit connections between the self-control construct as defined in GTC and personality traits. The hypothesis that the meaning of self-control could better be reconceptualised as a composite of personality traits guides the present investigation. These understandings from a personality psychology paradigm would modestly contribute to the growing literature on Gottfredson and Hirschi's influential theory.

Linking criminal and analogous behaviours to a validated and established personality structure could help to organise and interpret research findings about the development of such behaviours. Furthermore, the integration of knowledge from different disciplines may contribute to the clarification of self-control, its nomological net, measurement and aetiology. Crime and imprudent behaviours lead to ever increasing social and personal distress, thus theoretical integration may contribute to prevention and rehabilitation through improved measurement and assessment. In particular, emergent patterns of personality dimensions in relation to levels of self-control may reveal better understandings of why some people are more vulnerable than others are to engaging in behaviour with long-term aversive consequences.

To summarise, Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory continues to influence criminological theory and research. At the core of GTC is self-control, posited as the essential element to explain all crime, and analogous behaviours, in all societies. Although Gottfredson and Hirschi deny that self-control is a personality trait as understood in personality psychology, GTC describes characteristics, or traits, that account for differences in criminality at the individual level. Furthermore, self-control is conceptualised as general across situations and stable over time, a latent construct that underlies criminal and analogous behaviour. Thus, it appears that well-established psychological concepts and understandings from personality trait theory would complement GTC, clarifying the conceptualisation and measurement of self-control.

In the following chapter, “Issues in the conceptualisation of self-control”, various differing schools of thought and relevant issues in conceptualising self-control are overviewed. These issues are then developed and explored through a review of the literature and research in chapter three, “Literature and research review”. First, there is an exploration and discussion of the elements of self-control as defined in GTC. Secondly, the problems of conceptualisation and measurement of self-control are unfolded. Thirdly, self-control is identified as an important characteristic of personality and relevant psychological theories are reviewed. Additionally, impulsivity is explored as a specific personality trait that appears to have a well-established relationship with criminal and imprudent behaviours. Finally, elements from both GTC and personality theory are woven together as an attempt clarify conceptualisation and measurement of self-control. This conceptual clarification guides the research and informs the discussion of obtained results and the conclusion in the final chapters, “Aim and general hypothesis, Method, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion.”