



SCHOOL of  
GRADUATE STUDIES  
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University  
Digital Commons @ East  
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

8-2011

# Psychopathy and Gender of Serial Killers: A Comparison Using the PCL-R.

Chasity Shalon Norris  
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Norris, Chasity Shalon, "Psychopathy and Gender of Serial Killers: A Comparison Using the PCL-R." (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1340. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1340>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact [digilib@etsu.edu](mailto:digilib@etsu.edu).

# Psychopathy and Gender of Serial Killers: A Comparison Using the PCL-R

---

A thesis

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Criminal Justice & Criminology

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice & Criminology

---

by

Chasity S. Norris

August 2011

---

Dr. Larry Miller, Chair

Dr. John Whitehead

Dr. Michael Braswell

Keywords: Psychopathy, Serial killer, Gender, PCL-R, Murder

## ABSTRACT

Psychopathy and Gender of Serial Killers: A Comparison Using the PCL-R

by

Chasity S. Norris

Psychopathy and serial murder are 2 of society's most devastating and least understood tribulations. Even less is comprehended with regards to the differences in the way these ills are expressed between the genders. In this study, psychopathic personality traits are considered in a sample comparison of male and female serial murderers. Traits are measured using questions derived from Hare's Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL-R, 1991). A content analysis was performed to score the components for each subject, using known and accepted biographical and personal interview materials. Findings showed a distinct difference between the sexes, with females scoring lower than their male counterparts, indicating that factor structure of the PCL-R may need to be restructured in regards to females. Implications for public policy including the way female psychopathy is viewed and diagnosed are reviewed.

Copyright 2011 by Chasity S. Norris.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ten years ago, I could not even imagine that I would be writing this page. I have achieved more than I ever dreamed was possible, but I have not achieved it all alone. There are many people I wish to take a moment and give them very heartfelt thanks. This experience and these people have truly changed my life. I would like to thank my daughter Cynthia Higgins for taking this incredible journey with me and always being my biggest fan. I love you more than words can say. I would like to thank my father Dennis Norris for always believing I could be doing more and for believing I always could. Thank you to my grandfather Faue Norris for reminding me to do the best that I can no matter what it is that I am doing. To my best friends—Mandy, Tasha, Karen, and Robby—thanks for listening to my constant blabbering about psychopaths and serial killers and for your encouragement when I was overwhelmed.

I would like to thank my committee members: Dr. Larry Miller, Dr. Michael Braswell, and Dr. John Whitehead for their kind words, tireless efforts, and extreme patience during this project. To Dr. Larry Miller, I want to thank you for your endless support and encouragement during the years I have known you. You have always been such a fun, calming influence both in the department, and the classroom, and I am glad to call you a friend. To Dr. Michael Braswell, I want to thank you for always having an open door and a few words of wisdom when I needed them most. Your counsel has been invaluable to me over the last few years, and I am most grateful. To the rest of the extraordinary professors in the CJ department, you have all been a crucial part of me being where I am now. Each of you has encouraged and inspired me in infinite ways. I could not have done it without you.....Thank you all!

## CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	4
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	7
The Subjects.....	11
Purpose.....	14
2. LITURATURE REVIEW.....	15
History and Controversy Surrounding Psychopathy.....	15
Etiology.....	27
Effects on Personality Structure.....	31
Female Versus Male Psychopathy.....	41
Treatment of Psychopathy.....	45
Psychopathy, Paraphilia, and Its Relationship to Serial Murder.....	48
Serial Murder: History and Comparison.....	52
Ted Bundy.....	61
Richard Ramirez: The Night Stalker.....	70

Dennis Rader: The BTK Killer.....	77
Countess Erzebet Bathory.....	86
Jane Toppan.....	92
Aileen Wuornos.....	99
3. METHODOLOGY.....	105
Hypothesis.....	107
4. RESULTS.....	108
Ted Bundy.....	108
Richard Ramirez.....	120
Dennis Rader.....	128
Erzebet Bathory.....	136
Jane Toppan.....	144
Aileen Wuornos.....	153
5. DISCUSSION.....	160
REFERENCES.....	165
VITA.....	175

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Psychopathy and serial murderer are two of the most captivating and horrific tribulations society has ever encountered. Few other words in the English language conjure up more vivid images of the infamous “boogeyman” than do these two, especially when they are used to describe a fellow human being. There are those who walk among us, capable of committing heinous acts without feeling anything resembling guilt or remorse. The devastation these men and women bring to those who cross their paths is their only true pleasure in life. They are the men and women we call “psychopaths”.

The term psychopathy is often used interchangeably with the terms sociopathy and antisocial personality disorder. This is a mistake that is often made both in print and video. These terms are actually used to describe three distinct, although often interrelated, disorders. The differences between the three disorders are evident when examining their perceived causes, symptoms, and diagnostic measurements (Hare, 1993). All three disorders are agreed among scholars to be marked with lack of conscience, exaggerated sense of self-worth, and very superficial emotions. Sociopathy is perceived to have its root causes based in the social realm in which the person has been raised. In essence it is believed to be caused by society. Although this term is often used, it is not recognized as a true psychological condition. Antisocial personality disorder is diagnosed when patients exhibit at least three out of seven of the characteristics chosen by the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders IV*, published by the American Psychological Association in 2000. These characteristics are as follows:

Failure to conform to social norms

Deceitfulness and manipulativeness

Impulsivity, failure to plan ahead

Irritability and aggressiveness

Reckless disregard for the safety of self and others

Consistent irresponsibility

Lack of remorse at having hurt or mistreated another (APA, 2000, P. 706).

These symptoms are considered for diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder only when the person is 18 years of age at the time of diagnosis with a persistent history of conduct disorders appearing before age 15. These cannot be considered if present only during a manic episode or after onset of schizophrenia (APA). Antisocial personality disorder is most often used to explain various forms of criminality and deviant behavior. Most persons diagnosed with antisocial personality disorder are not psychopathic, but most psychopaths could easily be said to exhibit symptoms of antisocial personality disorder (Hare, 1993).

Psychopathy includes many of the various traits included in antisocial personality disorder, but is considered to have root causes both in biological and genetic predisposition and onset may or may not be influenced by societal influences (Cleckley, 1964; Hare, 1993). Because psychopathy is not officially listed in the DSM-IV, Hare created the Psychopathy Checklist in 1980. This version was a 22-item scale. Hare later revised and updated the tool calling it the Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL-R) in 1985. The diagnostic manual was written and published in 1991 as a tool for differentiating and diagnosing psychopathy apart from the other personality disorders

(Hare, 2003). This scale is now considered by scholars in various disciplines of social and behavioral sciences to be the leading diagnostic instrument for determining psychopathy. This instrument was originally designed to be used on males in an institutional setting. It has been found to be a useful tool in various settings and across gender lines (Hare, 1991). The test is comprised of a two-factor model with both behavioral and lifestyle components and interpersonal and affective factors. This is the instrument that will be used for the purposes of this thesis. This method is designed to be administered and interpreted by a trained professional. It is important to point out that this researcher is not currently licensed to administer or interpret results for definitive diagnosis of psychopathy using the PCL-R. This thesis is for research purposes only and any and all results should be used accordingly.

Serial murder has stimulated the morbid fascination of the masses since 1888, with the discovery of the first ravaged body crudely displayed on the street in Whitechapel. “Jack the Ripper” was the sensation who started it all. The elusively sly killer haunted the streets of London then, as well as he haunts the imagination of those who study him now. The ability to slip in and out of the shadows and kill so quickly and gruesomely without capture relegated him to the position of poster child for the macabre (Wilson, 2004). This fascination has hardly waned in the preceding centuries. The fascination with those who can kill indiscriminately without fear or remorse is not likely to diminish anytime soon. This appeared to be magnified during the middle 1980s and early 1990s when sensational cases such as John Wayne Gacy, a.k.a. “The Killer Clown”, and Jeffery Dahmer, who was a cannibal, were dominating headlines.

The majority of documented serial killers throughout history have been men. This has led to the false assumption that there are no female serial killers. This thesis will help to dispel that theory by bringing to the forefront the actions and crimes of some of the murderesses having been just as heinous as their male counterparts. It is difficult for most to imagine that a female could be just as callous and unremorseful a killer as Ted Bundy, for example. Little has been done in the past to compare male and female psychopaths including serial killers (Cleckley, 1964; Hare, 1993). One of the purposes of this thesis is to encourage further research and discussion about psychopathy and gender and its relevance to serial murder. It is the hypothesis of this researcher that the females will score lower than their male counterparts despite their crimes being just as violent, and their personality just as callous. This is often contrary to the societal assumption that males are more violent and psychopathic.

Serial homicide often contains a sexual or paraphilic element. Paraphilia is defined as defined by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 4<sup>th</sup> edition (DSM-IV) as having intense sexual urges and arousing fantasies for a duration of at least 6 months that involve nonhuman objects, suffering or humiliation of oneself or others, or children or nonconsenting people (APA, 2000, pp. 522-533). This factor is included in this study to try to select male and female serial killers with as many of the same attributes as possible in order to gain a more accurate result from the comparison. The females chosen for this project have reported sexual elements to their crimes as well as do the men.

## The Subjects

The serial killers were chosen for this research by both recorded crimes and amount of information publicly available. Those who were considered ‘team’ killers were disqualified from the study. Only the killers who killed repeatedly and independently were chosen. This was done to keep the similarities between the male’s and female’s crimes as close as possible. Within the genders, the researcher tried to find examples of killers whose crimes were similar, but their backgrounds and personalities dramatically different. This was done to try to gain an accurate assessment of the level of psychopathy both between and within the genders. Where possible, serial killers with verified biographies and recorded interviews were preferable. In this study, three men and three women were chosen and a content analysis performed using previously published works, both academic and nonacademic. The information gathered using content analysis was then applied to the questions on the PCL-R. The test was then scored according to Hare’s manual, with a score greater than or equal to 30 used to suggest the possibility of the presence of psychopathy (Hare, 2003). The results were then compared and discussed between the genders and the possible future implications revealed.

The male serial killers chosen for this study were Richard Ramirez, a.k.a. (“The Night Stalker”); Theodore Bundy; and Dennis Rader, a.k.a. (“BTK”) for “Bind, Torture, Kill”. The females chosen for the study were: Aileen Wuornos (famous for being portrayed by Charlize Theron in the movie “*Monster*”); Countess Elizabeth Bathory, a.k.a. (“The Blood Countess”); and Jane Toppan a.k.a. (“Jolly Jane”).

Richard Ramirez was chosen for this study because of his lower socioeconomic status, harsh upbringing, and embodiment of the word “boogeyman”. With his ability to hide in the shadows and creep into his victims bedrooms in the middle of the night, Ramirez is the stereotypical serial killer. His true psychopathic side revealed mostly after his capture when he chose to embrace the spotlight and truly take advantage of the situation by changing his appearance for the cameras and even getting married while on death row (Carlo, 1996).

Ted Bundy was chosen because to scholars he is the epitome of a psychopath. Bundy was charming, intelligent, handsome, grandiose, egotistical, and deadly. He had the ability to lure his victims with elaborate, sympathy-inducing scenarios, while looking like the all American boy next door. He revealed none of the *Mr. Hyde* that he was hiding on the inside with the cool, collected *Dr. Jekyll* he had perfected on the outside (Rule, 2000). Bundy perfected the art of psychopathy with his boyish good looks and law school education much to the detriment of the women he encountered.

Dennis Rader was selected because of his unique deviation from the previously accepted profiles of what a serial killer would be. Rader was every bit the psychopath and killer as the others but managed to use it like a “side job”. Rader was killing people over a 30-year span while raising a family, attending church, and wearing a badge at the same time (Singular, 2006). Rader completely dispels the myths perpetrated by the various attempts of profilers throughout the years. The previous picture of the typical “loner” who is socially and sexually inept has been completely dispelled by this killer. The true illustration of his psychopathy has been cemented by his own words during interviews and courtroom testimony after his apprehension.

Countess Elizabeth Bathory was selected because she could be considered the very picture of feminine psychopathy. Bathory was wealthy, stunningly beautiful, and completely vicious. Born into aristocracy and married early to a Romanian count who was often away in battle, Countess Bathory had more than enough privacy, time, and devoted servants to make her wildest and deadliest fantasies come true (Wilson, 2004). The Countess would use her breathtaking beauty and her stately post to manipulate servants into becoming willing accomplices to kidnapping, torture, and ultimately murder.

Jane Toppan was perhaps one of the most fearsome examples in the study. Toppan was a matronly New England nurse who had studied autopsy expansively and conducted crude experiments on her unsuspecting patients in order to derive sexual satisfaction. Toppan had worked for Boston's wealthiest citizens as a private-duty nurse before receiving tenure at one of the area hospitals. Toppan admitted to crawling into the beds with her victims to feel their dying convulsions (Schechter, 2003). Toppan would ultimately poison 31 trusting patients, friends, and family members before being committed to a mental institution for life (Schechter, 2003).

Aileen Wuornos is widely believed to be the first female serial killer. This thesis will help to dispel that myth. Wuornos was a woman with a very dysfunctional and neglected childhood who would one day grow into one of the most callous and unempathetic serial murderers to ever exist. Wuornos shot and killed seven men in Florida over the course of a few weeks (Russell, 2002). Her occupation as a prostitute allowed her easy access to her potential prey. The men who decide to pick her up while hitchhiking were wholly unaware that it would be their last ride.

## Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to try to further the discussion and research of the similarities and differences in the expressions of psychopathy between the genders and the future consideration of these differences in diagnostic tools. This researcher believes that the differences are not as great as have previously been predicted. The general belief in society has been one of disbelief when it comes to women and psychopathy. It is hard for most to fathom that a female is just as capable of dissociated violent acts as are their male counterparts. It is also unconscionable to most that a woman would derive sexual satisfaction from the act of murder. It is because of these long-held social beliefs that the study of this phenomena has not progressed as quickly as it has on many others. This researcher hypothesizes that despite the crimes between the genders being similar in deceitfulness, destructiveness, brutality, and heinousness, the females will score below the >30 average necessary to be diagnostically considered psychopathic.

This researcher fully acknowledges the limitations of this type of study as compared to more quantitative methods. Firsthand knowledge and personal interview are always preferable to secondhand knowledge. Due to the time limitations of the program and the lack of accessibility to the subjects due to death or incarceration, content analysis was the best available technique for research. Because the researcher is not a trained administrator of the PCL-R, all findings should be used only to initiate discussion and further research on the topic, and should not be used to definitively diagnose any mental disease or defect.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### History and Controversy Surrounding Psychopathy

Psychopathy is widely recognized as the first diagnosed personality disorder in psychiatry (Million, Simonson, Davis, & Birket-Smith, 1998). As far back as 1809, it was described by Phillippe Pinel, who is widely considered to be the father of modern psychology, as “Mania Sans Delir”, which is translated as a state of being “insane without delirium”, which was described by Pinel as those who “acted crazy without being crazy” (Wahlund & Kristiansson, 2009). This term was used by Pinel to describe a condition marked by lack of restraint and remorselessness. Pinel considered the psychopath to be suffering from deficit in passion and affect rather than in reasoning. This condition was described by Pinel by stating “there were many maniacs who betrayed no lesion whatever of the understanding, but were under the dominion of instinctive and abstract fury, as if the affective faculties alone had sustained injury” (as cited in Balfour & Browne, 1875, p. 275). The father of American psychology, Benjamin Rush (1812), recorded having patients who displayed “innate preternatural moral depravity”. The first person to actually introduce the term “psychopathic” was German systematists Robert Koch. This condition was the primary area of interest to Hervey Cleckley. Cleckley was one of the first to research and study the phenomenon in depth with his book *The Mask of Sanity*, published in 1941. This book is still considered to be the most comprehensive book written on the subject. Cleckley included 30 individual cases in the study (Cleckley, 1941). From this study, Cleckley developed a list of 16 characteristics that emerged repeatedly within the samples. Cleckley asserted that the psychopathic

personality was suffering from a strong disassociation between emotion and cognition, and that this dysfunction caused them to fail to appreciate many of their life experiences (Cleckley, 1941, 1976). In many ways the psychopath is just living life “going through the motions”, and mimicking the behaviors that others exhibit in various situations.

Table 1 lists the traits observed by Cleckley and is followed by a brief discussion of each.

Table 1

*Psychopathic Traits According to Cleckley’s Research*

Trait #	Characteristic
1	Superficial charm and good “intelligence”
2	Absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking
3	Absence of “nervousness” or psychoneurotic manifestations
4	Unreliability
5	Untruthfulness and insincerity
6	Lack of remorse or shame
7	Inadequately motivated antisocial behavior
8	Poor judgment and failure to learn by experience
9	Pathologic egocentricity and capacity for love
10	General poverty in major affective reactions
11	Specific loss of insight
12	Unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations

Table 1 (continued)

---

13	Fantastic and uninviting behavior with drink and sometimes without
14	Suicide rarely carried out
15	Sex life impersonal, trivial, and poorly integrated
16	Failure to follow any life plan

---

*Source:* Adapted from Cleckley (1976)

---

*Superficial charm and intelligence.* Most Psychopaths seem very friendly and engaging when you first meet them. They are easy to talk to and appear genuinely interested and involved in many things. They do not seem to be “weird” or odd and, in fact, are most likely to be very charming and engaging (Cleckley, 1976, p. 338). On the outside, the psychopathic personality appears to be well adjusted and pleasant. Most psychopaths also score very high on Psychometric tests due to their above average intelligence. Upon first encountering a psychopath, you generally feel that he or she is a “genuine” person and in excellent mental health. Psychopaths generally do not exhibit any outright signs of mental illness that would cause any wariness in those who first encounter them.

*Absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking.* The psychopath is usually absent of any typical outward signs of overt mental illness. They typically exhibit no delusional qualities and are aware of reality (Cleckley, 1976, p. 339). Psychopaths are typically able to understand the possible outcomes and consequences of their actions. Direct psychiatric examination will reveal nothing pathologic or lead one to believe that they are incompetent in any way. Psychopaths tend to display and react with what appear to be “normal” emotions to various situations to most outside observers (p. 339). Most who interact with them report feeling that they reacted with the proper

amount of emotion and enthusiasm when discussing personal issues such as family and their work.

*Absence of “nervousness” or psychoneurotic manifestations.* It is perfectly normal for a psychopathic personality to seem completely calm during what others would feel to be an extremely tense and anxious situation. They typically remain very calm and in control at all times and any tension that they may exhibit is almost always caused by some external stimuli (such as incarceration) and is never due to guilt or remorse (Cleckley, 1976).

*Unreliability.* It is exceedingly common for psychopaths to agree to do something for someone or commit to a project with great enthusiasm and subsequently fail to follow through. This is often a major source of disappointment to those who interact with the psychopath (Cleckley, 1976). It does not matter how pressing the obligation is, the psychopath typically reacts as if he or she has no real responsibilities and cannot be deterred from this behavior even if confronted about it. The reason that they are able to continue this devastating behavior for so long is often because it is cyclic. They do what they say they will do just often enough that much is overlooked as mistakes. Cleckley summed this quality up best by saying “Here, it might be said, is not even a consistency in inconsistency but an inconsistency in inconsistency” (p. 341).

*Untruthfulness and insincerity.* Psychopaths show no serious regard for the truth. They are able to make exorbitant promises and passionately defend themselves from accusations whether trivial or grand. Psychopaths seem to ooze trustworthiness and unpretention. They will even appear to be righteous by seeming to take responsibility for

some wrong doing, mostly when they know they are going to be caught for it (Cleckley, 1976). Psychopaths often brag about their honor and about “giving their word” without any actions or intent to follow up.

*Lack of remorse or shame.* Psychopaths are incapable of accepting blame for any of the negative consequences that they endure or for the harm and depravity they inflict on others. They raucously deny any accusations of responsibility and always place the blame for their behavior on others. Psychopaths, even when confronted with their transgressions, no matter how minor or depraved, show no sense of shame, humiliation, or regret (Cleckley, 1976, p. 343).

*Inadequately motivated antisocial behavior.* Psychopaths often commit crimes of risk such as theft, fraud, adultery, assaults, and the like for extremely small gains or even none at all. They are willing to put themselves at great risk just for the sake of the risk itself. It is not for the monetary, personal, or social gain that they commit these crimes, but often for no apparent gain at all (Cleckley, 1976). This is in contrast to the “average” criminal who would not usually take such great risks without the motivation of some hefty gain.

*Poor judgment and failure to learn by experience.* It is habitually observed when dealing with psychopaths that they continuously exhibit poor judgment. This is especially true in their actions. When engaging in a verbal test with a psychopath, they appear very sound in their reasoning abilities; however, when it comes to a test of their actions in these same situations, their decisions show their true sense of judgment (Cleckley, 1976). Psychopaths are also very self-deprecating when it involves their

ability to learn from experiences. Often, they will pull every weapon in their arsenal in order to be released from detention, only to go out and commit a crime that puts them right back where they lobbied so extensively to get freed from (p. 346).

*Pathologic egocentricity and incapacity for love.* One of the main features of psychopaths is their egocentricity. The level of this trait is often shocking to most ordinary people. There is a deep self-centeredness and an incapability of object love that is profound and absolute (Cleckley, 1976). The psychopath is capable of very generic feelings of like and dislike, but even these are not to the degree that most would label as typical, or “normal”. Most psychopaths are very adept at mimicking affection for their mate or children, often deceiving those closest to them for long periods of time. The absolute and unrelenting disregard and apathy for the hardships they bring on others gives away their true nature in time.

*General poverty in major affective reactions.* The psychopath generally expresses a defect in affect. Some are capable of displays of pseudo-emotion such as vanity and self-pity. Cleckley states that “mature, wholehearted anger, true or consistent indignation, honest, solid grief, sustaining pride, deep joy, and genuine despair are reactions not likely to be found within this scale” (Cleckley, 1976, p. 348). Cleckley encourages consideration of this trait that is common to all psychopaths, and poses a very intriguing query regarding the interdependence of the incapacity for object love and their shallowness of affect. Cleckley hypothesizes that it is possible for a person to feel some sort of “tragic” or “transforming” emotion without the ability to feel that particular personal commitment to another.

*Specific loss of insight.* Psychopaths have an extraordinarily distorted sense of insight. They have absolutely no capacity to see themselves as others see them. They are prone to extreme amounts of projection when it comes to blame. They will deny facts that would usually provide them with the insight needed to adequately assign blame. Psychopaths rationalize and blame all of their trouble on everyone else but themselves (Cleckley, 1976). They have the appearance of someone who uses all the words that would be used in the case of someone who understands the words but is still blind to their meaning. Cleckley also gives the example for lack of insight as the psychopaths' assumption that the legal penalties for the crimes they have committed do not apply to them. They commonly react to the idea of being prosecuted for their crimes like it is completely inappropriate.

*Unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations.* When dealing with psychopaths, it cannot be depended upon that they will have the typical responses to displays of kindness or trust. They show no consistent and recognizable reactions to kindness and appreciation save the usual shallow mimicry. Even then, they often even feign these responses if they perceive some personal gain. They can appear very generous and obliging when it serves their purpose; however, it is not uncommon for them to spend \$1000 on an escort or frivolous shopping and not show any distress over the deprivation that may be endured by their families as consequence (Cleckley, 1976, p.354).

*Fantastic and uninviting behavior with drink and sometimes without.* Although there are many psychopaths who do not drink, overindulgence is often a common theme among them. Alcohol is often a catalyst for many antisocial behaviors. With psychopaths many of the asocial and self-defeating behaviors are present even without extreme

intoxication required to produce it (Cleckley, 1976). Most psychopaths react oppositely to inebriation than do most typical drinkers. Where most people who partake in alcohol find themselves more boisterous, joyful, and excitable the more they ingest, psychopaths often become quiet and sullen. The normal gaiety that often accompanies a few drinks is markedly absent. What does often emerge is shocking and unexplainable behaviors in the psychopaths. With just a few drinks, they indulge in vastly antisocial behaviors. Cleckley gives the examples of those who would climb into a tree nude and shout to the top of their lungs in the middle of a busy intersection. This would not be typical of someone who had only had a few drinks. For psychopaths alcohol can be a powerful catalyst to fuel their darkest behavior because it temporarily numbs the inhibitory processes. For most psychopaths the inhibitory process is already very minimal, so it does not require much numbing.

*Suicide rarely carried out.* Even though psychopaths are prone to throwing away their opportunities and destroying the lives of those in their wake, suicide among psychopaths is exceedingly rare. In most instances it is observed that for psychopaths there is no general predilection for suicidal tendencies. This is true even though most psychopaths at some point often manipulate themselves and others into situations that often evoke suicide in the normal person. It is not uncommon for the psychopath to cleverly premeditate an attempt as another form of manipulation on those around them (Cleckley, 1976).

*Sex life impersonal, trivial, and poorly integrated.* It is nearly an accepted standard that the psychopath's sex life shows some type of peculiarities. Because they have no capacity for object love, the sexual inclinations of psychopaths do not include

any personal relations or desire to enjoy a shared experience with their partner. They do not seem to be encumbered by the normal complex emotional experiences that encompass most loving adult sexual relations (Cleckley, 1976). For most psychopaths sexual contact is regarded with absolute casualness. With psychopaths the feeling is the same for the wife, mistress, casual “hook up”, or prostitute. None of what is felt for any of these persons can inspire loyalty or influence their behavior one way or another. The typical promiscuity that is observed for both male and female psychopaths is most likely due to their immense lack of restraint and not to an abnormally excitable libido. Because they relish in high risk behaviors, they will often seek to have sex with high risk persons and in very squalid surroundings (Cleckley, 1976).

*Failure to follow any life plan.* Psychopaths do not tend to maintain any true effort toward any specific goals. They have very little ambition to follow any life plan whether it is good or evil. Most psychopaths actually seem to go out of their way to make sure they will fail. When in a career where everything is going well and they are on the track to be immensely successful, they will find a way to self-sabotage any headway they have made, usually in a grand and spectacular fashion (Cleckley, 1976).

It was from this invaluable insight and groundwork that the possibly most significant strides have been accomplished in the study of psychopathy by Hare. Cleckley’s influence can be readily observed throughout the career of Hare. Through his vast research, Hare states that even though the psychopath’s crimes are sensational and receive widespread coverage, that only about 1% of the total population and 10%-20% of the prison population are psychopathic (Hare, 1993). With the vast amount of research that was emerging in the study of psychopathy, there became a greater need to postulate a

standard definition of the disorder. McCord and McCord (1982, p. 4) described this dilemma by stating “for 150 years, science has known of the psychopath’s existence; for at least 140 years, scientists have quarreled over the definition of this disorder”.

One of the main problems with this, according to Cleckley, is that the motives of the psychopath are “more obscure” than those of the average criminal (Cleckley, 1976, p. 227). Both Cleckley and Hare agree on some traits that are exhibited in nearly all psychopaths. Both find the psychopath to have a callousness and lack of affect, risk taking behavior that would not be indulged by other forms of criminals, exploitation of others weaknesses, and are free from any other disease that could affect their judgment or movement (Cleckley, 1976, p. 227; Hare, 1993, chapter 12). It is also acknowledged by both Cleckley and Hare that the threat of punishment is not an effective deterrent for the psychopath.

From all of the previous studies by Pinel, Cleckley, Freud, and others, Hare began to form a detailed description and definition of the psychopath. This explanation is the standard characterization of encompassed characteristics that are widely accepted, by the psychiatric, legal, and medical communities today. Hare’s description is as follows:

Social predators who charm, manipulate, and ruthlessly plow their way through life, leaving a broad trail of broken hearts, shattered expectations, and empty wallets. Completely lacking in conscience and in feeling for others, they selfishly take what they want and do as they please, violating social norms and expectations without the slightest sense of guilt or regret (Hare, 1993, xi).

Hare also comprised a list of character traits that he deemed to be typical of the psychopath: glib and superficial charm; egocentricity; selfishness; lack of empathy; lack of any guilt or remorse; manipulateness; deceitfulness; lack of attachment; lack of

principles or goals; impulsivity; irresponsibility; and regular violation of social norms (Hare, 1980).

Another brilliant mind in the study of psychopathy, Meloy (1992), in his work *Violent Attachments* offers an eerily similar construct for psychopathy when he states:

The nature of the psychopath's violent behavior is also consistent with his callous, remorseless, and unempathetic attitude toward his victims. I theorize that the psychopath was psycho-biologically predisposed to predatory violence, a mode of aggression which is planned, purposeful, and emotionless (Meloy, 1992, p. 72-73).

Meloy also describes the self-aggrandizement and narcissistic behavior patterns exhibited by psychopaths. One term that Meloy uses to depict the other inherent behaviors that psychopaths portray is "omnipotent control" (Meloy, 1992). Meloy suggests that this level of control over others by the psychopaths is possible through their severe detachment and limited capacity to form effective emotional bonds with others (Meloy, 1992).

Although it is common to hear some other terms being used interchangeably for "psychopathy" or for being a "psychopath", it is important to quickly address these and their differences in order to maintain consistency in definition throughout this work. It is not uncommon to hear some psychiatrist, psychologist, and sociologists use the term "sociopathy" or "sociopath" when discussing someone with the same or similar symptoms. It is also common to see this diagnosis confused with "Antisocial Personality Disorder", or APSD. Hare disagrees that these are all interchangeable terms for the same disorder. Hare defines a "sociopath" as a criminal who is molded entirely from social forces and dysfunctional environment (Hare, 1993). In *Without Conscience* Hare states that he can find "no convincing evidence that psychopathy is the direct result of early

social or environmental factors” (1993, p. 23). Hare suggests that psychopathy “is defined by a cluster of both personality traits and socially deviant behaviors” (1993, p. 24).

Psychopathy is also not fully defined within the diagnosis of Antisocial Personality Disorder. This is a disorder described within the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV (DSM-IV), published by the American Psychological Association (APA) in 2000. This manual is the core diagnostic tool for psychiatrists today. It is noted that many of the same traits are exhibited in those suffering from APSD are present in those diagnosed with psychopathy such as: failure to conform to social norms; deceitfulness; impulsivity; consistent irresponsibility; and lack of remorse (APA, 2000). These criteria are applied to those who are over 18 years, not otherwise psychotic since age 15, and exhibit at least three of the preceding criteria on a regular basis. While these criteria are very similar to some of those used to diagnose psychopathy, it is worth noting that “psychopathy” is not currently listed among the possible diagnoses in the DSM-IV, or any prior edition (APA, 2000). ASPD is a useful and meaningful diagnosis that is readily applicable to most of the current prison population; however, it is understood that while all psychopaths have APSD, not all of those diagnosed with APSD are psychopaths.

## Etiology

When the debate over classification and diagnostic criteria began, the question of the etiology of psychopathy became of even greater importance to researchers and clinicians. It is fundamental human nature for us to wonder “why” and “how” someone behaves in the manner that they do. This is especially accurate when discussing the disconcerting behavior exhibited by psychopaths. The easiest and most convenient explanation that has previously been assigned to these individuals is “insanity”. Most of society feels comfortable with the assumption that in order to behave this way, and commit such heinous acts, they must be insane. This assumption creates a level of comfortability with the psychopath. These acts are not truly their fault, because they are not mentally sound. This is actually a very precarious and erroneous assumption to make.

Hare has asserted that psychopathy is a personality disorder, it is not to be confused with “psychosis”, which is a mental disorder. Those diagnosed with psychopathy, are deemed sane by both legal and psychiatric standards (Hare, 1993). Psychopaths are rational, able to premeditate their actions, and in control of their actions. They are able to understand the concepts of right and wrong and weigh out the risk versus reward ratio of their decisions. Because psychopaths do understand their actions and their possible consequences, they are legally accountable (Hare, 1993).

Once it had been decided that the psychopath was, in fact, considered to be sane, there grew an even greater need for an explanation for the cause of such appalling behavior. The great debate for this, as is for many difficult humanistic issues, is “nature

versus nurture”. Was psychopathy caused by organic deficits or environmental deprivations? So the two schools of thought were essentially (1) bad brain, or (2) bad parenting. What has occurred from this in the last 20 years, due in large part to Hare, has been a paradigm shift from the hypothesis that psychopaths are created by severe childhood trauma and abuse to a more inherent, bio-physiological explanation. Over the course of his research, Hare discovered that the majority of those he diagnosed with psychopathy had not reported coming from psychologically traumatic or emotionally dormant backgrounds (Hare, 1993). This is largely the case for most of the serial killers included in this thesis. The majority of the psychopathic personalities in Hare’s work *The Mask of Sanity* reported coming from relatively “normal” homes, with attentive and caring parents. This revelation has led to the search for a more complete and accurate explanation for the origins of this disorder.

The preponderance of research has narrowed down the possible genesis of this behavior to three main areas: attachment, arousal, and anxiety. The disorder is best personified by those having “no” attachments, very low arousal, and nearly nonexistent anxiety levels. Attachment is a biological mechanism that allows the infant to survive by creating closeness with its caretaker. According to British psychoanalyst John Bowlby, who first conceptualized the principle, it is highly present in all mammals but not reptiles (Robertson & Bowlby, 1952). Attachment begins in infancy when the infant learns the concept of “object permanence”. This is the behavior learned when the infant realizes that the mother will return again and again, even after leaving the room. This helps form a standard cycle of response behavior of seeking proximity to an object; feeling stress when it leaves; and behaving a certain way when it returns. This is the same for adults

and children throughout the lifespan (Cassidy & Shaver, 1999). Bowlby regarded the outcome of attachment disorder as being self-absorption, lack of emotion, and apathy. Bowlby labeled this condition as “affectionless psychopathy” (Bowlby, 1969).

The second area of interest in this deadly trifecta is low arousal. Hare (1970) conducted most of the work on this construct. Hare conducted research using galvanic skin response to show that psychopaths showed peripheral autonomic hyporeactivity to adverse events. Essentially, Hare measured the sweat response on the skin of the psychopaths in response to anxiety or punishment related stimuli. It was established that in psychopaths, a small skin conductance reaction in anticipation of negative stimuli followed by a hefty increase in heart rate. The opposite was observed in nonpsychopathic patients. The nonpsychopaths had a large galvanic skin response followed by a decrease in heart rate (Hare, 1970). To sum these findings: in nonpsychopaths an important event or stimuli caused an increase in skin conductance and a lower heart rate, but negative stimulus caused an increase in fear, thus causing a rise in both heart rate and conductance. In the psychopaths the fact that they experienced an increased heart rate, but low skin reaction shows that they are somehow able to negate the impending negative stimuli or threat of punishment and experience no increased fear (Hare, 1970).

Anxiety is the third dimension in what Bowlby labeled “the house of the psychopath”. The biological basis for anxiety is believed to serve to keep the infant close to the mother and keep the infant safe from any predators (Bowlby, 1969). Anxiety in this form is readily observable when the infant is handed to a stranger too quickly and it reacts with fear and anxiety. This usually initiates startle and crying that evokes the

mother to retrieve the infant and thereby remove the perceived threat. Anxiety has been shown to be absent or drastically diminished in psychopathic personalities. This was originally observed by Lykken (1957) during his testing on anxious and nonanxious psychopaths at the University of Minnesota. During this study Lykken discovered that according to the low electro dermal reactivity in anticipation of punishment, psychopaths fail to develop feelings of anxiety in expectation of punishment. It is believed that this detrimental trifecta of emotional detachment; underarousal; and low anxiety levels are the biological walls that construct Bowlby's "house of psychopath".

The low fear and anxiety hypothesis was more recently examined by Bradley and Lang in 2000. In this study a sample of male psychopathic and nonpsychopathic prisoners was shown three different pictures: erotic and thrilling (pleasure inducing); victim or threat (unpleasant); and neutral. This study concluded that there was a significant delay in reflex inflection at early intervals in those inmates diagnosed as psychopathic, signifying a deficit in their initial evaluation of the photos (Bradley & Lang, 2000). Bradley and Lang's study furthermore concluded that the psychopathic prisoners showed a distinct delay in their startle response when shown photos of mutilation and vicious attacks. This is most likely related to the reflex inhibition as well.

These revelations have guided even further exploits into the psyche of the psychopath in current years. Building upon this very strong base, the neurobiological emphasis has emerged. One chief breakthrough for explanation achieved in recent years has been dysfunction in the amygdala and the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) of the brain. The amygdala, which is Greek for "almond shape", is a small organ located in the temporal lobe of the brain. It is the area responsible for anxiety and fear response. This

area delegates the “fight or flight” response when confronted with a perceived threat (Blair, 2006). The OFC is located in the frontal lobe of the brain and plays an integral part in anticipation of reward or punishment. With deficits present in these areas, it is conceivable that one would present with symptoms of low fear response and low anxiety levels such as those present in the psychopathic prisoners sample (Blair, 2006). There is still considerable debate in the scientific community on whether the amygdala or the OFC play a bigger role in the underlying development of psychopathy. It is widely accepted that the pathway is likely multi-systemic and widespread. The need for future research in this area is vast, but the groundwork has been well laid.

#### Effects on Personality Structure

The theory that psychopathy is, in part, of biological and innate origin aids considerably in understanding why psychopathy tends to emerge during childhood and remain relatively stable throughout the lifetime (Hare, 1993). Those who are in contact with the psychopath as a child often describe them as being “inexplicably different” from other children (Hare, 1993, p. 157). Frequently, these children are found to be very aggressive, manipulative, and deceitful from a very early age, and are often considered to be hard for others to relate to (Hare, 1993). It is also hypothesized by Hare (1993) that the best chance for treatment of psychopaths is during these early years when many of the behaviors are first presenting. During these years they can be taught to channel these antisocial behaviors and needs into more prosocial channels rather than the destructive outlets chosen by most psychopaths. This concern lends credibility to the bioneurological theories offered and also offers hope for future treatment options.

Because psychopathy is essentially a personality disorder and not considered to be a “mental illness”, there is no formal diagnosis of psychopathy included in the DSM-IV (APA, 2000) or in any previous edition of the manual. This discrepancy left a great need within the scientific, legal, and behavioral science communities to have a formal tool for diagnosis of this disorder. Hare recognized and responded to this need with his creation of the *Psychopathy Checklist* based on previous research by Cleckley and others and numerous years of his own research and observations (Hare, 1993). This instrument was revised in 1991 and renamed the *Psychopathy Checklist-Revised* (PCL-R) (Hare, 1991). In the revised edition two of the factor items were removed due to low correlations with the total score. These factors were: (1) previous diagnosis as a psychopath or similar; and (2) drug or alcohol not a direct cause of antisocial behavior (Hare et al., 1990). This tool was considered to be the “Gold Standard” for assessing psychopathy in both male and female subjects (Fulero, 1995). The PCL-R second edition includes differential information according to gender. The inclusion of female samples is why this tool was used by the author for the purpose of thesis.

According to Hare (1994), “this checklist is now used worldwide and provides clinicians and researchers with a way of distinguishing, with reasonable certainty, true psychopaths from those who merely break the rules” (Hare, 1994). Hare also remarks that we should be aware that many people who are not psychopathic exhibit many of these symptoms. Psychopathy, as a disorder, is a syndrome comprised of clusters of associated symptoms (Hare, 1994). The PCL-R has been proven as a valid and vigorous predictor of psychopathy and violent criminal activity and recidivism (Hare, 1991; Quincey, Harris, & Rice, 1990). The PCL-R is a diagnostic instrument consisting of three parts: a

semistructured interview, review of file information, and collateral review. The PCL-R was originally designed to always include a direct interview with the subject; nevertheless, studies have suggested that for purposes of research a record review alone is sufficient if the information used is high quality (Grann, Langstrom, Tengstrom, & Stalenheim, 1998). It must be noted that there is some evidence to suggest that increasing the amount of information available to those conducting testing has been found to amplify the amount of elevated scores and positive diagnosis (Rutherford, 1993). The instrument has been shown to be equally applicable and reliable across genders (Hart & Hare, 1999) and ethnicities (Kosson, Smith, & Newman, 1990). Even though the instrument has been validated for the assessment of female psychopathy, some significant procedural concerns have been raised. These concerns have arisen from the conclusion that females generally present with a much lesser base rate of psychopathy, as opposed to their male counterparts (Vitale et al., 2002). This has led to discussion on factor structure reassignment for females in the future to help account for the lower base rate.

The foremost issue with application to females is the female psychopath's tendency to express these traits in dissimilar conduct to their male counterparts. The sensitivity is lower for females because of this disparity. For instance, the female scores lower on the "callousness" factor because she often exhibits less violence and aggression in her behaviors. This does not mean that she is not just as callous as her male counterpart, but her callousness is achieved through more subtle methods (Vitale & Newman, 2001). Most of the issues being addressed with using the PCL-R for females are due to the differentiation between the female's expressions of these factors. It is not

that the females are any less psychopathic than the males, but they are often more understated and sly in their expression. Females often use sexual promiscuity and subtle manipulation to achieve their antisocial goals, whereas males often use aggression, violence, and harassment to achieve the same ends (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1993). Even with these issues being suggested, the studies have shown that the PCL-R is still stable and reliable for use with female psychopaths.

The internal consistency of the PCL-R has been established by numerous studies in which the Chronbach's Alpha is collectively reported above .80. Meta-analysis in one of the most recent studies reported Chronbach's alphas  $>.80$  for all results (Hemphill, Hare, & Wong, 1998). In his studies Hare (1991) reported alphas of .87 and .85 for his pooled prison and forensic patient samples respectively.

The PCL-R is a 20 item scale useful in measuring the core characteristics and personality traits of psychopathy. The items on the scale account for traits and lifestyle behaviors relating to criminal behaviors, substance abuse, medical history, lifetime antisocial behaviors, psychological test results, behavior while institutionalized, family life; financial behavior, work history, and sexual and relationship histories (Salekin, Rogers, & Sewell, 1996). Each of these items is then rated using a 3-point scale from (0-3) in which 0= (Not Applicable) no examples of behavior evident; 1= (Uncertain) at least one example of behavior exhibited, but behavior not exhibited consistently; or 3= (Definitely Present) multiple examples, pattern of behavior exists (Hare, 1991). This allows for total scoring of (0-40), with the standard cut off for a diagnosis of psychopathy being a score of 30 or greater. Those with a score  $< 30$  are not considered to be clinically psychopathic. These items are also grouped by factor analysis into two main factors and

four facets. These four facets are (1) Interpersonal, (2) Affective, (3) Lifestyle, (4) Antisocial (Hare, 1991).

Factor 1 traits are consistent with behaviors indicative of the “selfish, callous, and remorseless use of others”. These traits are highly correlated with the disorders of narcissistic personality disorder and histrionic personality disorder (Hare, 1991). This is also described as aggressive or malignant narcissism and describes the interpersonal and affective interactions of the personality (Hare, 1991). The key features of this personality disorder involve exaggerated sense of entitlement and self-importance and lack of empathy (APA, 2000). These traits are most closely considered to be those of the “primary” or “true” psychopath. Factor 2 traits are consistent with “chronically unstable, antisocial and socially deviant lifestyle”. These traits are most consistent with antisocial personality disorder (Hare, 1991). The key features of this disorder include frequent law or rule breaking, using others for personal gain, and charming and seductive personality (APA, 2000). These factors are more consistent with anger issues, chronic criminality, and impulse control violence. Most of these features are consistent with the “secondary psychopath”, considered by some to be a more virulent form of APSD and not truly psychopathy at all. Those with primarily Factor 2 traits (common criminals and those with APSD) tend to “age out” of their criminality, while those displaying primarily Factor 1 characteristics (core psychopaths) do not (Hare, 1993).

Primary psychopaths suffer from what McCord and McCord (1982) termed “lovelessness and guiltlessness”. These patients are the true predators of society. Primary psychopaths present low anxiety, little stress response, and no fear. They are emotionally detached, callous, master manipulators, dominating, and are often perceived to have

difficulty understanding the meanings of others' words. They often seem to be unable to discern the meaning of their own words as well, a condition termed "semantic aphasia" (Cleckley, 1976). Primary psychopaths also appear to be devoid of any genuine emotions, although they are very adept at mimicking them (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1993). This group is considered to be the "core" or "true" psychopath. This term is applicable to those whose psychopathy is innate and unchanging throughout the lifespan (Hare, 1993).

Secondary psychopaths have more in common with those diagnosed with APSD by the DSM-IV criteria. This category shows more risk taking behaviors, high anxiety levels, aggressive and prone to violent outbursts of anger, and impulsivity (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1993). One of the main distinctions observed in the secondary psychopath is their capacity to feel guilty for their actions (Hare, 1993). This class of psychopath is more prone to petty criminality and thrill seeking behavior than are the core psychopaths. Secondary psychopathy is often more associated with substance abuse and childhood trauma (Hare, 2003). It is also common with this group to see them "age out" of many of their antisocial and criminalistic behaviors, whereas primary or core psychopaths never show a steady decline in those behaviors throughout their life (Hare, 1993). Table 2 lists the items included in the PCL-R and is followed by a description of each.

Table 2

*20 items included in the PCL-R*

Item	Description
1	Glibness and Superficial Charm
2	Grandiose sense of self-worth
3	Need for stimulation and Proneness to boredom
4	Pathological Lying
5	Conning and Manipulative
6	Lack of remorse or guilt
7	Shallow affect
8	Callous and lack of empathy
9	Parasitic lifestyle
10	Poor behavioral control
11	Promiscuous sexual behavior
12	Early behavior problems
13	Lack of realistic long-term goals
14	Impulsivity
15	Irresponsibility
16	Failure to accept responsibility for own actions
17	Many short term marital relationships
18	Juvenile delinquency
19	Revocation of conditional release
20	Criminal versatility

*Source:* Adapted from Hare (1991).

The core traits of psychopathy according to Hare can be divided into two key categories: 1. Emotional and Interpersonal that includes glib and superficial, egocentric and grandiose, lack of remorse or guilt, lack of empathy, deceitful and manipulative, and shallow emotions. 2. Social Deviance that includes impulsive, poor behavior controls, need for excitement, and lack of responsibility, early behavior problems, and adult antisocial behavior (Hare, 1993).

*Glib and Superficial.* Most psychopaths are very well spoken and can often spin a great tale, making sure to cast themselves in the very best light. They are able to easily draw others in due to their exuberant charm and charisma (Hare, 1991, 1993).

*Egocentric and Grandiose.* Psychopaths present with extreme narcissism and egocentricity. They feel that they are so extraordinary that the world owes them anything they desire. Psychopaths have little regard for society's rules, laws, and regulations. They often explain that they 'live by their own set of rules'. Psychopaths often talk about their grand plans and life goals but nearly never actually work toward bringing them to fruition, even though most are exceedingly capable of doing so (Hare, 1991, 1993).

*Lack of Remorse or Guilt.* Psychopaths always have a dozen excuses for their actions and show relatively little concern for the effect these actions have on those around them. They are never sorry and often express that they do not understand why others are upset or hurt by them. Psychopaths often rationalize away their deviant behaviors, blaming everyone but themselves. Typically, the psychopaths often deny culpability, even when presented with definitive evidence of their guilt (Hare, 1993).

*Lack of Empathy.* The most devastating characteristics displayed by psychopaths evolve from this trait. They are unable to see things as others do or put themselves "in other's shoes". Psychopaths do not give any thought to the needs, feelings, fears, or rights of others. The only reason they keep any ties to anyone at all is because they feel possessive of those persons. It is not out of any type of true emotional attachment (Cleckley, 1996; Hare, 1993).

*Deceitful and Manipulative.* Psychopaths are intensely overconfident with their ability to lie. They are unafraid of anyone catching them in the lies. If they are discovered and confronted, psychopaths will just make up another lie to cover the lie that was discovered. They are very adept at keeping this cycle going until the listener is so confused he or she does not even know what the original tall tale was (Hare, 1993).

*Shallow Emotions.* Psychopathic personalities have little to no emotional depth. They appear to suffer from a form of emotional poverty not seen in normal individuals. They can appear very distant, cold, and blank. At times, they may be prone to outburst of superficial attempts at emotion, but most people will be able to see through this (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1993).

*Impulsive.* Psychopaths are prone to behavior that is self-serving and unplanned. They will often decide to do something without consulting anyone or stopping to think and evaluate the possible consequences. They often live by the motto “if it feels good, do it”. This often leaves those closest to them wondering what is happening when they decide to leave suddenly, stay gone for days with no explanation, or quit their job on a whim (Hare, 1993).

*Poor Behavior Controls.* Psychopaths frequently react with sudden violence when confronted with any perceived insult or threat. They respond to any type of inconvenience in a similar fashion. The psychopath’s controls are very weak and any provocation overwhelms them and cause intense overreaction. Once this occurs, it is usually over very quickly, and they will immediately act as if nothing has happened. It

can be said that it is like they are “flipping a switch” within themselves, and it occurs just as quickly (Hare, 1993).

*A Need for Excitement.* Psychopaths are very easily prone to boredom. They are in constant need of some form of excitement or stimulation. They do not bother with or involve themselves with any routine, monotonous activities. This is part of what makes them so devastating to their families. They habitually gain the trust, admiration, and love of others, even entering into marriages and having children, but will soon tire of the routine and disappear. Much of what excites them is nonconformity and risk-taking. These thrill seeking behaviors are often the only way that they end up getting caught (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1993).

*Lack of Responsibility.* Psychopaths cannot be bothered with the responsibilities of the common person. They do not worry about the well being of their mates or children, leave and return as they please, spend every dime in the shared account on frivolity, and feel nothing in response to confrontation about their behaviors. At work psychopaths make grand suggestions and brag about their prime business acumen while misusing company property and doing absolutely nothing all day. They have no sense of pride in any “real” work, only in their ability to manipulate others into doing it for them (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1993).

*Early Behavior Problems.* According to Hare (1993) most psychopaths begin to exhibit their peculiar behavior patterns early in life. The behaviors may include “persistent lying, cheating, theft, vandalism, and/or be precocious sexually”. Even

though many children exhibit some of these traits, even in the best of situations, the psychopath has these to a more persistent and prolonged extent (Hare, 1993).

*Adult Antisocial Behavior.* Psychopaths carry these behaviors into adolescence and adulthood. Psychopaths are more diverse and recurrent in their criminal behavior than is the standard criminal. They are more adept by adulthood and show no particular affinity for any one kind of criminal activity (Hare, 1993).

The characteristics that are incorporated in the Factor 1 cluster (Emotional and Interpersonal) are 1-2, 4-8, and 16. The traits that are included in the Factor 2 cluster (Social Deviance) are 3, 9, 10, 12-15, and 18-19. Items 11, 17, and 20 are excluded from either Factor cluster due to marginal factor loadings and similar descriptive strength. Only those that are indicative of lack of empathy, remorse, guilt, and shallow affect are included (Hare, 1991). Without many exceptions, Hare's two-factor model is widely supported as the preeminent method for analysis. Most notably, one of those exceptions was proposed by Raine (1985). Raine suggested that the scale be divided into four clusters instead of Hare's two. These four clusters are Egocentricity, Emotional Detachment, Impulsiveness, and Superficial Relationships. Regardless of the newer suggestions, the two factor model implemented by Hare continues to be the standard accepted worldwide.

### Female Versus Male Psychopathy

It is the common misconception that females are less capable of unprovoked and undeserved violence than are males. This misconception has hindered the progress of study on the female psychopath for nearly 100 years. Society tends to underestimate and

underplay the amount of violence that women are capable of. Females have never been excluded in the study of psychopathy, having been cited in studies by both Cleckley (1941, 1976) and Hare (1993). The main issue with these and other studies including females and psychopathy is the constructs are being applied exactly the same for both males and females. The females are being analyzed by the criteria designed for males without regards for possible differences in expression of traits according to gender. It is worth noting that even Cleckley may have been swayed by the traditional gender roles in society when analyzing some of the female psychopaths in his practice.

This is evidenced by his analysis of a psychopath in his practice named “Anna”. Although Anna displayed many of the same aggressive and deviant behaviors as her male peers, Cleckley seemed to make excuses and downplay the seriousness of her actions (Cleckley, 1941; 1976). Anna was a pathological liar, promiscuous (even knowingly transmitting sexually transmitted diseases), physically aggressive with classmates, and even expelled from school for urinating on her classmate’s clothing. Despite all of the evidence of her being just as callous and unremorseful as her male equals, Cleckley states that “Anna never really seems to have meant much harm to others or to herself” (Cleckley, 1941). It seems Cleckley may have himself “fallen prey” to the gender stereotypes regarded by society. Cleckley, in all probability, felt that because she was female, her actions were less insidiously motivated.

These assumptions have been allowed to persist for so long due to the fear of recognition that those expected to be the nurturers and caregivers are just as capable of unemotional and unremorseful evil as any male. This is an uncomfortable notion to digest. Due to this feeling of unease, nearly all of the female criminals exhibiting these

symptoms are labeled psychiatrically unstable ( Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). Once again, this takes a sense of accountability away from the offender, as a way of mitigating their behavior. This notion is slowly being dispelled through more frequent and extensive studies involving female psychopaths. Carozza (2008) suggests that female psychopaths also demonstrate many of the same interpersonal and affective features considered to be the hallmarks of the disorder including shallow emotion, lack of empathy, egocentricity, and deceptiveness. It has also been observed that females use more covert methods of operation. They often use more sexuality and physicality to manipulate and achieve their goals rather than blatant physical aggression (Carozza, 2008). Salekin et al. (1997) suggests female psychopaths show more inappropriate sexual behaviors and shallow or exaggerated emotions, traits in common with Histrionic Personality Disorder, moreover, male psychopaths have more need of admiration, lack of emotion, and grandiosity; traits familiar to Narcissistic Personality Disorder.

Both males and females show analogous irresponsible behavior and parasitic lifestyle components, although it is often scored lower for females due to the perception of acceptability for females to be dependent on their parents or spouse. The key differences between male and female psychopaths lie in the methods used to achieve their parallel goals. Females use more sexual manipulation, and various other nonviolent behaviors, whereas males often use more aggressive violent behaviors (Cruise et al., 2003; Grann, 2000; Salekin et al., 1998). Guze (1976) stated that women are almost never classified as psychopathic, those characteristics are generally labeled as hysterics instead. These differences have led discussions of possible changes being made in the

evaluation and scoring of female psychopathy using the PCL-R and other self-reporting measures in the future.

Grann (2000) conducted the first direct comparison regarding psychopathy and gender using the PCL-R. Grann found the prevalence of psychopathy to be substantially lower for females at 11.0 % than males at 31.0%. In the numerous studies that have been conducted thus far, the incidence of psychopathy has been universally lower for females. In one large-scale study conducted by Hare including 1,218 female inmates and 5,408 males, the mean PCL-R scores were 19.0 for females with a standard deviation of 7.5. The mean score for males was 22.1 with a standard deviation of 7.9 (Hare, 1993). This outcome has been proven consistent in both inmate and college student populations; showing a much lower level of psychopathy in the females (Bolt et al., 2004; Forth, Brown, Hart, & Hare, 1993; Hart & Hare, 1996). While Hare contends that this is due to an actual lower incidence of psychopathy inherent in the female populations, some researchers contend the disparity could be due to the factor structure of the PCL-R itself. Cooke and Michie (2001) proposed that the two-factor model proposed by Hare is biased toward males due to the different expressions of psychopathy between the sexes. Cooke and Michie developed a three factor model they believed would be better suited to female psychopathy because it lowered the emphasis on antisocial behaviors and re-emphasized the apathy and callousness that were more prominent determinants of female psychopathy (Cooke & Michie, 2001).

The affective defects present in the male psychopaths also appear to be applicable to the female persuasion of the disorder (Vitale, Brinkley, Hiatt, & Newman, 2007).

Sutton et al. (2002) in a study of 528 female prisoners found that the female psychopaths

also displayed a moderately delayed startle response to unnerving photos. This provided some of the initial evidence regarding the female psychopath's display of similar emotional processing deficits. One definitive difference between male and female psychopaths is in the area of empathy. Research has consistently demonstrated that the females display higher scores for empathetic concern (Eisenburg & Strayer, 1987; Zagon & Jackson, 1994). To a great extent the most significant disparity between the sexes lies in socialization and gender roles. Typically, males have been socialized to be more aggressive, independent, and emotionally inhibited. Females are expected to be more inhibited and dependent; therefore, women tend to be saddled with a less deviant diagnosis of Histrionic Personality Disorder, versus males with the same symptomology who are more often diagnosed with APSD (Forth et al., 1994; Lillienfield, 1992; Magdol et al., 1997). This happens, perhaps, due to both gender biases on the part of the clinicians, as well as that of society at large. These chief disparities serve as a prompt for much needed future research on psychopathy and gender differences.

### Treatment of Psychopathy

In the past, the general consensus on the treatment of psychopathy has been one of disappointment. The outlook was perhaps best expressed by Suedfeld and Landon (1978) when they stated, "Review of the literature suggests that a chapter on effective treatment should be the shortest in any book concerned with psychopathy. In fact, it has been suggested that one sentence would suffice: No demonstrably effective treatment has been found" (1978, p. 347). This was the standard thought model until research by Salekin in 2002 provided some much needed hope. Salekin found that following a meta-analysis of 42 studies, 60% of the psychopathic patients had benefited from therapy. The

most successful forms of therapy among these patients were cognitive, behavioral, and psychoanalytic. A combination of these forms of therapy appeared to improve the capacity for remorse, increase empathy quotients, reduce lying, and increase relationship intimacy (Salekin, 2002). The most effective results were achieved when this therapy was intensive and extensive (preferably three or more times per week) and included group and family therapy.

This development has been strongly contested by several studies suggesting that the meta-analysis was performed using only case studies, thus creating a biased outcome. Harris and Rice (2006) performed analysis on several treatment studies with more evolved and unbiased criteria and concluded, “No clinical intervention will ever be helpful”, and “Psychotherapy could actually make psychopathic individuals worse” (Hare, 1993, p. 198; Harris & Rice, 2006, p. 563). This view was also condoned by Wong and Hare (2005). Wong and Hare concluded that the only outcome that may be affected is recidivism. Hare, Clark, Grann, and Thornton (2000) demonstrated that due to an increase in Factor 1 traits (superficial and manipulative) in those psychopaths in therapy, the treatment may actually be intensifying the level of psychopathy. The psychopaths were just learning to better manipulate their therapists and others in their facilities (Seto & Barbaree, 1999). They learned to “talk the talk” without ever really understanding what it means to “walk the walk”. Seto and Barbaree concluded that those psychopaths who responded better to therapy and scored higher on the PCL-R were more than five times more likely to violently reoffend (Seto & Barbaree, 1999). Salekin (2002) has suggested that the treatments for male and female psychopaths need to be tailored differently, and that one blanket treatment should not be used for all. Females

have consistently shown that they may respond better to some forms of therapy than do males. This is most likely due to their slightly higher levels of emotional diversity.

Females generally score lower on the Factor 1 traits (lack of empathy, callousness) than do males and often display a higher capacity for empathy (Hare, 1991, 1993; Salekin, 2002).

Some studies have addressed the issue of medication therapy for psychopathy. By large, these studies have not proven any great successes as compared to any other form of treatment. Lithium and carbamazepine have been used in the past to help reduce violent and aggressive behavior (Tyrer & Seivewright, 1988). Phenytoin has been studied for its impulse control properties, although premeditated aggression was not effected (Barratt, Stanford, Felthous, & Kent, 1997). The greatest hope for treatment or, at least, containment of psychopathy appears to lie in the recognition of the symptoms of the disorder in early childhood in order to train the psychopaths to execute their antisocial impulses in socially acceptable ways (Hare, 1993). At this time the only truly effective treatment for psychopaths is incarceration. Being incapacitated from harming society and remaining in a structured and well controlled environment appears to be the safest and most effective solution for all. Some of the most advantageous treatment theories revolve around early intervention for children diagnosed with severe Conduct Disorder. Catching and addressing these behaviors early, before they progress into more destructive and violent behavior, may be the key to some prevention.

## Psychopathy, Paraphilia, and Its Relationship to Serial Murder

According to Hare, nearly all serial murderers are psychopathic, but not all psychopaths become serial murderers (Hare, 1993). Despite this assumption, there have been many psychopathic traits routinely exhibited by serial murderers including lack of remorse or guilt, need for control, impulsivity, and predatory behaviors (Hare, 1993; Hickey, 2006). Psychopaths who commit serial murder are among the most dangerous predators known to man. They are extremely callous and show no regard for any human life (Hare, 1993). Although there are many different apparent motivations for serial murder, all of these murders are committed for some form of personal gain. It is in the type of gain that these crimes appear to differ. Many of the female serial murderers commit their crimes for either financial gain or to “get someone out of the way”. These women are often referred to as “black widows” (Holmes & Holmes, 1998). The male serial murderers are often more motivated by sexual fantasy or power and control (Holmes & Holmes, 1998). While this may describe the majority, there are several female serial murderers who appear to have been sexually motivated as well. These females are just as vicious, callous, and unremorseful as their male counterparts. They represent the very essence of Hare’s description of a “primary or core” psychopath.

In the majority of the cases in which a sexual component was present, there was most often an underlying Paraphilia encouraging the motivational fantasies. According to the DSM-IV (APA, 2000), Paraphilia is defined as:

Recurrent, intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors generally involving 1) nonhuman objects, 2) the suffering or humiliation of oneself or one's partner, or 3) children or other nonconsenting persons, that occur over a period of at least 6 months; and that cause clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning.

These components are evident in many cases of serial slayings. The Paraphilia themselves are as diverse and unusual as their names. Table 3 lists the most common accepted Paraphilia and their meaning.

Table 3

*Types of Paraphilia*

Title	Description
Exhibitionism	Exposure of genitals to unsuspecting strangers
Fetishism	Use of nonliving objects
Frotteurism	Rubbing against a nonconsenting person
Pedophilia	Sexual arousal, urges, or behaviors with a child under 13
Sexual masochism	Sexually arousing fantasies, urges, or behaviors involving acts of humiliation, beating, bondage, or other suffering
Sexual sadism	Sexually arousing fantasies, urges, or behaviors involving acts of psychological or physical suffering during which the humiliation of the victim is sexually arousing to the person
Transvestic fetishism	Involves cross-dressing by a heterosexual male
Voyeurism	Act of observing an unsuspecting person in the nude, involved in sexual activity, or while undressing
Telephone scatologia	Making obscene phone calls

Table 3 (continued)

Necrophilia	Sexual activity with corpses
Partialism	Fantasies partial to a particular part of the body
Zoophilia	Sexual acts involving animals
Coprophilia	Sexual excitement involving feces
Klismaphilia	Sexual excitement from receiving an enema
Urophilia	Sexual pleasure from the act of urinating or being urinated on

*Source:* Adapted from the DSM-IV (APA, 2000)

Rape and sexual sadism are frequent components in serial homicides, especially in those cases perpetrated by male serial murderers (Hickey, 2002; Stone, 1998). In those with a personality disorder in which lack of conscience is present, the person is permitted to kill without remorse; and in these individuals sexual sadism is most often the primary motivation behind the homicide (APA, 2000; Hare, 1993;). Whereas childhood trauma did not appear to be a primary contributor in diagnosis of psychopathy, it has been revealed to greatly contribute to the development of a propensity for sexual sadism.

Ressler et al. (1988) concluded that childhood maltreatment was particularly prevalent in the histories of the sexually motivated serial murderers studied. Hickey (2001) also describes sadistically motivated rape as being a Paraphilia. Biastophilia is when the perpetrator can only become sexually aroused while committing rape. They are aroused by the rape itself; usually there must also be a high level of brutality involved for the act to be considered satisfying to the rapist (Hickey, 2001). This type of rape is different from the more common “anger” rapist, or “compensatory” rapist. Biastophilic rapists rely more heavily on fantasy and are a more controlled type of offender with

regards to their anger level (Hickey, 2001, 2003). Sadistic Paraphilia is the most deviant and perilous of all the named Paraphilia because it is known to lead to sexual violence and serial murder (Purcell & Arrigo, 2006). Erotophonophilia is the proper name for “lust murder”. This Paraphilia entails the sadistic murder of another in order to achieve sexual gratification and orgasm (Douglass, Burgess, & Ressler, 1995). These types of murderers often feel the compulsive need to repeat the act for sustained gratification, therefore, often they become serial in nature. Genital mutilation is also frequently observed in these types of homicidal rituals (Hickey, 2006). Research states that it is the pattern of pervasive, sadistic fantasies that eventually lead to the homicidal behavior. The fantasies are replayed repetitively in the murderers mind, often aided by violent photos, videos, and pornography. Eventually, the fantasies are no longer sufficient stimulation and the murderer must act on them in order to achieve the same level of sexual gratification (Burgess et al., 1986; Douglass et al., 1995; MacCulloch et al., 1983).

The etiology of Paraphilia is also a highly debated topic. Money (1980) suggests that excessive restriction of and punishment for normal childhood sexual curiosity and rehearsal play may cause the development of deviant practices. It has also been postulated that introduction of a deviant sexual stimuli or abnormal sexual trauma during childhood or adolescence may become part of the child’s sexuality (Healey, 2005). Burgess et al. (1986) stated that according to the motivational model the personality traits crucial to the evolution of a serial murderer are often present in psychopathic adolescence. These traits include social isolation, fetishism, autoerotic fascinations, aggressive behavior, pathological lying, and a sense of entitlement. These are many of the qualities and behaviors exhibited by Hare’s definition of the psychopathic personality.

It is worth noting that these qualities and Paraphilia are not limited to male serial murderers. In many of the cases of female serial murderers, a deviant sexual component was also documented and is discussed further in latter sections of this thesis. It is reasonable to conclude, given the preponderance of the evidence, there is a relationship between psychopathy, Paraphilia, and serial murder.

### Serial Murder: History and Comparison

Serial murder has been falsely perceived by most to be a relatively new crisis. In fact, serial murder has most likely existed since the beginning of time. It is arguably one of society's oldest maladies. It is likely that in 16<sup>th</sup> Century France most of the myths revolving around "vampires" and "werewolves" were created to explain the unspeakable acts of early serial murderers. The people of that time period had no other way of explaining or comprehending such atrocities, moreover, that such evil could be perpetrated by another human being (Everitt, 1993). The atrocities committed by the Emperor Nero who ruled Ancient Rome from 54-68 AD are well suited for such speculation (Bunson, 1994). During his reign Nero became the epitome of the term "sadistic psychopath" and could easily be considered an early representation of a serial murderer. According to early Roman Historian Suetonius, Nero was reported to go hunt the streets at night and stab men to death, dropping their bodies down the sewer (Schechter, 2003; Wilson, 2004). Later on in his reign Nero would dress in the skins of the arena animals and attack the genitals of men and women he would tie to stakes, often biting off pieces of their flesh with his teeth (as stated in Schechter, 2003). One of the more scandalous historical figures now considered a serial killer is Gilles de Rais of France. Gilles was born in 1404 and was revered as a war hero, serving alongside Joan

of Arc when he was 16 years old (as stated in Schechter, 2003). Gilles began his sadistic activities after the war ended and his subsequent return to his family's castle. Gilles began experimenting with alchemy in 1440 and eventually began having his servants bring young children (mostly males) to the castle during which time he would sodomize, strangle, decapitate, and disembowel the youths. Gilles would eventually seal the ritual by masturbating into his victims entrails. He was finally captured in 1440, excommunicated, and hanged above a fire (Schechter, 2003; Wilson, 1990; Wilson, 2004).

This phenomenon was first documented in psychiatry literature during modern times by Richard Von Kraft-Ebbing (1886) who wrote of persons in his work *Psychopathia Sexualis* who gained sexual gratification from the act of sexually sadistic domination of others. This insight was furthered by Robert Brittain in his descriptions of the sadistic murderers he had counseled during his career in the 1970s. The sensationalism of the serial murderers during the 1970s-1990 including Ted Bundy, Richard Ramirez, and the BTK Killer propagated a sense of urgency for the study and understanding of this phenomena.

The popularity, hype, and media blitz that erupted during this time inspired movies and books such as Thomas Harris's *The Silence of the Lambs* (1989), which was subsequently released as a movie by Orion Pictures in 1991. These works and Jodie Foster's performance as a budding agent in the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) created an immense amount of curiosity in serial murder and in the FBI's Behavioral Analysis Unit (BAU). The BAU, formerly known as the Behavioral Sciences Unit, is an integral part of the FBI's National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime (NCAVC).

This unit was separated into four departments: BAU-1 (counterterrorism), BAU-2 (crimes against adults), BAU-3 (crimes against children), and VICAP, which is the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (FBI.GOV, 2005). The BAU-2 is the department now responsible for the study and apprehension of serial murderers. Although the massive amount of attention and sensationalism these murders received made it appear that serial murder was fast becoming an epidemic in America, it is actually a relatively rare event. The FBI and the Bureau of Justice statistics do not currently compile statistics for “serial murders” specifically; however, Norris (1990) states that serial murder is becoming more prevalent and that at any given time in America, there are over 500 active serial killers, claiming 5,000 victims per year. This figure is highly disputed among his colleagues, and according to Hare (1993) the approximate total of homicides in America attributable to serial killers at any given time is less than 1% of the total homicides. According to 2002 data from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report, the United States had 14,054 murders, with serial murder being responsible for only 70-140 of those victims (UCR, 2002). This lends validation the 1% theory proposed by Hare (1993). Of this figure, only 4-14 of these deaths per year are attributable to female serial murderers (UCR, 2002).

The term “serial killer” was coined by Robert Ressler, a former FBI Special Agent. Ressler was a key influence in the establishment of the BAU and was the model for the “Jack Crawford” character in *The Silence of the Lambs* book and film (Schecter, 2003). The next 3 decades have held immense debate on the exact definition of what constitutes “serial murder”. Prior to the 1980s serial murder was thrown into the category of mass murder. This was actually a misnomer created due to lack of a

consensus of definition. The accepted definition for *mass murder* is when three or more victims are killed involving one event on the same day (Hickey, 1991; Levin & Fox, 1985; Norris, 1998). Examples of this type of murder include the August 1966 sniper shootings committed by student Charles Whitman from the bell tower at the University of Texas at Austin and the mass killings committed by Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold at Columbine High School in April 1999. The most recent example of this type of event is the Virginia Tech Massacre that occurred in 2007 in Virginia. In these cases the victims were all massacred in a single event on a single day. This is unlike serial murder in which the primary difference is a “cooling-off” period between victims during which time no new murders occur (Hickey, 1986). Hickey (1986) theorized that serial murderers included all offenders (male or female) who premeditatedly killed three or more victims over a period of days, weeks, months, or years.

This definition has since been refined by the FBI and United States Department of Justice (DOJ) during a Symposium entitled: *Serial Murder: Multi Disciplinary Perspectives for Investigators*. This symposium, held August 29- September 2, 2005 in San Antonio Texas was a multi-disciplinary symposium designed to “identify the commonalities of knowledge regarding serial murder” (FBI, 2005, p. vii). In total, 135 experts on various subjects’ related serial murder were in attendance. These experts span the expanse of the legal, ethical, and civil arenas. At the end of the 5-day conference, all of the experts had combined their vast knowledge and came to a new all-inclusive consensus on the definition of serial murder based on criteria including one or more offenders, two or more victims, separate events at separate times, and time-lapse between events. Including these criteria, the experts attending the symposium concluded serial

murder to be “The unlawful killing of two or more victims by the same offender(s), in separate events” (FBI, 2005, p. 9). This is the definition accepted and used by the researcher and author for the purpose of this thesis.

A large amount of the early profile attempts for serial murderers have been dispelled. Many of the personality assumptions of the earlier researchers have since been proven false. These myths included the presumption that all serial murderers are white males who are loners, travel constantly, are only sexually motivated, and cannot stop killing (Cleckley, 1976; Holmes & DeBurger, 1985; Leibman, 1989). This profile has since been amended to allow for the inclusion of many of the traits exhibited by the offenders in the preceding decades. The original profiles did not account for female serial murderers at all and did not include those for whom sexual gratification was not the primary motive. There have been numerous examples to nullify the original profile in recent decades, some of which include female serial murderers, murderers of various ethnicities, physicians who kill their patients, and murderers who stop killing for extended periods of time (Schechter, 2003).

In 1985 Holmes and DeBurger proposed a four-type model for serial murderers that was later revised and expanded by Holmes and Holmes in 1998. These classifications were developed with information gathered from case files of 110 serial murderers and interviews with selected cases. The model proposed by Holmes and Holmes (1998) included the following: visionary killer, missionary killer, hedonistic killer, and the power control killer. *Visionary killers* are those who have experienced a psychotic break with reality. They report hearing voices from God, demons, angels, etc, telling them to commit the murders. Visionary killers just see this as a job that must be

done. *Mission killers* are compelled to murder those they perceive to be undesirable. These types of killers believe their actions are noble and that they are doing the world a favor by ridding it of a particular type of people (such as prostitutes). *Hedonistic killers* are sexual “lust” or “thrill” killers. *Lust* subtypes of hedonistic killers experience sexual gratification when murdering their victims. The sexual gratification is the motivation for the event. This type of killer will often participate in the Paraphilic activities discussed earlier as well as cannibalism and mutilation. *Thrill* subtypes of hedonistic killers murder for the excitement and gratification they receive from the action of the kill itself. Once the victim is dead, they hold no further significance, and the killer moves on. These types of killers often participate in prolonged bouts of torture to make the kill last longer, thus elongating their experience of pleasure. There has been another subcategory added to the hedonistic killer by Holmes and Holmes (1998) called *comfort* killers. Comfort killers murder for some material gain, not for the sexual gratification that is the motivational factor in the previous two categories. *Power or control killers* are motivated by the need to have absolute power and control over another human life (Holmes & Holmes, 1998).

The typologies of female serial murderers are a developing concept but currently are believed to be similar to those of their male counterparts. Holmes and Holmes (1998) suggest the following divisions for female serial murderers: the visionary, the comfort, the hedonistic, the power seeker, and the disciple. The *visionary murderess* is comparable to her male counterpart. She will often hear voices or experience visual hallucinations. The *comfort murderess* kills for monetary or business gains. The hedonistic female killer is the least understood according to Holmes and Holmes (1994).

This category is for the sexually motivated female murderers. The female murderess known as the *power seeker* includes those looking for a sense of social power and recognition. These killers include females exhibiting Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy disorder. This occurs when the female repeatedly places her child in near-death situations for the sympathy and attention of others. The concluding type of female serial murderer is the *disciple murderer*. This type of female killer is motivated to kill by the encouragement of a charismatic leader or group to which she has attached herself. This type of murderess is exemplified by the female followers of the Manson family. Charles Manson and his “family” of followers were responsible for the deaths of actress Sharon Tate, her unborn child, and some houseguests in August 1969 (Holmes & Holmes, 1994, 1998; Schechter, 2003).

Some of the core differences between male and female serial murderers lie in the differences in motive, victimology, and method of dispatch. Female serial murderers are more likely to kill for motives other than sexual gratification, although this type also exists. Monetary gain or ridding themselves of a perceived burden is the most common motivations for female serial killers (Hare, 1993; Hickey, 1991). Female murderesses generally begin their killing career later in life than males, kill for longer periods of time, and amass a greater body count than their male counterparts (Hare, 1993, 1997; Hickey, 1991). The average age for females to begin killing is in their early 30s, and they can continue their murderous activities well into older age. They do not typically “age-out” as do some of their male counterparts (Hare, 1993). The male serial murderers typically begin killing in their early to middle 20s and peak in their activity by age 40, perhaps due to the common sexual motivation. The males could begin experiencing sexual

dysfunction and begin to lose interest (Hare, 1993). Females are known to choose persons they know or who are in their care as victims. These victims are very likely to be their own spouses and children. This is in contrast to the males who typically choose strangers (Hare, 1993). Gender does not appear to be of great issue for female serial killers. The female's victimology is comprised of males and females, adults and children. They are the true "equal opportunity" murderers. Another chief difference between the male and female serial murderers is in their killing methods. The males typically use more "hands on" methods of murder such as strangulation, bludgeoning, or stabbing to dispatch their victims. Females will more often use a more "hands off" approach to killing, often using poison or suffocation to kill without direct or violent contact (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1993; Hickey, 1991). These muted and indirect methods allowed female murderesses to go undetected for a vast period of time. These differences are key to understanding the perpetuation of the myth that female serial killers do not exist.

These classifications were further expanded for both male and female serial murderers by the FBI's agents Ressler, Burgess, Douglass, Hartman, and D'Agostino in 1996. Ressler et al. (1986) divided the classification into categories of "organized" and "disorganized" offenders. These differentiations were made according to personality clues found at the crime scenes. *Disorganized* murderers often appear very psychiatrically disturbed and have a history with the mental health system. They are usually socially unskilled and live alone or with their parents. Disorganized killers often have lower intelligence scores, little education, and an interrupted work history (Ressler et al., 1986). This type of offender leaves a chaotic crime scene often with the body still present. There is little evidence of planning and nearly no attempts to "clean up" or

conceal any of the evidence. This murderer often kills with extreme brutality, often mutilating or severely brutalizing the victim (Ressler et al., 1986).

In contrast, the *organized* killers display many of the traits that allow them to continue killing for long periods of time, even decades, without detection. Organized killers are often intelligent, socially adept, and live with a spouse or significant other. Organized killers are usually gainfully employed, often choosing positions in which they hold some level of power or control. They leave crime scenes that show meticulous planning and execution of the crime, often leaving behind little to no physical evidence. Organized murderers have a particular type of victim they prefer and take as much time as needed to seek out and stalk their intended victims. The offenders bring their own weapon(s) of choice to the scene and subsequently take them back with them. Organized killers often torture and rape their victims slowly and methodically according to their precipitating fantasies. Evidence is removed from the crime scene and the body is moved elsewhere and hidden or even displayed crudely in order to be found when and where the killer desires it to be (Ressler et al., 1998).

With firm groundwork psychopathy, serial murder, and the PCL-R having now been used, the individual serial murderers chosen for this analysis can now be examined. This evaluation included Theodore “Ted” Bundy, Richard “The Night Stalker” Ramirez, Dennis “BTK Killer” Rader, Elizabeth “Lady Dracula” Bathory, Jane “Jolly Jane” Toppan, and Aileen Wuornos. Their history and heinous crimes are reviewed from the research gathered via content analysis by the author and researcher of this thesis.

## Ted Bundy

Theodore Robert Cowell was born the illegitimate son of Louise Cowell November 24, 1946, in the Elizabeth Lund Home for Unwed Mothers. During his childhood in Vermont “Ted” was led to believe that his mother was his sister and that his maternal grandparents were his mother and father to whom he had been born “late in life” (Wilson, 2004). Ted never knew his biological father who was rumored to be an Air Force veteran. When he was 4, his mother moved Ted and herself to Washington State where she subsequently met and married military cook Johnnie Culpepper Bundy in 1951. Ted was adopted by Bundy and his name was legally changed for good (Wilson, 2004). By most accounts Ted’s childhood was a relatively “normal” one, and he appeared to get along with his stepfather and subsequent half-siblings. Johnnie tried to get close to Ted during those years, often including him on camping and fishing trips, and other father-son type activities. During the years, and despite the many attempts by Johnnie, Ted remained distant and unattached from his stepfather (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989).

Ted Bundy was self-reported to be a shy, socially inept child in elementary and middle school. He maintained a good grade-point average throughout school and even into his early college years. In high school Ted seemed to be “coming into his own” and began expressing more confidence. He became more socially involved, his particular interests were skiing and politics (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989). Even considering his newly acquired confidence and popularity, Ted only dated a couple of times during his high school career and was very sexually ignorant. Ted was not a very motivated worker and was frequently found to be unemployed or “between” jobs. He had garnered a

reputation for being an unreliable employee. When Ted graduated high school in 1965, he attended the University of Puget Sound in Tacoma, Washington on a scholarship. By this time Ted had already acquired a juvenile record for burglary and auto theft (Rule, 2000). Ted worked the following summer and saved money in order to transfer to the University of Washington to study Chinese. It was during this time that he met the woman who would have perhaps the greatest influence on his life and maybe his crimes.

Ted met Stephanie Brooks on campus in the spring of 1967. She was everything he ever thought he deserved. Stephanie was a beautiful, bright, wealthy socialite from California, and Ted was at once enthralled with her (Rule, 2000). Ted and Stephanie did not run in the same social circles, and he thought she was far out of his league. The one commonality they shared is a love of skiing. Ted began to steal expensive ski equipment to impress her. When Stephanie began showing interest and spending more time with Ted, his studies were pushed to the background. Ted would later recall his infatuation with Stephanie and describe the way it made him feel stating, “It was a once sublime and overpowering”. “The first touch of hands, the first kiss, the first night together.....For the next six years, Stephanie and I would meet under the most tentative of circumstances” (Rule, 2000, p. 13). They dated through the summer of 1968, but Ted had begun to founder both in his studies and his menial jobs. Stephanie began to feel that Ted was not really “husband material”. His lack of focus and determination had become worrisome to her. When it came time for Ted to return to school in the fall, Stephanie had graduated and felt that this was a good time to break off the romance. She told Ted that they were at separate points, going in different directions, and Ted was distraught by this sudden rejection from the perceived love of his life (Rule, 2000).

This relationship and its subsequent abrupt end would prove to be a watershed moment in Ted Bundy's life. This event would be the ending of Ted's brush with "normality" and be the epiphysis of his ill-fated killing career. Ted could no longer concentrate on Chinese or any other subject and subsequently dropped out of school. In 1969 Ted had decided to investigate his lineage and discover the truth that he had so long suspected. He traveled to Vermont and located his birth certificate that proved his suspicions true. The certificate stated the word that he had long suspected "illegitimate" (Rule, 2000). Ted had also attempted surprise reconciliation with Stephanie during this time. Ted just happened to show up in front of her office one day, and she was not as excited to see him as he had hoped. Ted still appeared to be an unmotivated mess, and after some brief conversation, she once again rejected him. This rejection only made him more determined to become the man he perceived she wanted him to be. Ted reenrolled in the University of Washington the following semester and began to study psychology, where he would become an honors student in the discipline (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2000).

It was during the years of 1970-1973 that Ted appeared to be going in the right direction. He was excelling in class, a rising star in the Republican Party, and considered a hero by the Seattle police for saving a drowning boy. During this time Bundy was also completing his work-study hours at an area crisis clinic where he counseled callers on the brink of suicide. At the crisis clinic Ted befriended another volunteer named Ann Rule, who would prove to be a powerful ally in future years as well as the writer whose biography and personal insight would make him a household name. Ann Rule (2000) would later recall the kindness and empathy that Bundy would show both her and his

callers in peril. This disparity would cause Ann to question his guilt all the way to the middle of his Capital Murder Trial. In many ways Ann Rule, the highly educated former police officer-turned true crime writer, was Bundy's last victim.

Ted had kept in contact with Stephanie sporadically since their last meeting in front of her office. This was unknown to Ted's live-in girlfriend Liz, whom he had met in a campus tavern some time earlier that year. In 1973 Ted attended a meeting in California for the Washington Republican Party during which time he met Stephanie again (Rule, 2000). Stephanie was thoroughly impressed by the confident, seemingly successful young man Ted had become. They quickly rekindled their romance and Stephanie fell madly in love with Ted. Ted proposed marriage to Stephanie and she quickly accepted. During this time Ted was still living with Liz back in Washington. Neither of the women had a clue about the other. It was like Ted was maintaining two separated lives.

In the fall of 1973 Ted suddenly became very cold and distant to Stephanie. They were no longer intimate, and he no longer responded to talk of marriage. This was not the first time that there had been an appearance of his "*Jekyll and Hyde*" persona. Soon after Ted ended their relationship. He had attained the level of revenge he had wished for so long. Stephanie would later recall the break up and weeks prior to a friend stating, "I don't know what happened. He changed so completely. I escaped by the skin of my teeth. When I think of his cold and calculating manner, I shudder" (Rule, 2000, p. 47). This was the last time Stephanie would ever see or hear from Ted again...she was one of the lucky ones.

During this time Ted had begun to barrage the University of Utah requesting admission into law school despite his low Law School Aptitude Test (LSAT) scores. Bundy had listed some jobs on his postgraduate employment record that many would later find ironic. These occupations included: Criminal Corrections Consultant, Crime Commission Assistant Director, and Psychiatric Counselor. This was a resume that made Ted a formidable foe for law enforcement and psychiatrists. Even though Bundy lobbied tirelessly to be accepted into law school and eventually was admitted, Ted made up a lie about a car accident and did not attend. Bundy's final statement on his admissions application was more of a striking admission than anyone ever noticed. The final paragraph stated "I apply to law school because this institution will give me the tools to become a more effective actor in the social role I have defined myself" (Rule, 2000, p. 39). This statement would eventually become a self-fulfilling prophecy for Bundy. During his trial he served as his own defense.

It was during this period of accomplishment that Bundy made his first kill. Lynda Ann Healy, a 21 year old radio announcer majoring in psychology, would be the first of many to experience Bundy's "entity". Lynda lived in a house just off-campus with four other girls on January 31, 1974. She had talked on the phone and gone to bed reasonably early. No one heard a thing that night. When her alarm continued to go off the next morning, her roommate went to check on her, but she was not there, and her bed was made. It was not until later when she failed to show for a family dinner that the police were informed. When her room was searched, a bloodstain was found on her pillow and bottom sheet. The top sheet and pillowcase were missing, as were the clothes she had on the night before and her backpack. Lynda had simply vanished. This was the beginning

of a kidnap and murder spree that had college students all across the northwest terrified. The police were interviewing as many college students as possible and began receiving reports of a male who was “good looking” and who appeared to be injured (either a cast on his foot or arm was reported) and struggling with books or a briefcase and being seen with some of the girls who had disappeared shortly after (Schechter, 2003).

Two women disappeared within hours of each other on July 14, 1974, at Lake Sammamish State Park in Washington. Some witnesses reported seeing a man talking with one of the girls and reported he was asking her to aid him in loading his boat because he was injured (once again his arm was in a cast) (Lewis, 2009). The two girls, Janice Ott, and Denise Naslund, who were kind enough to help were never seen alive again. Their remains were found in September approximately one mile from the park where they were taken. They had been bludgeoned, strangled, raped, and sodomized. This was Bundy’s pattern that continued across as many as five states: Washington, Utah, Colorado, California, and Florida (Lewis, 2009). One major lead that detectives did receive included the name “Ted” that one witness overheard the stranger telling Ott was his name. Police had also been given a description of a Tan VW Beetle at the park as well as other known crime scenes (Lewis, 2009). Bundy’s name had been suggested to the police at least four times in the years before he was captured. Bundy was named twice by his colleague and friend Ann Rule, once by an anonymous source, and even by his long-time girlfriend Liz at the insistence of her best friend who had never liked or trusted Ted (Rule, 2001). During this time Ted’s crimes grew more frequent and brutal by the week.

Despite Ted's best efforts, there was one woman who would escape and live to tell about the stranger in the Tan VW. Carol DaRonch was approached by Bundy in a Utah shopping mall in November 1974 (Lewis, 2009). Bundy told Carol that he was "Officer Roseland" and that he suspected that someone had tried to burglarize her car. Bundy instructed her to come with him to check and see if anything had been taken. Eventually Bundy told DaRonch that she would have to accompany him to the station and take a statement and that they would take his car. Carol noted that it did not look like a police car, not even an unmarked one, but she did as she was told (Lewis, 2009). Bundy proceeded to handcuff her and attempt to knock her out with a crowbar. Carol was able to fight him off and jump out of the car. Bundy went on to kill six more young women in the year following this incident; he was finally arrested the first time in August 1975 (Lewis, 2009; Rule, 2000).

Bundy was driving erratically in Salt Lake City, and an officer attempted to pull him over. Ted tried to run but was eventually stopped and found to be in the possession of what appeared to be burglary tools to the officer. Bundy was in possession of a crowbar, handcuffs, an ice-pick, and a mask made from stockings with eye holes cut in them. Bundy would tell the officer that he used it for keeping warm on the slopes (Rule, 2000). Authorities began to put together the picture of the man in the Tan VW Bug, with the good looks and deadly intent. The police brought in witnesses including the much traumatized Carol DaRonch, all of whom identified Bundy in a line-up without hesitation. Bundy was convicted 7 months later and subsequently sentenced to 15 years in prison for the kidnapping of DaRonch (Lewis, 2009; Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2000). Ted would escape from prison during a hearing for another murder in 1977,

when he would be free for 6 days (Schechter, 2003). It was during a subsequent premeditated escape that he would succumb to an orgy of violence, the likes of which have barely been rivaled since and from which there would be no return or redemption for Ted.

On December 30, 1977, Bundy managed to escape again by climbing through the air shaft of the prison. Ted rode a bus into Tallahassee Florida and began a life of theft and other petty offenses (Lewis, 2009). Bundy's resolve soon expired and on January 15<sup>th</sup> he broke into the Chi Omega Sorority house and with the ferocity of a wild animal and the stealth of a Navy Seal Ted proceeded to bludgeon, rape, and strangle four women, two of whom died at the scene from their horrific injuries. Bundy had managed to complete such carnage in less than 30 minutes without alerting anyone else in the house (Lewis, 2009). Then within minutes Bundy attacked and nearly killed another woman in a house just a couple blocks from the Chi Omega house. The following February Bundy claimed his youngest and final victim. Kimberly Leach was only 12 years old when she was lured away from her school by a stranger. This event was witnessed by at least three people, all of whom chose to do nothing until after the story of her disappearance hit the news (Rule, 2000). Most of the witnesses would claim that it just appeared to be a father picking up his daughter who had gotten in trouble at school (because the girl was crying, and Bundy was reportedly yelling at her), yet no one thought to inquire (Rule, 2000). Little Kimberly's body would later be discovered thrown in a pig pen. Kimberly, like the others before her, had been raped and strangled. This incident was particularly important evidence of Ted's mental deconstruction. Just a short time earlier Liz's daughter Liane had requested a friend to go out for hamburgers with

her and Ted (who she considered a father figure), but the girl's mother refused. Ted was outraged by this decision and commented to Ann Rule "What did she think?" "That I'd attack her daughter?" (Rule, 2000).

Bundy was eventually pulled over on February 15<sup>th</sup>, 1978, and arrested when it was discovered that he was driving a stolen vehicle (another VW Beetle). At first he gave the police a false name, Ken Misner, a man whose identification he had stolen prior to his arrest (Lewis, 2009; Michaud & Aynesworth, 1998; Rule, 2000). Eventually, his fingerprints told the truth of his identity, and the Florida police finally realized they had captured one of the FBI's 10 Most Wanted fugitives (Rule, 2000). Bundy's trial was eventually granted a change of venue to Miami where he acted as his own attorney. Ted was identified by a sorority sister who saw him running out of the Chi Omega house and by a forensic odontologist who matched his teeth print to a bite mark left on the buttock of one of the last victims (Lewis, 2009). Bundy was convicted and sentenced to death. During the next 9 years worth of appeals, Bundy managed to marry his long-time companion Carol Ann Boone, who had become his de facto legal secretary in the preceding trials, and father two children with her, a girl named Rose and a boy named Jamie (Rule, 2000). Ted maintained contact with Ann thorough calls and letters until shortly before his execution. Bundy became upset with Rule when he felt that she was not educated or insightful enough to be lecturing on Serial Killers. Ted felt that she did not truly understand them and should not be discussing "them" or more specifically, "him" (Rule, 2000). Theodore Bundy was executed at 7:13am on January 24<sup>th</sup>, 1989. He confessed to many more murders while awaiting execution. The attractive, suave, intelligent, and deadly "All American Boy" would remain the poster child for teaching

law enforcement and the public that the devils sometimes look like angels. His final victim total was 37 by his account. Many in the law enforcement community believe the actual count to be in the 100s.

### Richard Ramirez: The Night Stalker

Ricardo Levya Munoz Ramirez was considered by those who both hunted him and feared him to be the embodiment of the mythical “boogeyman”. Richard became the monster of legend, creeping into his victims rooms in the dark of night and bestowing the world of nightmares upon them. “Richard” Ramirez was born February 29<sup>th</sup>, 1960, to a poor Mexican family in El Paso, Texas. Richard was the youngest of five and was prone to epileptic seizures (Carlo, 1996). Ramirez’s father Julian was a very serious man (as was his father before him) who took the responsibility of raising his family with great pride. Julian’s father Jose Ramirez would often beat his children severely for any perceived infraction. Because Julian was the oldest, he often received the most severe beatings. Julian vowed to be less physical with his own children and would often resort to beating himself with an object (such as a hammer) instead of hitting his children (Carlo, 1996). He was very religious and was often saddened and disappointed at the behaviors of his sons. Julian only wanted them to be honest, hard working Americans. Most of his children would subsequently let him down. Richard’s mother Mercedes was by all accounts a very loving and doting wife and mother. After eloping, Julian and Mercedes lived briefly in Juarez, Mexico before moving to El Paso so that their children would be born U.S. citizens (Lewis, 2009). During that time the Los Alamos Nuclear Plant was involved heavily in nuclear radiation testing. This testing was only 200 miles

from their home in Juarez, and the wind would blow the nuclear material over the entire area (Carlo, 1996).

This contamination caused their first born son Ruben to be born with radiation deformities. Ruben had large knots on the base of his neck and down his spinal column. The doctors did not know how to treat this at that time and feared Ruben would die. Julian and Mercedes were devastated and could not comprehend what they could have done to deserve this (Carlo, 1996). The young family just dropped to the floor and began to pray vehemently to the Virgin Mary for help. Ruben eventually began to recover and the couple became pregnant with a second child within months. This second child was a boy named Joseph who also was found to have abnormal bone growth problems due to the nuclear testing. Once again the young couple asked God to intervene, and they were told with the proper surgical intervention and special shoes Joseph would be alright. Mercedes and Julian went on to have three more children: Robert, Ruth, and finally, Richard. The last three children appeared healthy despite the fact that Mercedes had worked at the Tony Lama boot factory while pregnant. In the factory Mercedes had been exposed to chemical fumes without a mask every day (Carlo, 1996). Many of the workers would complain about feeling ill on the weekends when they were away from the fumes.

Mercedes had a much more difficult pregnancy with Richard. She would have cramping and joint pain frequently. Mercedes had to take several injections to prevent a miscarriage (Carlo, 1996). Richard grew up receiving the majority of the love and attention from both his parents and siblings. When Richard was around 4 or 5, his older brothers Ruben and Joseph began getting into trouble frequently and hanging with a

rough crowd. Both brothers eventually were arrested for various charges including burglary and drugs. This infuriated Julian and he would often burst into violent rages and beat the two boys while the younger children hid and cried. When Julian realized that he was beginning to behave like his father and grandfather, he would take his frustrations and disappointment out on himself instead (Carlo, 1996). Richard was found to be an epileptic while in fifth grade. He had a couple of Grand Mal seizures during class and was taken to the hospital. The doctors informed Mercedes that he would eventually outgrow the condition and did nothing further to treat Richard. Richard did eventually stop having seizures by his late teens.

One of the most influential moments in Richard's life occurred at age 13. Richard witnessed his beloved cousin murdering his wife. Richard's Cousin Michael had served in the Vietnam War and was greatly suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Michael executed his wife in front of Richard by shooting her in the face. Richard was consequently covered with her blood (Lewis, 2009). Richard and Michael were always very close, and Richard seemed to admire his cousin for his bravery. Richard was also fascinated by the wildly inappropriate stories he told of his time in the war. Michael told stories of his many bloody conquests, many of which involved rape and mutilation of the women in the villages (Carlo, 1996). To cement the mental images his stories would conjure in Richard's young mind, Michael had also taken Polaroids of his conquests. This was not an uncommon practice during Vietnam. Many of the soldiers kept similar photos as mementos.

Shortly after his cousin's murder, Richard began to smoke marijuana incessantly and became enthralled with the vicious photos his cousin had shown him. Richard began

to fantasize about sex, blood, and violence compulsively. At the same time his drug habit had become bad enough that he began breaking into houses to steal valuables for drugs (Carlo, 1996; Lewis, 2009). This activity eventually allowed Ramirez a venue in which he could indulge his violent fantasies that had now begun to take over. Richard soon dropped out of school in the ninth grade and began eating so much candy many of his teeth had rotted out (Lewis, 2009). When he turned 18 Richard moved to Los Angeles, California and soon after began his tirade. Ramirez became obsessed with the occult and Satanism. His favorite band was AC/DC, and he would listen to their album *Highway to Hell* compulsively. Ramirez would state in later interviews that one of the songs labeled “Night Prowler” had been considered by him as his personal “anthem” (Carlo, 1996). Ramirez was arrested multiple times while in California for possession of marijuana and various theft charges. This would give the California Police a fingerprint profile that would later be used to identify one of the most prolific murderers in California history.

Richard got involved with harder drugs in LA including Cocaine and PCP (Angel Dust). These hard-core drugs added fuel to the fire of his overwhelmingly sadistic fantasies. In the summer of 1978 Richard had his first fantasy fulfilled. Ramirez met a young woman looking for some drugs. They went to a dealer Richard was familiar with and acquired some PCP. After partying with the drugs for a while, Richard tried to hit on the young woman and was quickly rebuffed. The woman explained that she was a lesbian and was not sexually interested (Carlo, 1996). Ramirez did not take this lightly and returned to the girl’s apartment that night, snuck in through her window (which would become his *modus operandi* hence forward), and proceeded to bind and rape her several times. This was his initiation into the powerful world he had long fantasized

about. Richard felt like a God (Carlo, 1996). It was this same week that Ramirez became completely infatuated with Satanism. Richard began reading the Satanic Bible written by Anton LaVey, a famous priest in the church of Satan. Ramirez felt that he had finally found his calling.

Most of the terror rained down on LA would take place in the summer of 1985. By then Ramirez was already a well-tuned killing machine. In June 1984 Ramirez climbed through the window of Jennie Vincow. The 79 year old woman had opened her window to relieve the pressure of the stifling LA summer heat (Lewis, 2009). Ramirez proceeded to rape Jennie and slash her throat, practically to the point of decapitation, and ransack her home. Jennie would be found by her son the next morning (Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1997). The police were able to lift fingerprints from the windowsill that would later link Ramirez to the slaying (Newton, 2000). Richard showed no hint of ageism within his crimes. He robbed, raped, and murdered victims from 6 to 83 years old (Schechter & Everitt, 1997). In spring of 1985 Ramirez kidnapped, sexually assaulted, and later released a 6 and 9 year old girls from the surrounding neighborhoods. They would be the luckiest of his victims (Newton, 2000).

On March 17<sup>th</sup> Ramirez watched as a 20 year old woman, Angela Barrios, entered her condo after a long day at work. Richard followed her in the garage door and confronted her with a gun. Richard aimed the gun at her face, which she shielded with her hands, and fired. Angela fell to the floor of the garage, and Ramirez stepped over her to head into the condo. Angela's keys had deflected the bullet and she only sustained a wound to her hand, but she pretended to be dead until he was out of the garage (Lewis, 2009). Angela actually ran into Ramirez while running away and feared he would then

kill her, but he just tucked his gun away and ran. Once inside, Angela found her roommate lying dead in the kitchen from a gunshot to the head. Richard had actually gotten sloppy and dropped his black AC/DC hat on the floor of the garage; the police now had another piece of evidence (Carlo, 1996). Ramirez would proceed to shoot and kill a 30 year old woman the next day and abduct and rape another on March 20<sup>th</sup> before letting her go (Newton, 2000).

Ramirez showed another escalation in the brutality of his crimes on March 27<sup>th</sup>. Richard, now dubbed the “Night Stalker” by the press, broke into the home of 64 year old Vincent Zazzara and his wife. He proceeded to beat Mr. Zazzara to death and sexually assault and stab Mrs. Zazzara to death. The Night Stalker then removed her eyes and took them with him as a trophy (Carlo, 1996; Newton, 2000; Schechter & Everitt, 1997). In the next few months Ramirez continued to add as many as 10 others to his growing body count. Some he raped and stabbed, others he simply robbed and shot. Ramirez even drew pentagrams on the body of 83 year old Mabel Bell in her own blood (Carlo, 1996; Newton, 2000). By August 22<sup>nd</sup> of 1985 the California police figured Ramirez’s death toll to be at least 14 (Newton, 2000). Soon after Richard shot and wounded Bill Carns in the head, raped his fiancée, and stole their vehicle. The vehicle was found on August 28<sup>th</sup> complete with Richards prints inside (Lewis, 2009; Newton, 2000). Law enforcement now knew the identity of the monster who had terrorized the city for nearly a year. An all points bulletin (APB) was issued and his mug shots released to the press as quickly as possible. The next day Richard was captured by a mob of bystanders in East LA, who recognized him while he was trying to steal a car. The police barely got him free before he was beaten to death by the angry hoard (Carlo, 1996).

During his trial the Night Stalker showed no remorse and often flashed pentagrams drawn on his palms. Ramirez would often shout “Hail Satan!” throughout the preliminary hearing (Newton, 2000, p. 195). Richard always had “groupies” following him into court and writing him, sending money. He would eventually marry while on death row just like his predecessor Ted Bundy (Carlo, 1996; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003). Richard Ramirez a.k.a. the “Night Stalker” was convicted on September 20<sup>th</sup>, 1989, of 13 counts of 1<sup>st</sup> degree murder and 30 other various felonies. Richard’s own count was actually higher. Ramirez told a cell mate that “I’ve killed 20 people, man. I love all that blood” (Newton, 2000, p. 195). He was sentenced to death on November 7<sup>th</sup> (Newton, 2000). After his sentencing Ramirez addressed the court and society with a scathing monologue:

You don’t understand me. You are not expected to. You are not capable. I am beyond your experience. I am beyond good and evil. I will be avenged. Lucifer dwells in all of us. I don’t know why I’m even wasting my breath, but what the hell. For what is said of my life, there have been lies in the past and there will be lies in the future. I don’t believe in the hypocritical, moralistic dogma of this so-called civilized society. I need not look beyond this courtroom to see all the liars, the later, the killers, the crooks, the paranoid cowards, Truly the *Trematodes* of the earth. You maggots make me sick! Hypocrites one and all. We are all expendable for a cause. No one knows that better than those who kill for policy, clandestinely or openly, as do the governments of the world which kill in the name of God and country...I don’t need to hear all of society’s rationalizations.

I've heard them all before....legions of the night, night breed, repeat not the errors of the night prowler and show no mercy (Carlo, 1996, pp 517-518).

Richard Ramirez's family was devastated. His father died a short time later, and his mother continued to pray for his soul daily. The Night Stalker is still on San Quentin's Death Row awaiting execution.

### Dennis Rader: The "BTK" Killer

Dennis L. Rader was a man truly living a double life, and once his crimes were discovered, would shatter the previous assumptions of serial killer profilers forever. His crimes would terrify the town of Wichita, Kansas for nearly 30 years, the time span rivaled only by the "Zodiac" killer, who has yet to be captured. The boy scout- turned- church deacon with the model family would be the last person any would have suspected to be the monster they had feared for over a quarter century. That the local scout leader would be the merciless murderer with the self-ascribed moniker of "Bind, Torture, and Kill", or "BTK", would stun law enforcement and shake a community to its foundation.

Dennis Rader was born March 9<sup>th</sup>, 1945, in Columbus, Kansas. Rader was the first son born to Marine Corps veteran William Rader and his bookkeeper wife Dorothea. William moved his family to Wichita when Dennis and his three brothers were still very young (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). By all accounts Dennis had a fairly happy and normal childhood. The only complaint ever registered about his parents by him was with his father coming out of his bedroom and scolding the children for being too loud while he was trying to rest after a long shift at the electric utility company he worked for after discharge from the Marines (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). Even this event was not recalled

with any true fear or animosity by Rader, just that it was the only time his father was harsh with him or his siblings. Rader's mother Dorothea was known around town as an exceptional beauty. The local "boys" would all take turns going by the store window where she could be viewed working just to get a glimpse of her. It was often thought that she highly resembled the movie star of the day, Natalie Wood (Douglass & Dodd, 2007).

Rader often spent time in his preschool years at his paternal grandparent's farm approximately 100 miles from Wichita. On the farm Dennis began to realize he was not exactly like everyone else around him. He would often have to help his grandmother ring the necks off chickens for dinner. In doing this Dennis began to feel a strange sensation in his crotch area while watching the headless chickens flop around the yard before their collapse. Even at that time Rader realized that this was not the same way the others around him felt about the task (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). These experiences would cause Rader to intertwine sex and violence for the remainder of his life.

On the outside Dennis appeared just as normal as the rest of the boys he hung out with. He had many friends, was a model boy scout, and enjoyed music. Dennis was described by some of his former classmates as being the boy whom other parents would ask their children to act more like. Rader would later report having a secret obsession on Annette Funicello, who was a regular teen actress on "*The Mickey Mouse Club*" television show, and with mystery story magazines that depicted any type of woman being tied up (Singular, 2006). Rader would fantasize about rape and bondage scenarios with Annette frequently. Dennis would often sketch out his bondage fantasies and often cut out women from magazines and draw bondage apparatuses such as nooses on their necks over the pictures. Dennis was also obsessed with an early serial killer here in

America, Dr. H.H. Holmes, a.k.a. Herman Mudgett. Holmes built an enormous castle-like structure in the middle of downtown Chicago during the time of the 1893 world's fair. When he was arrested for some insurance scams, a search of his "house" was executed and a chamber of horrors was discovered. Holmes had built secret rooms, caverns, and passages in the bowels of the home in order to detain and conceal those he chose to kidnap and torture within the structure. Holmes had even put a giant incinerator in the basement that would get hot enough to disintegrate human bone. No one knows exactly how many victims Holmes claimed, but it is estimated to be in the hundreds (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Larson, 2004). Rader was able to keep this side of him well hidden from his family and classmates until his capture.

Rader eventually graduated high school and entered the Air Force in 1966. Rader was quite adept at the military lifestyle and was very successful, making it to sergeant. During the time he was stationed in Tokyo he would frequent the local bars in search of prostitutes (Singular, 2006). Dennis was discharged in 1970 and returned home. He was married a year later to Paula Dietz, whom his mother introduced him to at church. The couple moved a few miles away to Park City. Dennis and others close would say that they had a very good relationship, and Dennis himself stated that their sex life was "very good". Rader eventually landed a good job with Cessna in summer 1973 but would be laid off within the year (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). This lay off would prove to be detrimental in more ways than anyone could imagine. During the time he was laid off, Dennis had entirely too much time to sit and dwell on his fantasies. This allowed for the fantasies to build and would eventually take him, and the city of Wichita, over with dire consequences.

Rader began driving Paula to work in January, 1974 because of the snow. On his way home he would often look for prospects in the neighborhoods with whom he could fulfill his darkest fantasies that he could no longer ignore. Rader noticed Julie Otero and her daughter getting out of their car while on one of his trips home. Rader had always been attracted to Hispanic and other dark-skinned ethnicities. From that sighting Rader devised a plan to go back to the Otero residence and carry out the fantasies he had held inside for so long (Singular, 2006). On January 15<sup>th</sup> Rader went to the Otero house and cut the phone lines. When young Joseph “Joey” Jr., their 9 year old son, came out to dump the trash, Rader grabbed him and followed him in the back door. Rader proceeded to instruct the family that he was an escaped convict who just wanted some money and the family vehicle. The family was terrified and the father Joseph Otero Sr. was home, which Rader had not anticipated. He moved the family to the main bedroom and instructed them to tie each other up. All the time they were tying the knots, Rader was reassuring them that he was only there to rob them and no harm would come to them if they did what he said (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). At one point the family was complaining that the ties were too tight, and Rader proceeded to go over and loosen them “to make them more comfortable”. Rader also put a pillow or jacket under Joseph Sr.’s side because he had been in a car accident a couple weeks earlier and had some broken ribs (Douglass & Dodd, 2007).

After getting the family restrained to his satisfaction, Rader proceeded to place a bag over the elder Joseph’s head to suffocate him. Mr. Otero fought hard and managed to tear a small hole in the bag. This angered Rader and he placed a shirt over Mr. Otero’s head and then another bag. Eventually, Rader would use a garrote to finish killing Mr.

Otero. Dennis then moved on to Mrs. Otero and manually strangled her from behind with the rope he had just used to kill her husband while she lay face down on the bed. Julie Otero pleaded for her children's lives and stated to Rader "May God have mercy on your soul" (Douglass & Dodd, 2007, p.181). When Rader thought she was dead, he left her lying there and proceeded to take little Joey into another room where he strangled and suffocated him to death as well. The last Otero, 11year old Josie, was going to be what Rader described as "My Grand Folly" (Douglas & Dodd, 2007, p. 181). He carried Josie down stairs to the basement and tied a noose around an old water pipe. Rader was still trying to console the girl by telling her that her family was only sleeping and that soon they would all wake together in Heaven. Rader proceeded to pull her pants off and pull her underwear down around her bound feet. He hung Josie from the noose attached to the pipe and became aroused while he watched her expire. After her death Rader pulled up her shirt and sliced through her bra strap with his knife. At that time he looked at her breast and masturbated onto her leg. He would later recollect that he got a rush from knowing that he was most likely the only man who had ever seen her that way (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006). This brutal murder rocked the small community, but most attributed it to a possible vengeance slaying. Perhaps it was a drug hit, the neighbors would speculate, because the Oteros were Hispanic and relatively new to the neighborhood. The killer did not know at the time that the Oteros had three other children at school that day. Charlie, Daniel, and Carmen, who were 15, 14, and 13 at the time, would be the ones to make the gruesome discovery upon returning home. They would be spared the other's cruel fate but would be forced to endure a cruel fate of their

own. This first and arguably most brutal slaying would only be the beginning of a tirade of terror spanning nearly 30 years.

In April 1974 Rader attacked again. Kathryn and Kevin Bright, a brother and sister returning home from the bank, were ambushed by Rader who was hiding in the bedroom. Kevin was shot twice in the head, and Kathryn was stabbed in the abdomen because they were fighting so vigorously. Kathryn died at the hospital, but Kevin survived despite horrific injuries (Singular, 2006). Rader's infamous moniker was established in his first communication with the press in October. A call was placed by Rader to the *Wichita Eagle* newspaper stating there was a letter hidden in a book at the local library. This letter contained a detailed description of the murders of the Otero family and had many misspelled words (later believed to be purposely included) and the admission "The code words for me will be...Bind them, torture them, kill them, B.T.K..., you see he at it again. They will be the next victim" (Singular, 2006, p. 65). Rader had been working for ADT security since July of the prior year. This gave him unprecedented access to new victims, the layout of their homes, and their security systems (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). After his letter to the *Eagle*, the paper tried to reach out and make contact by placing a large ad in the paper stating that there was help for B.T.K., and included a toll-free phone number. Unfortunately, there was no response to the ad. This was just the first of many taunting correspondences between the killer and the press. After the subsequent murders of Shirley Vian in March 1977 and Nancy Fox the following December, B.T.K. sent another letter to the *Eagle*. This correspondence was a poem that discussed the murder of Shirley Vian (Singular, 2006).

After these incidences, in February 1978 a letter was sent to KAKE-TV confessing to the murders of Vian, Fox, and another unnamed victim. It was signed B.T.K. Rader attacked three more women from April 1979 through September 1986. On March 19, 2004, the *Eagle* once again receives a letter from B.T.K. containing a photocopy of the driver's license of a female victim who had not yet been attributed to B.T.K. Vicky Wegerle was killed in September of 1986 by strangulation. Rader included photos of her body that could only have been taken by the killer due to the EMT's removing her body from the house before the police arrived (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). The police were stunned both to receive communication after such an extended period of time and to have a murder that had not been attributed to the killer so suddenly solved. Rader would send several more letters in the next year that would ultimately lead police right to his door.

During the time that Rader was committing his heinous crimes, he was both a doting husband and perceived loving father of two children, a son and daughter. He was a model citizen in the community, deacon and congregation president in the local Lutheran Church, and even a Boy Scout troop leader. Most liked and trusted Rader and found it impossible to imagine him capable of such mayhem. The only clue he ever gave to his other side was in his job as County Code Enforcer. Rader would often be a stickler for the codes and wrote many tickets, often for very minor infractions. Dennis would be known to take out a yard stick and actually go about the neighborhood measuring the length of the grass on the lawns (Singular, 2006). After the birth of his children, Rader's fantasy life seemed to subside for a while and he took no further actions on his fantasies until the local press ran a story about the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the case, and he felt that old

familiar twinge return. Rader began to barrage the local papers and media with new letters, asserting his intention to begin anew. Rader even began sending the Wichita police nude “Barbie” dolls with their limbs bound in his signature knots and plastic bags over their heads (Douglass & Dodd, 2007).

Just like the rest of the world, by 2004-2005 technology had taken over in Wichita. Rader had discovered he could now type his correspondences on his computer and save them onto a floppy disk. The pastor of the church he belonged to had granted Rader permission to type his meeting notes and print them off for the other deacons on the church computer. Rader took a disc from the church, erased its content, and replaced it with his next letter to police. This would be the worst mistake of his serial killing career. With this disk the police were able to use their computer forensic analysts and locate the disks creator, which turned out to be someone with the name “Dennis”. The analysts were also able to locate the file containing the disks owner, which was identified as a computer at the Christ Lutheran Church (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). Agent Stone then “Googled” the name of the church and it listed Dennis Rader as the church president. The police began to get extremely excited and immediately sent agents into Park City to the church. At this same time agents located and watched Rader while they were building the case against him.

The police still had samples of the semen that had been left at the crime scenes from the previous years, and detective Landwehr suggested that they try to have it analyzed to make sure that B. T. K. was not setting this man up and making them look like fools. Landwehr did not want to go and subpoena the hospital records for Rader or his children because the town was too small and someone would possibly let it leak,

tipping him off. The police knew that Rader's daughter was now attending Kansas State University and they have a student clinic widely used by most students. Police received a subpoena and retained a recent sample from a pap smear that Rader's daughter had recently had performed. Analysts were able to gain DNA material from the nucleus of the epithelial cells present on the slide and match it to the samples left at the crime scenes....It was a definite match; they had the slayer after 30 years (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006). Rader was apprehended February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2005. He did not struggle or try to escape. He was reported to be very calm and collected by the arresting officers. Rader even made a type of dry joke to the officers stating "Tell my wife I won't be home for lunch...I assume you know where I live" (Douglass & Dodd, 2007, p. 261). Rader continued his calm, cool, and collected demeanor all the way through to his sentencing.

Dennis Rader pleaded guilty to 10 counts of first-degree murder and numerous others class A felonies on June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2005. The judge allowed him to plead guilty only after describing the reasons he felt that he would be found guilty if he had been judged by a jury of his peers. Rader went on to describe in cold sterile detail the Otero murders and many of the others. Rader performed this bleak and heart wrenching task with the same emotion and inflection that one might have when reading directions to assemble a bicycle aloud. The serial murderer known as the Bind, Torture, Kill or BTK killer was sentenced to 10 consecutive life sentences with no chance of parole for 40 years on August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2005. He is still incarcerated in the El Dorado Correctional Facility and will presumably be there for the remainder of his natural life (Douglas & Dodd, 2007).

## Countess Erzebet Bathory

Countess Erzebet Bathory of Hungary may have lived in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century, but the atrocities she participated in are yet unrivaled into the 21<sup>st</sup>. The blood lust, or *Lust Mord* as proclaimed by Kraft-Ebbing, was both frightening and insatiable, the stuff of legend. In the proceeding centuries the horrific truths of her crimes would be rediscovered when Raymond T. McNally, Boston College Professor and Fulbright Scholar, and his associate Radu Florescu obtained unprecedented access to Romanian and Hungarian historical archives. The archives contained the trial transcripts of as well as hand-written journals by the Countess Erzebet Bathory. The atrocities recounted in the transcript would earn Erzebet the nicknames “The Blood Countess” and “Lady Dracula” and would serve as a grim reminder that psychopathy and serial murder are definitely not “new” concepts.

Erzebet Bathory was born to an aristocratic family in the foothills of the Carpathian Mountains in 1560. Bathory’s family was overflowing with royalty. She was cousin to the reigning King of Poland, Stephen Bathory, and to the Prime Minister of Hungary, Gyorgy Thurzo, and was also related to the tyrannical Sigismund Bathory, the Prince of Transylvania (Baring-Gould, 1865; Penrose, 1970; Vronsky, 2007; Wilson, 2004). Bathory had little chance at a normal psychological or sexual development. From the day she was born she was raised by nannies and servants rather than her actual parents. This was the way of the aristocracy. Little is mentioned in the literature about her parents or her relationship with them other than their lineage. She was exposed to the occult and black magic practically from birth. Her uncle was a professed alchemist, practitioner of black magic, and Satan worshipper. Her aunt was a well known Lady of the Court but was also a reviled lesbian (homosexuality was not tolerated at this time. It

was considered evil) and supposed witch. Even her brother was a violent sexual predator who preyed on any female regardless of age (Wilson, 1990). With such a deviant bloodline and environment, it is not a tremendous surprise that she would exhibit brutality and depravity later on.

Erzebet was as beautiful as she was cruel. She had skin so pale it appeared translucent in places. This was considered the epitome of beauty in that time. Her hair was long and as raven black as her eyes. She had full, red lips and a curvaceous figure. These stunning features were primary in her promiscuity and legendary sexual prowess (Women Who Kill, 2009). When Erzebet was 11 years old, she was betrothed to Count Ferencz Nadasdy of Hungary who was 5 years older. At age 14 Bathory became pregnant by a peasant boy and was sent away to a local estate to give birth and give the baby to another family. Erzebet returned home and was married to Count Nadasdy on May 5<sup>th</sup>, 1575, at the age of 15 (Florescu & McNally, 1989; Wilson, 2004). The couple took up residence in Csejthe Castle in Northwest Hungary. Count Nadasdy was a celebrated war hero who was nicknamed “The Black Hero of Hungary”, and he was often away fighting the Turks and Spanish Mercenaries in the Balkans (Wilson, 2004). This left the Countess alone most of the time. She began to surround herself with Occultist, witches, astrologers, sorcerers, and Satanists. Among these were her childhood nanny, Ilona Joo (A practitioner of witchcraft); her husband’s man-servant, Thorko (Practitioner of Black Magick); a “forest witch”, Anna Darvula; Dorottya Szentes (witch, Satanist); and Johannes Ujvary, a black magic practitioner and sorcerer (Florescu & McNally, 1989). Count Nadasdy was reported to have a sadistic streak as well and would often send Erzebet instructions on how to punish the servants (putting honey on their naked

body and tying them to a pillar outside for the bees) and black magic spells gathered from his travels. This was a type of love letter between the two. One such correspondence from Erzebet to the Count recounted by Colin Wilson (2004) stated:

Thorko taught me a lovely new one. Catch a black hen and beat it to death with a white cane. Keep the blood and smear a little of it on your enemy. If you get no chance to smear it on his body, obtain one of his garments and smear that instead (p. 62).

The Count and Erzebet were a well suited couple. They were very sexually compatible, with voracious appetites and sadistic tendencies. When he was home, he would often help her with her torture of the servants. The couple bore no children for the first 10 years of the marriage. This is most likely due to the Count's infrequent home visits. This caused much tribulation between Erzebet and her mother-in-law. Quite frankly, she despised the Count's mother. The entire castle dreaded the visits from her mother-in-law due to the increase in beatings upon her departure (Wilson, 2004). From 1585-1590 C.E. the couple had four children, three boys and one girl. In some of the historical files reviewed by McNally (1989) she had written to her husband many times about the welfare of the children while he was away.

Tales of her sexual appetite were vast, and her husband was nearly always away, so the Countess began her debaucheries in order to keep sated. Erzebet had a lover brought to the castle who was rumored to have been a vampire by the locals. She eventually eloped with him, only to return a short time later alone. The Count forgave her the transgression because he recognized her needs were as great as his own, and he

was not there to tend to them. This forgiveness most likely was due to the Countess's conning and manipulative nature rather than the Count's extraordinary compassion. Bathory had also taken to feeding her sexual appetite through lesbian encounters with her chamber maids at the behest of her lesbian aunt (Wilson, 1990; Wilson, 2004). In 1600 Count Nadasdy passed away, leaving Bathory a widow at age 44, and Erzebet began the downward spiral into evil that she would come to be remembered for forever. The first order of business was to send her detested mother-in-law away to an unreported fate. Shortly after the Count's passing, the Countess began to host large, orgiastic, occult sessions during which she and her servants would torture the chamber maids while having sex with everyone.

Countess Bathory's depravity knew very few, if any, bounds. Many of her atrocities were documented in the trial records. According to records Erzebet revealed in using needles to torture the girls by piercing them in the face or breasts or forcing them underneath their fingernails (Newton, 2000). The Countess would also reportedly bite chunks of flesh off the girls with her teeth or rip flesh from their breasts with specially made silver pincers. One particular event recalled the Countess pulling a servant's mouth apart with such force it ripped her mouth apart at the sides (Florescu & McNally, 1989). One of Bathory's favorite depravities included a special cage she commissioned in which there were spikes inside. The victim would be placed inside and the contraption suspended from the ceiling. Bathory and her consorts would then poke at the girl with hot irons, forcing her into the spikes as she tried to shrink away. They would be sprayed by the victim's blood and proceed into sexual orgies (Newton, 2000).

It was not long before she began to tire of the victim selection at the castle and began sending her cohorts out at night into the village below to bring back a fresh assortment to choose from. The trial records stated that the villagers were terrified to see the black carriage with its black horses ride into the village each night. The Countess's servants would try to lure the girls into the carriage with the promise of a job at the castle, and if that did not work, they would simply knock the girls out and take them anyway (Women Who Kill, 2004). The villagers began to notice that none of the girls were ever seen again and reported it to their priests. Inside the castle the victims faced not a life of enriching servitude, but of horrors beyond their comprehension. The most attractive girls (with the softest tongues) were forced into depraved sexual slavery until the Countess grew bored with them; then they were tortured and killed. Some were chained in the dungeon and fattened up in order for them to make more blood for her sadistic occult rituals and orgies (Wilson, 1990, 2004).

The downfall of the Countess began when she began to get extra greedy with her blood lust. She began to offer the daughters of lesser nobility training in "social graces" at her castle. One of the girls accidentally died from exsanguinations and Erzebet tried to explain it away as a suicide. The girl's parents did not believe her due to all of the rumors and stories swirling about the villages. The parents went to speak to her cousin, Prime Minister Thurzo, and inform him of all the rumors. Thurzo held off action as long as he could, perhaps for political reasons or to spare his family the embarrassment. Eventually the news reached King Matthias II of Hungary and he ordered that the castle be raided to look for evidence and try to catch Erzebet in the accused acts. On December 31<sup>st</sup>, 1610, the castle was stormed by Thurzo, the village priest, and numerous soldiers.

Upon arrival the door was cracked open and they were able to enter the great hall undetected. According to trial records the team found a girl lying in the corner deceased, drained of all blood. Another girl, barely alive, was on the other side and was covered in puncture wounds. Realizing the girl was so near death she would not even make it to the village, they left her there and proceeded into the dungeon still undetected. In the dungeon numerous girls were locked in cages or chained to the walls, both alive and in various states of decomposition. Those who were deceased showed outward signs of physical torture including punctures, burns, piercings, bite marks, and numerous slashes to the veins (Florescu & McNally, 1989; Wilson, 1990; Women Who Kill, 2004). After freeing those still alive, the team proceeded up to the second floor and discovered the Countess and her servants engaged in such drunken debauchery and degeneracy that they did not want the acts recorded on official records. The homicidal group were so intoxicated they were easily apprehended (Women Who Kill, 2004).

Their trial was set for January 1611 in Bitse, Hungary. Through the political influence of Thurzo, Erzebet did not enter a plea either way or even attend the trial. She was locked in her apartment in the castle under guard. The trial lasted for 2 months, and by the end, all but one of the Countesses servants and coconspirators had turned on her in hopes of receiving clemency. All of the villagers whose daughters had been murdered were allowed to testify as well (Wilson, 2004). Bathory and her followers were convicted on 80 counts of murder, the number of bodies they discovered in and around the castle. The Countess was sentenced to death *in absentia* and her cousin Thurzo had her sentence suspended indefinitely. She was instead walled-up in her room with only a slot open to receive her food through. A guard was placed outside her wall at all times.

Her cronies would not be so fortunate as to share her fate. Judge Theodosius de Szulo sentenced Thoroko, Ujvary, Darvula, and the two lesbian maids to death by beheading. Ilona Joo and Dorottya Szentes were sentenced to having their fingers torn out one-by-one before being burned alive (Florescu & McNally, 1989; Newton, 2000). Bathory lived for 3 years inside the bricked-up room. She reportedly never spoke to anyone or made a single noise during that time. She was discovered lying on the floor dead by a new guard after several meals had gone uneaten. When the room was opened up, the walls and floor were covered in incantations and occult symbols. A letter was found on the floor near the body that had been written the night before the castle raid. It appeared to be a contract Bathory had made with the devil, invoking him to send 99 cats to tear out the hearts of King Matthias and her cousin Thurzo along with a few others (Wilson, 2004). It appears Erzebet knew the castle was to be raided, but she made no efforts to hide her atrocities or escape and save her life. Once again, psychopaths' egos are proven more valuable to them than their own lives. By the estimates according to trial testimony, bodies found, and later from the Countesses own journal, the final victim total for the Blood Countess was between 300 and 650 (Schechter & Everitt, 2007). The sheer volume of victims as well as her Paraphilia put the Countess into a league of her own in the realm of serial killers.

### Jane Toppan

One of New England's first female nursing students had also many other titles: liar, psychopath, poisoner, and sexual deviant. When the truth of her crimes would be revealed, she would also be labeled one of the most prolific serial sexual murderers in America's history. Honora Kelly was born in 1857 to a destitute couple in Massachusetts

named Peter and Bridget (Schechter, 2003). Bridget died shortly after of consumption (tuberculosis), and Peter was a sickly alcoholic. When Bridget passed, Peter fell into even greater bouts of drunkenness and chronic depression. Peter was reported to have violent outbursts frequently. In February 1963 Peter abandoned 6 year old Honora and her 8 year old sister Delia at the Boston Female Asylum. The children were allowed to stay due to their evident abuse and neglect (Schechter, 2003). Peter eventually went insane and sewed his eyes shut with sewing needles. Two years later Honora was indentured to Ann Toppan and her name was changed to Jane Toppan even though she was never formally adopted by the family. Jane was never really accepted by the family and was often reminded of her lowly Irish heritage. Jane was simply a servant and nothing more (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). Jane detested her foster sister Elizabeth, who she perceived to have everything she did not. By all accounts Elizabeth was always kind and accepting of Jane; however, the stark differences the family made between the girls fueled Jane's hatred. This would be detrimental to Elizabeth in the years to come.

In order to compensate for the emotional negligence she was enduring at home, Jane invoked a very vivacious, larger than life personality (Schechter, 2003). While she enjoyed many moments in the spotlight telling grandiose tales, she was hiding a much darker persona. Jane was a habitual liar and would often make up elaborate lies about her life and background, a trait that would follow her into adulthood. She delighted in spreading vicious gossip in school and stealing petty things only to place the blame on others (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). As Jane approached her 18<sup>th</sup> birthday she had gained a large amount of weight and resigned herself to spinsterhood. Jane only spoke of one potential suitor prior to this decision, an office worker who gave her an engagement ring.

The young man moved to a nearby town and fell in love with his landlord's daughter, whom he eventually wed. This only served to enrich the loathing she already felt for her foster sister, Elizabeth. In 1874 Jane was released from her servitude and given \$50.00 compensation. Even though she could now leave if she wished, she remained in the house as a servant to Elizabeth and her husband for 10 more years (Schechter, 2003). By 1885 Jane decided to move out and applied for acceptance at the newly established school of nursing at Boston's Cambridge Hospital (Newton, 2000). The patients and physicians were quite taken with her quick learning and happy nature. The latter characteristic would eventually earn the nickname "Jolly Jane", which she would have the rest of her life. Although she was well thought of by many of the doctors and head nurses, her classmates were far less fond of her. Jane was labeled a trouble-maker, liar, and thief. Jane would fabricate elaborate rumors about the classmates she did not like, some of whom were dismissed from the program due to them (Schechter, 2003).

Jane even had a warped sense when it came to the patients she took a liking to. She would often fabricate their charts or feed them mild doses of medications in order to produce new symptoms and keep them there a bit longer (Kelleher & Kelleher, 2003). In 1887, by the time Jane was 30, she began what she termed "scientific experiments" on the patients. In these experiments Jane would mix the doses and administration methods of opium and atropine and evaluate the effects on the unsuspecting patients. Both morphine (opium) and atropine (a belladonna derivative) were used for treatment of nearly every ailment of the time. They were used for painkilling, anesthesia, menstrual problems, consumption, typhoid fever, and copious other infirmities. The exact number

of patients she sickened or killed while a student there is unknown, although it is estimated to be around 12 (Schechter, 2003).

Despite some of the apparent character issues and suspicion surrounding Jane at Cambridge, the doctors in her favor wrote her recommendations for a bigger program at Massachusetts General Hospital. Jane was so successful in her new program, when the head nurse had to take some time off, she was voted her replacement. Many of the nurses under her ward began to notice some discrepancies. The medications she was administering to the patients were not even being measured. There were also the old familiar problems with her exaggerations, grand-standing, and gossip-mongering. Her colleagues detested her and took full advantage when she left one day without permission. The other nurses reported the infraction as quickly as possible and Jane was subsequently discharged from the program. This was the worst possible timing for Jane because she had already passed her final exams and was due to receive her licensure in a few days (Schechter, 2003). This was but a minor inconvenience to Jane who had already claimed several more victims while at General. After Jane was expelled from the program, she rented herself out as a private duty nurse in Boston. She worked long enough as a private nurse to gather some new letters of recommendation, and in the fall of 1890 Jane returned to Cambridge in hopes of finally attaining her license (Newton, 2000).

After returning to Cambridge Jane soon began her same patterns of destructive behaviors. She was stealing from others and continuing her ‘scientific experiments’ on unsuspecting patients. A few patients were lucky enough to survive her attentions. One such patient, 19 year old Mattie Davis, had a fever and was treated by Nurse Toppan.

Within minutes of her giving the girl some medication, she fell violently ill and began convulsing. A young doctor happened to be passing by and attended the girl. Her rapid onset of symptoms made the doctor suspect she had been poisoned. Some of the other doctors began to have the same suspicions when many of the patients being treated by Nurse Toppan were mysteriously getting worse or dying (Schechter, 2003). Jane was dismissed soon after on suspicion that she was reckless with her opiate dosages. This second dismissal, with still no license, did not worry Jane in the least. Toppan became one of the most successful private nurses in the town despite her chronic lying and stealing. Being a private nurse allowed her to begin to finally act on the fantasies that she had been harboring since becoming a nurse without much fear of discovery.

Beginning in May 1895 Jane embarked on a very serious version of a “parasitic lifestyle” so common to most psychopaths. Jane poisoned her landlord and then moved in with his widow. She also poisoned a few others that fall before finally exacting the revenge she had so long fantasized about. Jane went on vacation with Elizabeth during which time she poisoned her to death. Jane was elated to finally be rid of her and even told Elizabeth’s husband that her sister’s last wish was for her to have her jewelry. Her husband later found that Jane had quickly pawned it (Schechter, 2003). Jane would later confess that Elizabeth “was really the first of my victims that I actually hated and poisoned with a vindictive purpose, so I let her die slowly, with gripping torture” (Schechter, 2003, p. 96). During this time Jane was continuing to poison those she was supposed to be caring for while looking for ways to profit from those deaths. In February 1900 Jane killed one of her most intimate friends, Myra Connors, for her job as dining matron at a local school. After Myra was dead Jane went to the school and with her

typical conning and charm, explained how her dear friend had told her she intended to take some leave and wanted to recommend her good friend Jane to substitute for her (Schechter, 2003). Toppan professed her great agony over the decision to honor her friend's wishes and take the position. By the next year she had been tossed from department to department, but her incompetence was clearly evident and she was asked to resign. Once again the spinster nearly-nurse was without a family or career.

In the summer of 1901 Jane began a string of slayings that would eventually lead to her arrest. Jane began to poison the landlord over the vacation house in which she poisoned her foster sister some time before. Jane began to poison the woman named Mattie Alden almost immediately with poisoned water. When Mattie fell ill Jane instructed the husband to send for a doctor. The doctor who came was the same doctor who had caught another female serial poisoner a few years earlier, so he knew the signs. With the doctor present Jane took nearly a week to kill Mattie. Toppan wanted to extend Mattie's death partly because she needed to avoid detection, partly for the sheer sadism involved in her suffering (Schechter, 2003). Toppan would later confess to her deviant thoughts at the funeral stating: "You had better wait a little while and I will have another funeral for you. If you wait, it will save you going back and forth" (Schechter, 2003, p. 125). After the death of the landlord, Mattie Alden, Jane moved in with the grieving family to attend to the grief-stricken widower, Alden Davis, and his children. Jane began to methodically poison each one until the entire family was put down within a few weeks (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). Jane tried to burn down the Davis house twice with all of them inside. She said of these incidents: "I was hoping all along the house would burn down...but it didn't" (Schechter, 2003, p. 129).

Jane returned home after these murders and attempted to marry Elizabeth's widower Oramel. While she was occupied trying to carry favor with Oramel and poisoning his sister, the bodies of the Davis family were being exhumed at the requests of the father-in-law of the Davis's eldest daughter Minnie Gibbs. After the exhumation the police began to follow Jane (Schechter, 2003). During this time Jane had become distraught at being rebuffed by Oramel and overdosed herself on morphine. After her recovery she was immediately evicted by Oramel. Soon after, on October 29<sup>th</sup>, Jane was arrested at the home of some friends she had been vacationing with. She was very composed and calm. At one point Jane commented that the only thing that upset her was that the detective insisted on staying in her room while she was getting ready (Schechter, 2003). The trial would be continued several times with Jane reportedly smiling and laughing at each appearance. When the trial finally began the following June, Jane had pleaded not guilty to the four counts of murder she had been charged with. The court had ordered multiple psychological evaluations on Toppan and had concluded that she was morally insane, what we now call a psychopath. The psychiatrists commented on her lack of seriousness or remorse as well as her pathological lying (Schechter, 2003). There is also evidence to suggest that Jane was very aware that she had a problem. When one of the psychiatrists, Dr. Steadman, was discussing her feelings about her crimes, she responded by saying 'I cannot realize what an awful thing it is. Why don't I feel sorry and grieve over it? I cannot make sense of it all' (Schechter, 2003, p. 244). During the grand jury inquisition Toppan finally came forward with the truths behind her unthinkable crimes. Jane shocked the world when she reported that killing and torture gave her a sexual thrill. She claimed she was driven to the acts by "an irresistible sexual

impulse” (Schechter, 2003, p. 245). Jane claimed that something came over her and she could not stop herself. Toppan confessed to 11 murders, although she would later state the actual number was 31.

The trial lasted 8 hours and the jury only deliberated for 20 minutes. Toppan was found Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity and sentenced to the Taunton Hospital for the Insane for the remainder of her days (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Schechter, 2003). After she was institutionalized, her confessions continued. Jane told her attorney that she had gotten exactly what she wanted when she was found insane. She bragged about her talent for manipulation and thought she would be able to convince them that she was “cured” in a few years and be released. Toppan, despite her own confession of apathy, tried to convince the attorney that she was not completely unfeeling by recanting the story of the jilted lover she had and the grief it had caused (Schechter, 2003). Jane began to mentally and physically deteriorate in her old age. She refused to eat because she believed the food to be poisoned. Jane lived in the institution until her death at age 81 in 1938.

### Aileen Wuornos

Aileen Wuornos is often mistakenly believed to be the first female serial killer in America. Her story was so rare and profound it even inspired Hollywood. Actress Charlize Theron assumed the role of the now infamous killer in the 2003 movie *Monster*. The movie, a biography of sorts, was filmed in the actual locations she used to frequent in order to depict her as accurately as possible. In the end, however, it was her shocking crimes that would forever label her a real monster. Wuornos was born Aileen Carol Pittman in Rochester, Michigan, February 29<sup>th</sup>, 1956, a leap-year baby. Her mother

Diane Wuornos married her father Leo Pittman at the age of 15. Diane gave birth to Aileen's older brother Keith in 1955 and divorced Leo just a few months before Aileen was born (Russell, 2002).

Divorcing Leo was the best thing Diane could have done for her children. He was a sadistic psychopath and child molester. Leo would eventually commit suicide by hanging while in prison for raping a 7 year old girl (Meyers et al., 2005). Leo had been raised by his grandparents and when his grandfather died, his grandmother tried to comfort him with special foods and money. He would return the favors with beatings. Pittman would often brag about tying cats' tails together and stringing them over a clothesline to watch them tear each other apart (Russell, 2002). Aileen's mother would soon abandon her brother and her with their maternal grandparents Lauri (pronounced Larry) and Britta Wuornos. The Wuornos raised the children as their own and the secret was not discovered until the two were in their teens. Both of the Wuornos were heavy drinkers and Lauri was often physically abusive. Lauri would often make Aileen and Keith strip down and either bend over the kitchen table or lie spread-eagle face down on their bed while he would beat them with a doubled leather strap (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). Aileen reported that her father (grandfather) was also sexually abusive to her from a very young age (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). This is evidenced by her extreme early sexual promiscuity. By age 12 Aileen was already exchanging sexual favors for cigarettes with the neighborhood boys in a tree-house on the edge of town. She would even take on multiple boys in turn, trying desperately to attain the popularity and friendships she so desperately desired (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). Aileen quickly earned a foul reputation in the neighborhood and all the boys knew where to turn for their

quick gratification or to lose their virginity easily. This made her a pariah when it came to actually having a “boyfriend”. None of the local boys would have dared tell anyone they were “dating” Aileen; this would mean certain ridicule and banishment. Aileen was often teased and called derogatory names like “ugly whore” and “slut”. When she was approximately 6 years old, she accidentally set herself on fire while she and Keith were playing with lighter fluid. She would recover but was scarred on her face permanently (Russell, 2002).

At age 13-14 (reports vary) Aileen became pregnant and gave birth to a baby boy who was given up for adoption. Aileen would never tell exactly who the father was, she told everyone she had been raped by a family friend. Most likely her grandfather or brother Keith was the biological father (Vronsky, 2007). Aileen confessed to an incestual relationship with her brother for several years. Aileen began running away at the age of 15. While away she would survive by prostitution theft and pool hustling. At this time her grandmother died from hepatic cancer and Aileen returned to attend her funeral. The police found her sleeping in the woods and placed her in a girl’s home for several months (Russell, 2002). She began racking up quite a rap-sheet during high school. She was arrested for prostitution, drunken driving, disorderly conduct, theft, grand theft auto, and forgery, just to name a few. Aileen dropped out of school and hitchhiked to Florida in 1976. The years around when Aileen turned 20 would prove to be some of the most difficult of her life. At 20 Aileen met and married a man who was 50 years older. The marriage only lasted 6 weeks due to Aileen’s partying and anger issues. The man filed a restraining order against Wuornos for beating him with his own cane (Holmes & Holmes, 1998). After the divorce Aileen returned to her life of petty crime, significantly adding to

her arrest record. Shortly after this episode her brother Keith died from throat cancer at the young age of 21, and Lauri committed suicide (Meyers et al., 2005).

In 1985 Aileen was still prostituting herself heavily and was addicted to cocaine and crystal meth. It was during this time that she began a lesbian relationship that would last until her death sentence. Tyria Moore became her lover, best friend, and confidant (Russell, 2002). The two women met at a gay bar in Daytona Beach, Florida. Although their relationship was marred by excessive drinking, jealousy, and violent behavior, the two remained close and were supported by Aileen's prostitution and Tyria's hotel maid wages. In 1989 Aileen was prostituting from the side of the freeway in Florida when she was picked up by Richard Mallory. Mallory was a 51 year old business owner from Clearwater. He was known to be impulsive and disagreeable. He was also a porn addict with a paranoia disorder (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). Mallory's abandoned car was found days later on Ormond Beach with an empty wallet, used condoms, and vodka inside. His body was located on December 13, 1989, in nearby woods. Mallory had been shot three times in the chest with a .22 caliber hand gun. This would quickly become a scene of Déjà vu for local investigators, as Wuornos would murder six more men in the same manor within the next 11 months. All of the men would be middle-aged "Johns" who would pick her up and drive to a private locale while the men were undressing, or sometimes after they had finished, Aileen would shoot and rob them, dump the bodies in remote areas, and abandon the vehicle in another spot.

Aileen would often pawn the items she took from her victims, and this habit would inadvertently lead police right to her. The police were able to track Aileen through her fingerprints left behind on the pawn shop sale cards (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998). On

January 9<sup>th</sup> Aileen was arrested at her favorite local bar, *The Last Resort*. Police approached Tyria Moore at her relative's home the next day and offered her immunity in return for her help in the case. Police knew that Moore was aware of the crimes and perhaps had helped plan some of them (Russell, 2002). Tyria spoke to Aileen on the phone the next day and convinced her to confess. Wuornos confessed to six murders and claimed that they were all committed in self-defense. In her account of the first murder, that of Richard Mallory, that he had refused to pay her and proceeded to viciously beat her and attempt to rape her. She claimed she was able to reach her purse, retrieve her pistol, and shoot him in the chest. Afterwards, she realized that if he survived, she may be caught. This thought inspired her to shoot him two more times in the chest at point-blank range (Russell, 2002). Aileen subsequently replayed this incident in her mind every time she got in a new car. According to Russell (2002) Aileen admitted that she would scream "I knew you were going to rape me!" (p. 149) before she would fire.

The trial began on January 13, 1992, and testimony about Richard Mallory began. Tyria testified for the prosecution and detailed the conversations she had with Aileen about Mallory's murder. This was detrimental to the defense and the jury only deliberated 2 hours. Wuornos was ultimately found guilty of first-degree murder. Upon hearing the verdict, Aileen shouted: "I'm innocent! I was raped! I hope you get raped! Scumbags of America!" (Philbin & Philbin, 2009, p. 196). Aileen Wuornos was sentenced to death on January 29<sup>th</sup>, 1992; she was executed on October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2002, by lethal injection (Russell, 2002). It was discovered by the news show *Dateline NBC* that Richard Mallory had actually served 10 years in prison for a violent sexual attack. Some

believed that she would receive a new trial for the death of Mallory, but she never did (Russell, 2002).

    Wuornos made very revealing comments while waiting for her sentence to be carried out. In one interview Wuornos proclaimed she had killed the men for robbery, and she did not gain any particular thrill from it. Aileen also admitted that she was a serial killer, and if she were released, she would kill again (Meyers et al., 2005). Aileen's last words were reported by the *Associated Press* as follows: "I'd just like to say I'm sailing with the Rock and I'll be back like Independence Day with Jesus, June 6, like the movie, big mother ship and all. I'll be back". The 2003 film *Monster* that was inspired by the life and crimes of Aileen Wuornos earned actress Charlize Theron the Academy Award for Best Actress. She portrayed Wuornos as a pitiful character yet failed to mention her during her award acceptance speech.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

The foremost method of research employed for this work was qualitative content analysis. Content analysis as defined by Krippendorff (2004) is a technique used for constructing replicable and valid inferences from text or other significant matter to the circumstance of their use. Content analysis can compensate for a researcher's inability to observe phenomena they are interested in directly. There are many purposes for the use of content analysis as a research method such as the inference and coding of open-ended survey questions and determination of psychological states (Webber, 1990). Content analysis is an invaluable research method that is useful in both qualitative and quantitative research studies. This thesis has been comprised of various types of research including descriptive research, explanatory research, and social research. Descriptive research is used for the discovery of fact or to describe some reality. Explanatory research evaluates the reasons behind how or why something occurs. Social research is the "systematic examination or reexamination of empirical data, collected by someone firsthand, concerning the social or psychological forces operating in a situation" (Monette et al., 2011, p. 3). All aspects of these types of research are planned in advance; nothing is performed haphazardly or without consideration. The main goal of this type of research is "to provide knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon under study" (Downe-Wamboldt, 1992, p. 314).

The resources chosen for research and study for this work were comprised of academic references, scholarly articles, and both biographical and autobiographical

works. The subjects selected for inclusion were chosen partly due to the amount of available, accessible, and credible materials on each. The murderers chosen, both male and female, were chosen to be as evenly matched as possible based on reported crimes and behaviors to help lessen any possible gender biases. Killers who killed with a partner as well as those without sexual components to their crimes were excluded from this study to maintain consistency in evaluation and scoring. The validity, reliability, and objectivity are the three components necessary to make content analysis a legitimate and dependable research method. Lincoln and Guba (1985) have stated that the three elements needed to ensure the validity and reliability of any content analysis are credibility, transferability, and dependability. *Credibility* in this context is defined as providing sufficient representations of the constructions of the societal world under study (Bradley, 1993). *Transferability* refers to the researcher's hypothesis being applicable to other contexts. Lastly, dependability and confirmability describe the way the researcher accounts for changing conditions in the area of research and the degree to which the data characteristics can be confirmed by others who evaluate the research (Bradley, 1993).

Effort has been made to adhere to and account for these criteria and to ensure the validity and reliability of the information and results contained in this thesis. It is also accepted by the researcher that due to the nature of the research method used some limitations must be documented. The knowledge used for the study and scoring of the subjects was gathered from previously published texts and is therefore subject to the author's bias. Pertinent information may have been excluded due to the potential biases of the researcher conducting this analysis. When scoring the PCL-R, it is always best to conduct a personal interview in conjunction with the content review in order to gain a

more complete analysis and more accurate score. This impediment has been addressed by Hare in his works. Hare (2004) has concluded that when an interview is not possible due to unavailability of subjects or their refusal of cooperation, an accurate score is still possible if the collateral information used is of adequate value.

The information gathered during the extensive content analysis using texts and scholarly articles was used to arrive at a presumptive PCL-R score for each serial murderer chosen, and a comparative analysis of the results was discussed regarding the scores and gender comparison. Each of the subjects was considered individually, and the analysis material was used to retrieve specific examples where they are present and applicable of each of the 20 items on the PCL-R. Each subject was assigned a specific score on each item relative to the evidence of that trait being documented in the literature. Upon completion of scoring, each was totaled individually and a comparison of the scores was assessed according to gender.

### Hypothesis

The researcher hypothesizes that despite the numerous similarities between the type of crime committed, level of violence displayed during commission of the crime, and evidence of sadistic Paraphilia involvement the females will receive lower overall scores using the PCL-R.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

The following section presents the specific examples of the traits, the scores assigned to each, the reasoning behind the particular score, and the cumulative scores of each of the six subjects included in this study.

#### **Ted Bundy**

##### **Item 1: Glibness and Superficial Charm**

##### **Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bundy was always able to charm his way around situations with relative ease. Even those in contact with him inside the justice system were not immune to his acumen. In one such example Bundy was discussing the warden at the prison where he was being held. The warden was known to be a no-nonsense type warden but seemed completely charmed by Bundy. To Ann Rule Bundy stated “Ed’s [the warden] a good guy. I don’t want to get him into trouble but we have to have more to eat” (Rule, 2000, p. 247). His request was ultimately granted, along with more time outside, visits to the library, and various other luxuries not afforded the other prisoners. Ted had become a celebrity on his cell-block. All of the deputies liked him and spent hours just “hanging out” with him. Of all of those who would become enamored with Ted during the course of the trial, none appeared to be a bigger fan than Judge Cowart. The extent of Ted’s likeability and charm was evident through the patience and comments of the Judge. Bundy was often argumentative with Cowart, even asking to have the judge replaced at

one point during the trial. The judge still had some very encouraging words for Ted along with some pleasant banter. At one point Cowart commented to Bundy about his suit saying “You look nice today” to which Bundy wittily replied “I’m disguised as an attorney today” (Rule, 2000, p. 369). Perhaps the most extraordinary examples of Bundy’s charm and influence were in Cowart’s statements to Bundy immediately after handing down his death sentence. Cowart stated “Take care of yourself young man. I say that to you sincerely; take care of yourself. It’s a tragedy for this court to see such a total waste of humanity that I’ve experienced In this courtroom. You’re a bright young man. You’d have made a good lawyer, and I’d have loved to have you practice in front of me—but you went another way partner. Take care of yourself. I don’t have any animosity to you. I want you to know that.” To which Ted simply replied “Thank You” (Rule, 2000, p. 424).

## **Item 2: Grandiose Sense of Self -Worth**

### **Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bundy always detested his perceived “poor” upbringing. He always felt humiliated by his parents’ position in life and always felt he deserved to be rich (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989). In one interview with Aynesworth Bundy was discussing the people passing by his cell stating: “They all want to see Bundy, A lot of ‘em do. Where’s Bundy, I’ll hear. Let’s go see Bundy. They’ll drift by. There’ve been a lot of ‘em” (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989, p. 302). Bundy also thought so highly of himself that in the middle of his capital murder trial with the death penalty on the line, he fired his attorneys and decided he could do a better job as his own defense (Michaud &

Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2000). Bundy also thought of himself as a “ladies’ man” despite his vicious acts of rape. In one of the many conversations Ted had with author and friend Ann Rule, Ted states, “Why should I want to attack women? I had all the female companionship I wanted. I must have slept with at least a dozen women that first year in Utah, and all of them went to bed with me willingly” (Rule, 2000, p. 116). Bundy even played to the press telling one female reporter “If you have any trouble, you come to me. I’m the “Golden Boy”. I’ll see that you get in” (Rule, 2000, p. 373).

### **Item 3: Need for Stimulation and Proneness to Boredom**

#### **Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bundy described many instances during which he would become restless and go out into the neighborhoods walking at night and look in the windows of homes trying to find some stimulation in the form of women undressing or engaged in sexual acts (Rule, 2000). Later on Bundy would steal cars and drive them past police stations for the thrill of it (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989). Bundy also admitted to dressing in all black and following women around, watching them, hiding behind trees; taking great pride in knowing he could grab them anytime. Ted would say to Rule “They were there, so close I could hear them talking about me. They didn’t even know I was watching them from behind the trees” (Rule, 2000, p. 261). He loved the thrill of knowing they were unaware of his being there and he could follow them undetected (Rule, 2000). Bundy thrived on the stimulating high he received by this paraphilic behavior and stalking those who were unconscious of his dangerous presence.

#### **Item 4: Pathological Lying**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** There were many examples of Ted's compulsion to lie documented throughout his life. One such instance involved a discussion with Ann Rule during which she was asking him why he had called her on a particular night. Ann had seen the phone records confirming that it was indeed Ted who had tried to call her, but when she confronted him about the call, at first he inquired "what call" to which Ann replied "it was November 20<sup>th</sup>, the night I was in the hospital. You talked to my mother." Bundy curtly replied, "I never called you then." Ann then informed him that she had seen the records, and Bundy still replied, "I *never* called you" (Rule, 2000, p. 197). In an interview with Michaud, Bundy was asked about his cocaine use. Bundy answered: "Cocaine? I've never used it. I've never tried cocaine. I think I might have snorted it once and got nothing out of it, just snorted a little bit" (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989, p. 107). This was also an excellent example of the "double talk" described by Hare. Bundy says he never tried it and in the next breath contradicts himself entirely (Hare, 1993).

#### **Item 5: Conning and Manipulative**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bundy was a master manipulator. He was able to easily manipulate his victims, the press, the law enforcement officials, and even the judges with whom he came in contact. Bundy would often play the victim, and with his good looks and boyish demeanor, nearly all would fall for it. Ted put on fake casts and pretended to be an injured, helpless, student in order to lure his victims to his vehicle (Rule, 2000). Bundy

also had multiple women who thought he “loved” them and he kept them stringing along to send him money for commissary and do his legal research for him. Even author Ann Rule, who had been a cop at one time, was sucked in by his electric personality. When asked by one of the detectives working the case if she would stop writing to Bundy if he is found guilty of the murders and sentenced to life or given the death penalty, she answered: “No! No, I would always write to him. If what the detectives believe is true, if he is guilty, then he needs someone. If he had that on his conscience. No, I would keep writing, keep in touch” (Rule, 2000, p. 163).

**Item 6: Lack of Remorse or Guilt**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bundy gave many explicit examples of his lack of guilt and remorse. One such example was during an interview with Aynesworth in which Bundy says of Guilt:

I mean I don't feel guilty for anything! I feel less guilty now than I've felt in any time in my life. About anything. And it's not that I've forgotten anything, or else compartmentalized. I compartmentalize less now than I ever have. It's just done! Its back there in the mists...Guilt is a mechanism used to control people. It's an illusion. It's a kind of social control mechanism—and its very unhealthy. It does terrible things to our bodies. And there are much better ways to control our behavior than that rather extraordinary use of guilt (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989, p. 287-288).

Bundy also stated to the court after his conviction, “I cannot accept the sentence even though one will be imposed and even though I realize the lawful way the court will impose it—because it is not a sentence of me; it is a sentence of someone else who is not standing here today. So I will be tortured for and receive the pain for that act...but I will not share the burden or the guilt” (Rule, 2000, p. 423).

**Item 7: Shallow Affect**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bundy would often show his lack of understanding in what emotions are appropriate for certain situations. He would laugh at inappropriate times, even during questioning about his crimes. Bundy would laugh while describing some “hypothetical” way that the perpetrator would have committed the crimes. Bundy would also burst into tears when discussing mundane everyday matters (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989).

Bundy also found it absurd that most people would feel guilty for hurting another’s feelings (Rule, 200).

**Item 8: Callous and Lack of Empathy**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** The sheer volume of evidence and details of his crimes speak to Bundy’s infinite lack of empathy and callousness. In one conversation with Aynesworth Bundy was informed by Aynesworth that he felt Ted was guilty. Aynesworth asked Ted how it made him feel to know he [Aynesworth] felt he was guilty and asked Bundy if he cared. Bundy replied, “It’s not a matter of caring. It doesn’t have any meaning for me”

(Michaud & Aynesworth, 1998, p. 296). When asked by Aynesworth what should happen to people who kill repeatedly, Bundy replied “I don’t know. I don’t know that anything should happen to....uhm...uhm...” (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989, p. 267). Perhaps the most astonishing example came straight from Bundy’s own confessions. Bundy commented during an interrogation for his final arrest “But I’m the most cold-hearted son-of-a-bitch that you will ever meet” (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989, p. 3).

**Item 9: Parasitic Lifestyle**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Even though Bundy made his covetous nature known by telling interviewers of his desire from a young age to be wealthy, it never appeared he habitually lived off others. The only examples of behavior similar to this would be Ted’s skipping out on the rent after the Chi Omega murders and occasionally taking money from the women he dated. These incidents did not appear to qualify as a pattern of behavior.

**Item 10: Poor Behavioral Controls**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Even though Bundy had chosen to be his own attorney during such a momentous event, he still had moments of what could be described as frivolous “temper-tantrums”. During one such episode Bundy knocked out the light outside his cell by throwing an orange. The jailors moved him to an adjacent cell in order to search his current one and found some shards from the broken bulb hidden away (Rule, 2000). The next morning, when the bailiffs went to retrieve him for court, they found Bundy had

jammed the lock with toilet paper. Ted reportedly told them “I’ll be there when I feel like it” (Rule, 2000, p. 394). Ted became enraged and stormed out of the courtroom twice during the trial. Once he began screaming, “You want a circus? I’ll make a circus. I’ll rain on your parade, Jack. You’ll see a thunderstorm” (Rule, 2000, p. 440). This was the side previously observed only by his unfortunate victims.

### **Item 11: Promiscuous Sexual Behavior**

#### **Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Although there is insufficient evidence to prove that Bundy was promiscuous in the traditional sense (consensual partners), the definition provided by Hare in the Scoring Manual includes coercion into sexual activities and sexual assaults (Hare, 2004). Using this definition, promiscuity is certainly present through the multiple acts of rape and other sexual assaults committed by Bundy (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2000; Schechter, 2003).

### **Item 12: Early Behavior Problems**

#### **Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Bundy did have a juvenile record for petty theft; however, this characteristic as defined by Hare only pertains to behaviors exhibited before the age of 12 (Hare, 1991). Bundy’s delinquency problems were caught after this; therefore, they are not applicable to scoring. There was a story in one of the sources that stated Bundy was found to have slipped knives under his aunt’s pillows when he was 3. However, because it was not repeated in any other resource, it was omitted from consideration.

### **Item 13: Lack of Realistic, Long-Term Goals**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Bundy had “realistic” goals (becoming a lawyer), but he often failed to follow through with them. He often changed his mind about going to law-school, and rarely maintained any job for extended periods. This failure to become a lawyer did appear to bother him occasionally, though he would remark about how mundane and miserable he hypothesized his life would have been had he finished school and gotten married (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989).

### **Item 14: Impulsivity**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Although most of Bundy’s crimes showed immense amounts of meticulous planning and execution, Ted also had moments of impulsive actions. In one example, Bundy described himself sitting at home, drinking beer, when he thought about a TV he had seen in a store display window earlier. He claimed that “All of a sudden I said, I’m going to go get that Sony!” (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989, p. 30). Bundy proceeded to go to the store and walk right out with it. Bundy was also known to just “take-off” and be gone for days at a time (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989). The murders at the Chi Omega House were also considered to be an impulse act. The haste and frenzied brutality of the crimes in contrast to his other crimes showed a level of impulsivity not typical of Bundy (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2000).

### **Item 15: Irresponsibility**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** While not every point in Hare’s definition is applicable to Bundy, he did show irresponsibility with his work ethic. Bundy often asked his friend Ann Rule to check on and give money to his long time girl-friend who would eventually become his wife. Although Bundy made these requests, he continuously neglected many of his other responsibilities. Bundy would confess to stealing office supplies from his work and would often manipulate the women in the office into doing his work for him (Rule, 2000). He embodied the part of Hare’s definition claiming “their performance on the job is erratic, with frequent absences, misuse of company resources, violations of company policy, and general untrustworthiness” (Hare, 1993).

**Item 16: Failure to Accept Responsibility for Own Actions**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Ted Bundy epitomized this trait. After Ted was sentenced for the kidnapping of Carol DaRonch, he exclaimed at his sentencing: “Yes, I will be a candidate for rehabilitation, but not for what I have done, but for what the system has done for me” (Rule, 2000, p. 220). Bundy also blamed society for the violence he bestowed on others. In discussing his views on the death penalty, Bundy stated: “It [society] chooses to kill the fetus and preserve the infant and kill the murderer in retribution for the victim, then it must accept the consequences for the violence that it self-generates” (Michaud & Aynesworth, p. 267). Bundy often referred to the dark side of him as the “entity”. He would use this “entity” role to describe his crimes in third person, further removing responsibility from himself (Lewis, 2009).

### **Item 17: Many Short-Term Marital Relationships**

**Score: (0)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Bundy was only married once, a marriage forged through trickery while questioning his girlfriend as a witness at his trial. The marriage lasted until his execution. His other relationships were also fairly long-term affairs (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2000).

### **Item 18: Juvenile Delinquency**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** it is documented that before Bundy had graduated from high school he was already an accomplished thief and liar (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2000; Schechter, 2003). Bundy was also arrested twice as a juvenile, but these records were later expunged (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989).

### **Item 19: Revocation of Release**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bundy fancied himself quite the “escape artist” during his criminal career. He had two successful escapes while awaiting trial. He escaped from the courthouse in Aspen by jumping from a window in the library while being allowed to do legal research in preparation for his defense. He was rearrested a brief 6 days later. His second escape occurred when he acquired a hacksaw and \$500.00. Bundy was able to cut a small hole in the ceiling and escape through the crawl space to the jailers clothes closet. Bundy just eased himself down into the jailer’s apartment and simply walked out the door

(Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2000; Schechter, 2003). It was during this escape that the Chi Omega House murders took place before he could be recaptured.

**Item 20: Criminal Versatility**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bundy was arrested for theft, possession of burglary tools, kidnapping, murder, rape, assault, and drug charges during his expansive criminal career (Michaud & Aynesworth, 1989; Rule, 2002; Schechter, 2003).

**Total Raw Score: Bundy = 33**

Ted Bundy's overall raw score of 33 can be broken down into its Factors and Facets for a better understanding of his diagnosis. Bundy scored a total of 16 out of a possible 16 for the presence of Factor 1 traits. Factor 1 traits are considered to be the primary characteristics of a "core" or primary psychopath. For his Factor 2 cluster Bundy scored a 13 out of the possible 16. The Factor 2 traits are the antisocial lifestyle traits. To break it down even further, the four facets Interpersonal, Affective, Lifestyle, and Antisocial can also be give a total raw score. The Interpersonal facet includes the traits that describe how one presents himself or herself to others. This includes Factor 1 traits (1, 2, and 4). Bundy's raw score for the interpersonal facet was a 6 out of a possible 6. The Affective facet includes the emotional aspects and includes Factor 1 traits (6, 16). For this facet Bundy scored a 4 out of a possible 4. The Lifestyle facet includes how one lives in society and includes Factor 2 traits (13-15). For this facet Bundy scored a 5 out of a possible 6. Lastly, the Antisocial facet describes lack of control and lifetime

antisocial behavior. This facet includes Factor 2 traits (10, 12, and 18). For this facet Bundy scored a 4 out of a possible 6.

### **Richard Ramirez**

#### **Item 1: Glibness and Superficial Charm**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Ramirez was not particularly known for his overtly charming nature or extroverted personality. Mostly, Richard was quiet and kept to himself. He was very shy at school and never really had much of a personal or social life outside of his family (Carlo, 1996).

#### **Item 2: Grandiose Sense of Self- Worth**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** The only evidence the researcher could find to meet this criterion involved Richard's bragging about his protected status with Satan (Carlo, 1996; Schechter, 2003). In all other respects he appeared to be very realistic about both his life and situation and thought he deserved to die for his crimes.

#### **Item 3: Need for Stimulation and Proneness to Boredom**

**Score: (2)-definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Ramirez would often engage in highly dangerous, sensation-seeking activities. He would go out and break into homes for items he could sell for drugs. Richard went with his brother-in-law Roberto (who was a paraphilic himself) to prowl

people's backyards, hoping to see them undressing or having sex (Carlo, 1996). He would frequently go into dangerous neighborhoods late at night to procure some "Angel Dust" or PCP. Richard would then proceed to drive at high speeds, blaring AC/DC's dark anthem "Night Prowler".

#### **Item 4: Pathological Lying**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Although there did not appear to be a history of "pathological" lying as described by Hare (1993), Richard did lie consistently to his parents about his crimes. This appeared to be out of a sense of protection toward them and not merely deceptively motivated. Ramirez did not want his mother and father to view him as the monster he had been accused of being. In almost all instances in which a provable lie was documented, it was directed to his family regarding him being a "scape-goat". Richard would often make comments to his mother stating: "They needed someone, and they chose me" (Carlo, 1996, p. 303). If anything, Richard often got in trouble for his brutal and often hurtful honesty. It devastated his parents, who were strict Catholics, to listen to him declare his allegiance to Satan repeatedly (Carlo, 1996; Schechter, 2003).

#### **Item 5: Conning and Manipulative**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** This trait is only present in Ramirez during his days during trial and after his conviction. Ramirez was able to keep contact with, entice, and manipulate several women. Richard was very dark, dangerous, and appealing to a certain type of

woman. He had several “relationships” going while in prison, and these women would provide him with money and emotional support even knowing others were doing the same (Carlo, 1996). Ramirez was even labeled the “Death Row Romeo” by the television show *A Current Affair* (Carlo, 1996, p. 544). Richard was even able to win the affections of one of the female jurors who had convicted him. She met with him afterward and cried, saying she was sorry she voted for the death sentence. Ramirez just told her to forget it, he understood (Carlo, 1996). In the other aspects of Richard’s life, manipulation did not appear to be common.

**Item 6: Lack of Remorse or Guilt**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Richard told a fellow inmate with regards to his crimes: “I’ve killed 20 people, man, I love all that blood” (Schechter & Everitt, 1997, p. 249). Ramirez never expressed any remorse or guilt for his crimes other than for the hurt he had caused his family. Every time he was asked about his crimes, he would just shout profanities and praise Satan (Carlo, 1996). During one of Ramirez’s periods of incarceration in the LA county jail, the actor Sean Penn was serving a couple weeks for assaulting paparazzi. Penn had to be housed in the cell next to Ramirez due to his celebrity status. Penn later stated Ramirez “masturbated excessively, like an animal in heat” (Carlo, 1996, p. 485). Penn also stated that he fueled this excessive activity with pictures of his victims he hung on his cell walls with toothpaste (Carlo, 1996).

**Item 7: Shallow Affect**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** When he was finally rescued from the street mob and arrested by the police, Ramirez reportedly was not afraid but incensed that the “people”, not the police, had actually caught him and he began laughing. Richard also began humming the song Night Prowler while sitting on the curb after being pulled from the angry mob. He laughed when the officer asked him if that was the song he was humming (Carlo, 1996). Richard would often smile and flash the pentagram on his palm to the press on his way into court but only showed emotion in the courtroom when he would become restless or feel that his attorneys were incompetent. It was just viewed by those near him that his emotions were not appropriate for the situation (Carlo, 1996).

#### **Item 8: Callous and Lack of Empathy**

##### **Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Ramirez stated to Detective Ellis, “I told one lady one time to give me all her money. She said no. I cut her and pulled her eyes out” (Carlo, 1996, p. 321). In another incident Sheriff’s deputy Bob Anderson told the Judge that he just wanted to inform him [the judge] that Ramirez had recently given him [Anderson] a postcard to mail to his former friend Earl Gregg. In the postcard Richard drew a scorpion and pentagram, and had written a threatening poem to Gregg. To this confession by the deputy to the Judge, Ramirez replied “Crybaby” (Carlo, 1996, p. 321).

#### **Item 9: Parasitic Lifestyle**

##### **Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** The researcher could find no sufficient evidence that Ramirez characterized this trait. He left home early and lived out of cars and on the street. He appeared to support himself despite the fact that he obtained most of his money through theft. Theft did not qualify as parasitic behavior according to the definition set forth by Hare (1993).

#### **Item 10: Poor Behavioral Controls**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** The researcher could not find consistent evidence of Ramirez having a history of inappropriate violent outbursts as a recurrent theme in his life. By all accounts Ramirez was a very mild-mannered even tempered child and adolescent. Even as an adult he did not appear to be prone to unjustified or irrational anger. The only time he appeared to have poor control or anger was during the commission of some of his murders (Carlo, 1996; Hare, 1993; Schechter, 2003). This alone was not considered sufficient evidence to consider this trait for scoring.

#### **Item 11: Promiscuous Sexual Behavior**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** This trait is very loosely defined by Hare and contains many scenarios widely applicable to these types of murderers. Although Richard was not reported to have had multiple consensual sex partners, he was both a chronic masturbator and fervent rapist (Carlo, 1996). The definition proposed by Hare did include having convictions for sexual assaults or willingness to participate in a wide variety of sexual

behaviors. Hare also counted forcing others into sexual relations as a trait characteristic, which was clearly evident in all of the rapes and sexual assaults committed by Ramirez.

**Item 12: Early Behavioral Problems**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** By all accounts Richard was a quiet, shy, well-behaved child who was very introverted and was content to entertain himself for hours (Carlo, 1996).

**Item 13: Lack of Realistic, Long-Term Goals**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Richard never showed much interest in completing school or having a career. The fencing of stolen goods was the only steady job he ever held. He appeared to be an aimless wanderer with no steady goals or direction. Richard never really discussed any real dreams or ambitions pertaining to marriage and family or job and career (Carlo, 1996; Schechter, 2003).

**Item 14: Impulsivity**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Ramirez had many instances of committing crimes of opportunity. Most of his crimes were this way. When he attacked his victims, often they were chosen due to a window or door being unlocked allowing him to gain easy entry. His victims were chosen at random due to ease of access when he would go out “lurking”. The only

premeditation to his crimes was the intent to follow through with the “urges” he would experience. The rest was sheer impulsivity (Carlo, 1996; Schechter & Everitt, 1997).

**Item 15: Irresponsibility**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Even though Ramirez appeared to be very close to his family, his irresponsible behavior regarding his criminality warrants a score of (2) for this trait. Richard was very irresponsible with his money, his crimes, and his responsibility to uphold his family’s good name.

**Item 16: Failure to accept Responsibility for Own Actions**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Ramirez often commented to his mother and sister that he would be convicted of the murders because the police needed someone to blame. Once he was rescued from the mob, he told an officer to just shoot him because “I just know all of the killings are going to be blamed on me” (Carlo, 1996, p. 435).

**Item 17: Many Short-Term Marital Relationships**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Ramirez was only married one time, and like Bundy, it was while he was on death row. He did not appear to have many, if any, “normal” consensual relationships before he was apprehended (Carlo, 1996; Schechter, 2003).

**Item 18: Juvenile Delinquency**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Ramirez was reportedly a fairly well-behaved child. He had no notable record of criminal behavior until after the age of 12 and, therefore, would not fit the criteria for the presence of this trait according to Hare (Carlo, 1996; Hare, 1993).

**Item 19: Revocation of Release**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Ramirez had no record of escapes or revocation of probation or parole (Carlo, 1996; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1997).

**Item 20: Criminal Versatility**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Ramirez was arrested multiple times for various offenses including theft, assault, rape, and murder (Carlo, 1996).

**Total Raw Score: Ramirez = 18**

Richard Ramirez's initial raw score of 18 had a Factor and facet break down as follows: Richard's total Factor 1 score was 10 out of possible 16. His overall Factor 2 score was 8 out of possible 18. This is further broken down by the four facets stated previously. Richard's Interpersonal facet was scored at 1 out of a possible 6. The Affective facet for Ramirez was scored at 4 out of a possible 4. Ramirez received a 6 out of a possible 6 on the Lifestyle Facet, and a score of 0 out of a possible 6 on the Antisocial Facet.

## **Dennis Rader**

### **Item 1: Glibness and Superficial Charm**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader was able to fool everyone he ever knew about who he really was except for his unlucky victims. To those who knew him, he was a loving husband, attentive father, and pillar of the community. Rader even charmed his way into being church president. No one but the police and those whose last vision on earth was his face ever suspected he was anything but charming and upstanding (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006).

### **Item 2: Grandiose Sense of Self-Worth**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader often thought of himself as being “above the law”. He taunted the police time and again with letters, puzzles, and evidence from the crime scenes, always believing he was too smart to get caught (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). Rader would take jobs in which he would be in a position of authority and power. He was quickly promoted while in the military, worked for ADT security where he would have access inside people’s homes, was the congregation president at his church, and eventually was a city code enforcer. During his time as a code enforcer Rader would often write his neighbors citations for the most minor infractions. It gave him the sense of power he was looking for while he was not killing (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006).

### **Item 3: Need for Stimulation and Proneness to Boredom**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** According to accounts available Rader was not a regular drug user and maintained a household and employment for years; however, one way in which this need presented himself is in his “trolling” activities during which he would stalk and choose new victims. Rader would sneak into their house and wait for them to come home. This was the stimulating ritual he desired. Rader was also prone to trying to purposely scare his friends by driving the car onto the railroad tracks. Another favorite pastime of Rader’s led him to break into houses and steal the underwear of the women who lived there (Douglass & Dodd, 2007).

### **Item 4: Pathological Lying**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader committed his heinous crimes during the same years he was pretending to be the perfect model citizen. Being so successful at keeping these two lives going simultaneously and never have them intertwine must have entailed great numbers of lies. Rader could also be considered a pathological liar due to the constant lies he told to the victims. Telling them that he was just there to rob them to maintain their trust he was not going to hurt them (Douglass & Dodd, 2007).

### **Item 5: Conning and Manipulative**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader told the police that he had gotten a call from an old high-school friend and had thought about convincing the police that the classmate was BTK. The thought it would be funny to manipulate law enforcement into such a frenzy they would kick they guys door in while Rader watched from a distance. Rader would find it easy to manipulate those he felt were subordinate such as the church congregation, the media, and his wife (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006).

**Item 6: Lack of Remorse or Guilt**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** This trait was perhaps one of the strongest present in Rader. Rader chose to plead guilty and have a bench trial instead of a jury trial. He felt the evidence was too great and just wanted one last thing to control. At the hearing Rader was asked by Judge Waller to give specific information about why he felt he was guilty of each of the counts. Rader went on to give a very detailed and graphic confession about the Otero family as well as the other victims. Rader did this with a straight face, betraying no emotion or remorse. It was like he was describing a day of grocery shopping, even when discussing the heinous acts committed against little Josephine Otero. When Rader described hanging her, molesting her, and masturbating onto her little leg, his voice showed no change in pitch or inflexion, and he showed no outward emotions. This behavior went on for the duration of the description of the 10 counts he was charged with. Never once did he claim any sorrow or remorse for the Hell he had caused (Wichita Eagle, 2007).

**Item 7: Shallow Affect**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader’s statements of culpability were not only unremorseful but were wholly unemotional. He never appeared capable of understanding the devastation he had visited on his victims or on his own family. Rader also showed no true joy about anything in his life, not even his children. In an interview with Douglass Rader told Douglass that he was “Sorry to hear about your mother” (Douglass & Dodd, 2007, p. 299). Douglass stated it was like a “sucker punch to the gut” because he couldn’t have meant it. Douglass said that there was “something about a serial killer handing out condolences over the death of a loved one just seemed ironic” (Douglass & Dodd, 2007, p. 299). Douglass felt that he said it, not because he felt it, but because it was what “normal” people would say to each other, and he felt Rader had mastered the art of mimicking “normality” a long time ago.

**Item 8: Callous or Lacking in Empathy**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** When Douglass was discussing Rader’s feelings at his sentencing, Rader replied “I was pretty robotic during that whole day in court. I was on autopilot. I wasn’t feeling much of anything” (Douglass & Dodd, 2007, p. 305). Rader was also asked by Douglas about killing his neighbor, Marianne Hedge. Rader killed her and carried her down into the basement of his church. Rader replied to this by saying “Yes, she was a good one, I really enjoyed that one” (Douglass & Dodd, 2007, p. 307).

**Item 9: Parasitic Lifestyle**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Rader always appeared to work and maintain his own living. He supported his family, and it was not reported that he ever really lived off others or used them for financial or material gain (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006).

**Item 10: Poor Behavioral Controls**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** By all accounts Rader appeared to be a very calculating and controlled individual. It did not appear that he was prone to violent outbursts or unwarranted aggression. He was even calm and controlled during the commission of his murders. He would not even become angry if his victims tried to fight back; he would just try to calm and reassure them that they were going to be all right (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006).

**Item 11: Promiscuous Sexual Behavior**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader was very promiscuous during his time in the military. When stationed overseas Rader would frequently ride the bus deep into the heart of town and frequent prostitutes, often taking their pictures to have for later. Rader would also fantasize about bondage and masturbate compulsively. The sexual component to his crimes and his compulsion with violent bondage fantasies and murder earn him a score of 2 (Douglas & Dodd, 2007).

**Item 12: Early Behavior Problems**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader began his bondage fetish while still in elementary school. By 6<sup>th</sup> grade he was drawing torture chambers to keep his girl classmates in. By age 9 Rader began sneaking off to abandoned barns in order to tie himself up and fantasize, or later, to bind animals and kill them while he masturbated (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 1996).

**Item 13: Lack of Realistic Long-Term Goals**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Examples:** Rader would often be ridiculed for his extremely ambitious goals. He would tell his classmates that he intended to become a rocket scientist. After he was a little older, he claimed he wanted to become a game warden, which was completely plausible to those who knew him. He would eventually become a respected man with jobs in the military and security and as a city officer (Douglass & Dodd; Singular, 2006).

**Item 14: Impulsivity**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Rader was very calculating and methodical. He planned nearly every single detail of his crimes and made sure he left as little as possible behind (at the time, DNA typing of semen was not yet possible, so he had no worry about cleaning it up). Rader planned nearly every aspect of his life with the same tenacity (Douglass & Dodd, 2007).

**Item 15: Irresponsibility**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Rader successfully supported and maintained his family for nearly 20 years before he was caught. He honored his responsibilities to both his family and his church. He took his job very seriously (many of his neighbors would say too seriously) and had a very good work record (Singular, 2006).

**Item 16: Failure to Accept Responsibility for Own Actions**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader diligently kept a journal through the years. He divulged all of his darkest secrets in it. In many instances he referred to his impulses as “Factor X” (much like Bundy’s “Entity”). In one such entry Rader wrote, “The Uncontrollable Factor X is saying kill” (Douglass & Dodd, 2007). Rader mentioned this “Factor X” in several entries in his journal over the years. In one such entry Rader was thinking of what his father would say to him on the “other side”. He wrote about telling his father that he had been a good father and it wasn’t his fault, he must understand that the “did not raise a problem child” and that the “real culprit responsible for his horrible appetite was Factor X” (Douglass& Dodd, 2007, p. 216).

**Item 17: Many Short-Term Marital Relationships**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Rader was only married one time and was married until he was convicted. His wife was granted a “quickie” divorce after his conviction due to all of the

stress and trauma caused by the fiasco. Rader was not reported to have had any other serious relationships over the years (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006).

**Item 18: Juvenile Delinquency**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Rader had multiple instances of antisocial behaviors from the time he was very young. Rader was erotically obsessed with bondage from about age 9. He would become aroused by drawing pictures of mummies. He would fantasize about binding a girl like a mummy. Rader would also catch unwitting cats and dogs, take them to a barn, tie them to a post, and choke them to death with his rope while he sexually relieved himself. Afterwards, Rader would just throw the carcass into a ditch on his way home. Rader once wrecked his parent's car with a friend with him while racing some boys from his church youth group. His friend was hurt pretty severely, but Rader simply dropped him off at home and never mentioned to his parents that his friend was even with him. The friend had a severe concussion and received several stitches, but Rader was only concerned about the car (Douglass & Dodd, 2007).

**Item 19: Revocation of Conditional Release**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Rader had no history of escape from prison, or revocation of probation or parole (Douglass & Dodd, 2007; Singular, 2006).

**Item 20: Criminal Versatility**

**Score: (2)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Even though Rader showed many types of activities in the commission of his murders, his overall goal was always the murder itself. This was the main emphasis of the charges he actually accrued for indictment. Rader, however, admitted to numerous other crimes for which he was never formally indicted. Among these were included animal cruelty, soliciting prostitution, breaking and entering, stalking, and theft (of women's underwear from the houses he had broken into) (Douglass & Dodd, 2007).

**Total Raw Score: Rader = 22**

Rader's score is further broken down by the Factors and Facets. Rader's raw score for Factor 1 was 16 out of a possible 16. His Factor 2 total was 6 out of a possible 18. The breakdown of his facet scores included Interpersonal, he scored a 6 out of a possible 6. In the Affective facet he scored a 4 out of a possible 4. The Lifestyle facet was a 0 out of a possible 6, and in the Antisocial facet he scored a 4 out of a possible 6.

### **Erzebet Bathory**

#### **Item 1: Glibness and Superficial Charm**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** The researcher could find no evidence suggesting the Countess was particularly glib or charming other than in the boudoir. By all accounts she was very cold, cruel, and sharp-tongued. Those who followed her did so not out of charmed admiration but out of fear for their lives and souls (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

#### **Item 2: Grandiose Sense of Self- Worth**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Countess Bathory considered herself to be a very powerful being. Bathory believed she had great magical powers and a personal connection with the Devil. Bathory was known to be extremely vain and narcissistic, often changing clothes several times a day and standing for hours observing her image in the mirror. The Countess was not bothered by the charges or her subsequent sentence, being walled up into her room. Bathory could not even be bothered to attend her own trial. Countess Bathory embodied Hare's description of "making her own rules" (Hare, 1993; Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 3: Need for Stimulation and Proneness to Boredom**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bathory often surrounded herself with witches, sorcerers, and Satanists in order to keep her occupied. She engaged in many high-risk activities (black magic, orgies, torture) for the perceived excitement and "taboo" nature of the activities. Bathory often sent her followers out to get her new girls to torture to keep her excitement for blood-lust satisfied (Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 4: Pathological Lying**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Bathory was a woman of great power and never had a reason to lie habitually about anything. If any others spoke against her, she would have had them killed. Bathory had the ability to say and do what she wanted when she wanted without

fear of repercussion. She did not attend her trial and never spoke to anyone after her sentence was carried out, so even then she did not lie (Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 5: Conning and Manipulative**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Countess Bathory would send out notices stating the villagers could send their girls (both noble and peasant) to the castle for “social graces” training where they were actually being used for her sexual gratification and sadistic fantasies. Bathory would use and manipulate those around her at her leisure in order to gain stature, money, power, or sex at her personal discrimination. Once she had gotten what she wanted from them, she would torture and kill them for one last kick (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 6: Lack of Remorse or Guilt**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bathory would often write to her husband when he was off at war bragging to him about her extensive torture of both her servants and the local village girls. The Count would instruct her in new torture techniques he was learning abroad, and she would respond to him with her delight at how well they worked. Bathory also kept a ledger (supposedly on an infant’s cauls) detailing in her own writing the torture and murder of nearly 650 females over the years. There was nothing in the ledgers that suggested she felt any guilt or remorse for any of them (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 7: Shallow Affect**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** The Countess was presented as very high-strung and often her emotions would vary wildly from laughter to vicious anger in a split second. She appeared to be very passionate about her magic and power. Although her emotions and passions were often inappropriate and unnerving, the presence of such emotions disqualifies Bathory from this trait (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 8: Callous and Lack of Empathy**

**Score (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Bathory perhaps embodied this trait more than any other. The sheer amount of torture and mayhem she inflicted repeatedly, only expressing delight and joy while doing so, is the very definition of callous. Bathory viewed those around her as only existing to bring her whatever depraved type of pleasure she was seeking at the moment. Bathory did not give any thought to the families of her victims or to even her own family's name when committing her atrocities. There was never a hint of empathy, understanding, compassion, guilt, or sorrow shown by this murderess. The Countess continued to abduct, torture, and kill repeatedly for decades. The only empathy she could ever share is her husband's sorrow for missing out on the action (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 9: Parasitic Lifestyle**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** During the time of Bathory's life it was expected that a woman, especially an aristocrat, would be fully supported by her husband and family. After her husband's death Bathory ran the estates herself and even collected on the debts owed to her husband. She was actually quite independent for her time, thus she would not qualify for this trait (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

#### **Item 10: Poor Behavioral Controls**

##### **Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Countess Bathory was reportedly prone to violent outbursts. If her chosen girl did not perform to Bathory's satisfaction, she would instantly become enraged and beat her to near death and then act as if nothing had happened. If she was not complimented properly and often, she would also become violent and beat and torture her servants and followers. Shortly after these outbursts she would seem flippant, suddenly suggesting a party or orgy (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

#### **Item 11: Promiscuous Sexual Behavior**

##### **Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** The Countess was also the embodiment of this trait. She became pregnant at 14, had a multitude of extra-marital relationships (even having one lover stay at the castle with her), and participated in frequent lesbian and orgiastic affairs. Bathory was even found in such a predicament on the night she was arrested (she was in her 50s). So embedded in her personality was her sexual prowess, once the Count discovered her

affairs, he forgave her immediately stating his understanding of her and how difficult his frequent absence must be for her (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 12: Early Behavior Problems**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** During her childhood it was reported Bathory was prone to fits of rage and would often suffer from violent “fits”. These “fits” were speculated to possibly have been epileptic seizures. She was reportedly a very difficult child, and her own family believed her to be “possessed” due to her violent and unpredictable behavior. Much of this could have possibly been attributed to her childhood nurse being a self-proclaimed witch. Her uncontrollable behavior made Erzebet’s own family fearful of her. Because she received no treatment for these problems, they would be greatly exacerbated in her adulthood (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 13: Lack of Realistic, Long-Term Goals**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Due to the time in which Bathory lived, this trait is not applicable. Women of this age were not usually educated or expected to pursue a career. Bathory actually achieved great stature for a woman of that time. After her husband died she was the Mistress of the estate and attained all the political power that her husband had previously held. There was no higher goal for a female during those days (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 14: Impulsivity**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** The power and position held by Bathory gave her permission to be impulsive. Bathory could indulge her every whim without fear of any serious repercussion due to her station in life. Impulsivity was a common affliction of the aristocracy in that age. Bathory could decide to just take-off with a lover for a period of time or send someone to fetch her a new “girl” from the village in the middle of the night. No one would have questioned or objected to her sudden desires. She was the Countess, and what she wants she gets (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 15: Irresponsibility**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** By all accounts the Countess was responsible with her political duties, and she appeared to be as doting of a mother as any woman of her station in life during that time. Even though she spent much time indulging her own whims, it is also documented that she stayed in touch politically and tried to collect on debts owed to the estate after her husband’s death. Her irresponsibility was in the area of her personal indulgences, thus not applicable for scoring according to Hare (1993) (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 16: Failure to Accept Responsibility for Own Actions**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Examples:** Bathory never tried to blame others for her actions. In fact, she never admitted nor denied anything verbally with regards to her crimes. She did not testify at

nor even bother to attend her own trial. In her ledger she listed the various sordid details of her crimes but never tried to place the blame outside herself. Bathory would have had the perfect opportunity to save herself by claiming she was led astray by her nanny and degenerate family; however, she never even tried (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 17: Many Short-Term Marital Relationships**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Bathory was only married one time and remained so until her husband's death in 1601. Her promiscuity with the servants, while lasting many years, does not fulfill the definition set forth by Hare (1993) for this trait (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 18: Juvenile Delinquency**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Despite Bathory's violent outbursts and anger problems in childhood, she was never arrested or charged with any crimes before age 12 and was not reported to have participated in any illegal activities before she was grown (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 19: Revocation of Conditional Release**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Bathory was only arrested and sentenced one time in her life. After this sentencing she was walled-up in her room and never even tried to escape. She remained in the room until her death (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Item 20: Criminal Versatility**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** The Countess was charged with a wide variety of crimes when she was finally arrested. Because these crimes were categorized differently than they are today, it is difficult to ascertain how many different categories, as defined by Hare (1993) her crimes fit into. That makes scoring this category difficult. To err on the side of caution, a score of 1 was assigned (Newton, 2006; Wilson, 1990, 2004).

**Total Raw Score: Bathory = 17**

Bathory's score is further broken down into the subsequent Factors and Facets. Bathory's Factor 1 total was 8 out of a possible 16. Her total Factor 2 score was 9 out of a possible 18. The Facet analysis for Bathory was as follows: Her Interpersonal Facet score was a 2 out of a possible 6. The Affective Facet score was 2 out of a possible 4. The Lifestyle Facet scored a 2 out of a possible 6, and her Antisocial Facet was a 4 out of a possible 6.

**Jane Toppan**

**Item 1: Glibness and Superficial Charm**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** In order to compensate for her indentured life, Jane was known to have a larger than life personality, and it was said she was a “clever and amusing storyteller” (Schechter, 2003, p. 57). Many of her friends would later say, “If Jane Toppan was there, it wasn’t necessary to provide any other entertainment”, and she had the “gift of gab” (Schechter, 2003, p. 58). Most of the doctors Jane would work with found her delightful and charming. Jane was often quickly promoted in her clinical positions and was liked by most of her patients who gave her the nickname “Jolly Jane” (Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003).

**Item 2: Grandiose Sense of Self-Worth**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Jane was constantly reminded of her inferior Irish lineage at her indentured home. This caused her to develop an insatiable need for revenge against those she perceived to be ignorant and less important than she was. Psychologist Edward Glover wrote of Toppan in his book *The Roots of Crime* stating, “The deceit, the egotism, the desperate craving for prestige—were present in Jane Toppan from the start” (2003, p. 60). Jane also thought she was smarter and more deserving of position than were her nursing school classmates. She would spread vicious gossip to try to have them expelled. Also, if she felt herself more worthy of a man, she would kill his wife to make way for her to move in (Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003).

**Item 3: Need for Stimulation and Proneness to Boredom**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Although it is well documented that Toppan did many high-risk things during her criminal career, she did these in order to commit her murders. The activities were not indulged in simply to placate boredom or for the sake of the activity itself. Jane had a higher purpose for all her risky behaviors, not just for the risk itself (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

#### **Item 4: Pathological Lying**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Many of Jane's schoolmates, both in grade school and later nursing school, saw her as a consistent liar. Jane was prone to wild exaggeration about her life and her parents' lives. She would tell them her father had sailed around the world, living in China, and would later tell nursing school classmates that she was being courted by royalty to come work for them as a private nurse. Toppan even claimed her brother (she never had one) had been given a medal by President Lincoln for the battle of Gettysburg. She claimed her sister had been betrothed to an English Lord, when, in fact, her sister had been committed to an insane asylum and died in squalor (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

#### **Item 5: Conning and Manipulative**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Jane was known as a notorious gossip and would often tell things on the other girls in nursing school to the head nurse in order to gain favor and further her position. Toppan would also place herself in a position to pretend to be patients "care-

taker” and would then poison them and wedge herself into their family by pretending to be the kind, caring, nurse who tried to save them. Several times Jane would volunteer to act as a private nurse for someone and after he or she died horribly and mysteriously, she would insert herself into the deceased person’s life. She manipulated those around her in order to get what she wanted (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 6: Lack of Remorse or Guilt**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Jane Never reportedly expressed any guilt for the anguish she caused others. Her classmates were actually shocked at the unbridled joy and elation she exhibited after some of the girls she had spread lies about were dismissed. Jane called her poisoning of patients while in nursing school her “scientific experiments” and claimed poisoning had become a “habit of her life” (Schechter, 2003, p. 71). Reportedly, her favorite type of death to observe was one in which the patient died while experiencing violent convulsions. Toppan would later confess that the killings gave her “delirious enjoyment” and the “greatest conceivable pleasure” (Schechter, 2003, p. 73).

**Item 7: Shallow Affect**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Jane seemed to have wild fluctuations in her emotions and demeanor. She did not appear, by all accounts, to lack emotional range that is needed to fulfill the qualifications of this trait according to Hare (1993). Toppan would become

angry easily and had enough emotional range to appear charming to most who had contact with her (Schechter, 2003).

**Item 8: Callous and Lack of Empathy**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** As for her patients and their demise at her own hand, she remarked, “There was no use in keeping old people alive” (Schechter, 2003, p. 69). Toppan would also confess to trying different combinations of drugs on patients, evaluating the results, and then moving on to the next patient to try again. Toppan only spoke of killing her patients with reverence. Jane often spoke about how efficient she was at mixing the poisons so that the symptoms they caused the patients were so varied the doctors could not determine the causes for their symptoms or death. Even one physician who had helped convict a female poisoner prior to meeting Toppan failed to recognize the cause of death as a poison homicide. Toppan considered this one of her greatest feats (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 9: Parasitic Lifestyle**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Jane was indentured to the Toppan until she was 18 years old. After she turned 18, she chose to stay on and take care of her foster sister. During this time women were still taken care of by their families and later by their husbands. Her staying with her foster sister would not have been considered parasitic by these standards. This is disputed, however, when later on in life she began killing persons in order to move in to

their home and take over their lives. This behavior could be considered parasitic. To be conservative the researcher scored this as a 1 (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 10: Poor Behavioral Controls**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** As it was with Bundy, Toppan was so conning and manipulative that she was not often seen to be out of control. She regulated very carefully what others saw of her. She was even calculating and in control of her emotions when she was exacting her revenge by poisoning her foster sister, who she perceived to be the cause of many of her problems. For her subtlety and control, the researcher gave her a score of 0 (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 11: Promiscuous Sexual Behavior**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Jane was only involved with one serious relationship in which she had her heart broken when he left her for his landlord's daughter. There was no history of sexual behavior prior to this relationship, nor was there any real evidence that she even had a sexual relationship with that man. The fact that she confessed to feeling sexual gratification from her murders is not included due to her not actually having intercourse or molesting her victims (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 12: Early Behavior Problems**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Jane's early childhood before her arrival at the asylum is not documented. After her arrival there was no mention of behavioral problems reported by the asylum records nor by her indentured family. The only reports were of her apparent exaggerations and storytelling, reported by her peers (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 13: Lack of Realistic Long-Term Goals**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Jane attended nursing school (although she never received her license) and worked as a private-duty nurse very successfully. Even though her goals were accomplished through the detriment of others, Jane always had another goal to pursue, even if it was other peoples lives (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 14: Impulsivity**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Jane's manipulation and planning indicate that she was not prone to great impulsivity. She may occasionally take advantage of an unplanned opportunity that came along, but that factor alone, did not qualify her for this trait (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 15: Irresponsibility**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Jane was an indentured servant for many years and there was no mention in the literature of her being irresponsible in her duties. Toppan appeared to fulfill her obligations regularly and usually held a steady job. She had no husband or children of her own, so it is unknown how responsible she would have been as a wife or mother; however, with the responsibilities she was known to have she appeared responsible (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 16: Failure to Accept Responsibility for Own Actions**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Jane was notorious with her classmates all throughout her life for “contriving to escape punishment by blaming her misdeeds on others” (Schechter, 2003, p. 60). Jane was also a kleptomaniac. When things that would be missing would be noticed, Jane would quickly implicate one of her innocent classmates in the crime (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 17: Many Short-Term Marital Relationships**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Jane was never married and only claimed to be in love once in her life. She attempted to convince her foster sister’s widower to marry her after her sister’s murder; however, she was rebuffed and arrested a short time later (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 18: Juvenile Delinquency**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** By all accounts Jane never got into any real criminal activity for which she was caught during her childhood and early adolescence. She was reported to be a thief; however, she never was caught for it. This activity does not satisfy the definition set forth by Hare (1993) and is therefore given a score of 0 (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 19: Revocation of Conditional Release**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Toppan was only arrested and convicted once. She never attempted escape and lived out her days in the asylum; therefore, she did not qualify for this trait (Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Item 20: Criminal Versatility**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Jane only admitted to theft and murder in her confessions. Hare's definition for this trait includes a score of 1 for activity in 3 or more areas of criminal activity or a score of 2 for activity in 5 or more areas. If the activity is in less than 3 categories, the score must be 0 (Hare, 2003; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Newton, 2000; Schechter, 2003; Schechter & Everitt, 1996).

**Total Raw Score: Jane Toppan = 17**

Toppan's score is broken down into its composite Factors and Facets. Her Factor 1 total was a 14 out of a possible 16. The Factor 2 total was a 3 out of a possible 18. Toppan's Interpersonal Facet Score was a 6 out of a possible 6. The Affective Facet scored a 2 out of a possible 4. The Lifestyle Facet scored a 2 out of a possible 6, and the Antisocial Facet scored a 0 out of a possible 6.

### **Aileen Wuornos**

#### **Item 1: Glibness and Superficial Charm**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Aileen was never a socially gifted woman. She was never described as particularly charming and tried desperately to earn friends and popularity by being sexually promiscuous. To most Aileen seemed to be a little backward and severely socially inept, even borderline mentally handicapped (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

#### **Item 2: Grandiose Sense of Self -Worth**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Aileen often bragged about her excessive drinking and drug use. She would also brag about her many sexual conquests and appeared very cocky (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

#### **Item 3: Need for Stimulation and Proneness to Boredom**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Aileen participated in many high-risk, dangerous, and illegal activities from the time she was very young. She was always looking for the next thrill. Wuornos became heavily involved with drugs, promiscuous sex, hitchhiking, and taking off whenever she felt like it. Aileen would often ride her bike up and down the street waiting for someone to come out and buy her drugs or alcohol in exchange for sex in public places she knew they could easily be caught (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

#### **Item 4: Pathological Lying**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Aileen's family reported a history of lying throughout her childhood. She also lied to the police numerous times over the years, providing false identification and various aliases. She often lied to her "johns" in order to gain sympathy and get more money (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

#### **Item 5: Conning and Manipulative**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Aileen would sometimes quote men a lower price for sex if they were willing to go to secluded areas versus going to a hotel. This made it easier for her to kill them undetected (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

#### **Item 6: Lack of Remorse or Guilt**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Aileen admitted shortly before her execution that had she not been caught she would kill again. She claimed she had wanted to kill 12 men. Wuornos often stated that she did not care that her victims were dead; she felt that she had to kill them before they could kill her (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 7: Shallow Affect**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** During her interviews, confessions, and trial Aileen was very flat and unemotional save the occasional angry outburst. She spoke with no inflection even about her rape and abuse. Wuornos often laughed at inappropriate times such as when the court was told by her attorney that her IQ test had showed she was borderline retarded. Aileen heard this and began to giggle to herself (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 8: Callous and Lack of Empathy**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Aileen never showed any empathy toward her victims. She callously lured them into remote locations with the promise of sex and proceeded to shoot and rob them. Wuornos insisted that she had to kill them all because they were trying to rape her (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 9: Parasitic Lifestyle**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Wuornos never held a steady job except prostitution. She was content to have sex for what money she needed for the days liquor, drugs, and cigarettes. Later she lived off her girlfriend Tyria. It was never understood why she never tried to work a regular job other than it was just quicker and easier for her to perform sexual favors for quick money (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 10: Poor Behavioral Control**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Applicable**

**Example(s):** Wuornos had many incidences of aggressive, angry outburst even against those who were close to her. She stabbed a friend with a skewer as a teen after a minor disagreement. Aileen had several charges as an adult for assault and disorderly conduct, charges consistent with behavioral control issues (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 11: Promiscuous Sexual Behavior**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Aileen began having a multitude of sexual encounters by around age 11 and was pregnant by age 14. She confessed to being raped by her grandfather and to consensual sex with her own brother. Aileen would have sex with the neighborhood boys for beer and cigarettes and eventually became a full-time prostitute by the age of 15. It

was during her years of prostitution that she committed the murders (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 12: Early Behavior Problems**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Because Hare's (1993) definition of this trait states behaviors before age 12, this trait was not scored for Aileen. By all accounts most of her behavior problems began shortly after this period (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 13: Lack of Realistic Long-Term Goals**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Wuornos made her living as a prostitute from a very early age, but she always talked about becoming a police officer or lawyer even though she had nearly no education or training (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 14: Impulsivity**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Aileen had a history of running away on a whim and hitchhiking from state-to-state. She would change her identity as she pleased and used drugs routinely (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 15: Irresponsibility**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Aileen never held a steady job during her life or had to take care of anyone but herself. She leached off of her girlfriend for support for years. She never finished school, got married, or cared for her own child (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 16: Failure to Accept Responsibility for Own Actions**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Although Aileen often blamed her childhood and her Johns for her despicable acts, she ultimately did confess to her murders and state emphatically that she would murder again if released (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 17: Many Short-Term Marital Relationships**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Aileen was married once for only 6 weeks to a much older man who claimed she physically abused him and stayed out all night. Wuornos also had another live-in relationship with her girlfriend Tyria (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 18: Juvenile Delinquency**

**Score: (1)-Uncertain**

**Example(s):** Aileen had some minor offenses as a juvenile pertaining to theft and underage drinking; however, she was not convicted of any violent offences during this time (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 19: Revocation of Conditional Release**

**Score: (0)-Not Applicable**

**Example(s):** Aileen never tried to escape from prison and never received parole (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Item 20: Criminal Versatility**

**Score: (2)-Definitely Present**

**Example(s):** Aileen was arrested on a multitude of offenses during her life including prostitution, assault, weapons charges, drug charges, capital murder, identity theft, grand theft auto, and forgery (Holmes & Holmes, 2010; Kelleher & Kelleher, 1998; Russell, 2002; Vronsky, 2007).

**Total Raw Score: Aileen Wuornos = 23**

Aileen's score can be further broken down into its Factor's and Facets. Her total score for Factor 1 was 9 out of a possible 16. The total Factor 2 score was 14 out of a possible 18. This is further broken down into the four Facets. Her total score for the Interpersonal Facet was 2 out of a possible 6. The Affective Facet scored a 4 out of a possible 4. The Lifestyle Facet received a score of 6 out of a possible 6, and her Antisocial Facet scored 4 out of a possible 6.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

While all of the serial murderers chosen for this study outwardly appeared to fit the profile of a psychopath, only Ted Bundy scored high enough to be diagnosed as such. Overall, the males scored higher than the females with an average total score of (24.3). The female's average total score was (19). This was in agreement with the researcher's original hypothesis. The males also had higher totals for Factor 1 Traits with an average Factor 1 total of (14/16). The average Factor 1 total for females was (10/16). Factor 2 traits would be considered statistically the same, with the average Factor 2 for males being (9/18) and females averaging (8/18). These results indicate that the male serial murderers are more callous, selfish, and remorseless than their female counterparts. They have more characteristics of the "primary" psychopath than the females. The sexes are mostly equal with regards to the "secondary psychopath" characteristics. The murderers led equally chronically unstable and socially deviant lifestyles.

With the Facet Scores, the results are very similar to those found for the Factor characteristics. The males overall averaged slightly higher scores than the females, with the results as follows: Interpersonal = Males (4/6), Females (3/6); Affective = Males (4/4), Females (3/4); Lifestyle = Males (4/6), Females (3/6); and Antisocial = Males (3/6), Females (3/6). Because the males averaged only one point higher than the females in three of the categories, no statistical significant difference would be reported. Both the male and female serial murderers appeared to be equally displaying antisocial

characteristics. While both sexes shared many similarities overall, there were some differences individually worth noting.

Bundy scored very high on the Factor 1 (interpersonal and affective) portion of the list and achieved a total overall score of (33). This was not entirely surprising, considering he is often presented as the “poster child” for psychopathy. Bundy wholly embodies the meaning of the word and is often used in the classroom to teach the concept. Bundy was the only one of the murderers chosen who actually had a total score high enough to label him a psychopath. Bundy had a higher score for the Factor 1 (callous, unremorseful, manipulative, charming) traits than those for his Factor 2 (chronically unstable, antisocial lifestyle); (16 out of 16, compared to 13 out of 18, respectively). Bundy was a cold, calculating, unremorseful predator. He would never have stopped killing if he had not been caught and executed.

Richard Ramirez had a total score of (18). This places him well below the required cut off score of 30 required to be labeled psychopathic. Richard did score higher on his Factor 1 characteristics versus his Factor 2 just like Bundy, but only slightly. As compared to Bundy, Ramirez actually showed almost equal tendencies in both areas (interpersonal and affective) and (deviant lifestyle and antisocial behavior). His Factor 1 and 2 scores were (10 out of 16) and (8 out of 18, respectively). In the review of his Facet scores, it is notable that he scored perfectly on the Affective and Lifestyle facets receiving (4 out of 4) and (6 out of 6); however, on his Interpersonal and Antisocial Facets he only scored (1 out of 6) and (0 out of 6, respectively). His lack of empathy, sense of responsibility, and impulsive nature far outweighed the superficial, grandiose,

and antisocial characteristics. This is in direct contrast to Bundy. They are complete opposites but both equally deadly in different ways.

Dennis Rader had an overall score of (22). This was higher than Ramirez but still much lower than Bundy. Rader also fell well below what was required to be considered psychopathic. Even with the cold, calculating, and heinousness of his crimes, he is not clinically a psychopath. Rader, like Bundy, received a perfect score of (16 out of 16) on Factor 1. He was defiantly callous, remorseless, and selfishly used others at will. His Factor 2 score was (6 out of 18), placing him closer to Ramirez. Rader's Facet scores were very different from both Bundy's and Ramirez's in that he scored highest on the Interpersonal and Affective portions at (6 out of 6) and (4 out of 4 respectively). Rader was very deceitful, grandiose, and remorseless. His Lifestyle and Antisocial Facets were scored at (0 out of 6) and (4 out of 6 respectively). This says Rader had moderately poor behavior control, but he was not impulsive or irresponsible at all. In this way, he was very much like Bundy, cold, calculating, and manipulative. Rader was also a complete predator.

Elizabeth Bathory scored an overall score of (17). This, like those for Rader and Ramirez, is well below the score of 30 needed. Despite this outcome, no one would dispute that her crimes definitely seemed like the work of a psychopath. Unlike her male counterparts, Bathory's Factor 1 and 2 scores were almost dead equal at (8 out of 16) and (9 out of 18 respectively). The Countess was equally callous, unremorseful, manipulative, and deviant and antisocial. Her Facet scores were also fairly equal to each other with scores of Interpersonal and Affective at (2 out of 6) and (2 out of 4), and her Lifestyle and Antisocial facets scored (2 out of 6) and (4 out of 6 respectively). Bathory

scored slightly higher on her deviant lifestyle and antisocial behavior category than the others. Her second highest was in guiltlessness and remorselessness. This was not a surprising result given her body count and silence on her crimes.

Jane Toppan scored an overall score of (17) as well. This score was a bit surprising given her high score on the Factor 1 traits (14 out of 16). Toppan had the highest Factor 1 score of the females in the study. She was extremely callous and remorseless and used others at will to fuel her sadistic needs. It was also surprising that her Factor 2 score was (3 out of 18). Considering her high score on the parasitic lifestyle component, it is surprising that she would score so low on the chronically unstable and socially deviant lifestyle component. Jane also scored very high on the Interpersonal and Affective Facets at (6 out of 6) and (2 out of 4 respectively). Toppan was very deceitful, grandiose, and superficial and had no remorse. Comparatively, she scored very low on the Lifestyle and Antisocial Facets with (2 out of 6) and (0 out of 6 respectively). This would suggest Toppan was not very irresponsible or impulsive and did not lack behavioral control. These scores suggest that Toppan was a very deceitful, calculating, manipulative, guiltless murderess. She was very comparable to her male counterparts but scored lower than most of them as hypothesized.

Aileen Wuornos had a total overall score of (23). This surprisingly placed her higher than Dennis Rader and Richard Ramirez as well as high above the other women. The way in which Aileen is different is in her Factor 1 and 2 totals. Aileen's Factor 1 total was (9 out of 16) and her Factor 2 total was (14 out of 18). This says Aileen was not very callous or remorseless but was very chronically unstable and led a very socially deviant lifestyle. This is in contrast to most of the others, male or female, in this study.

Aileen's Facet scores were also in contrast to the others chosen with her highest scores being in the Affective and Lifestyle Facets at (4 out of 4) and (6 out of 6 respectively). Her scores for the Interpersonal and Antisocial Facets were (2 out of 6) and (4 out of 6 respectively). Wuornos was very unremorseful and showed extraordinary lack of responsibility. Aileen was also very impulsive and irresponsible and had nearly no achievable goals. Wuornos was the quintessential "secondary" psychopath. She was dominated by her antisocial tendencies and had extremely poor behavioral control.

It must be noted that in addition to the limitations previously mentioned the PCL-R has some inherent problems that need to be addressed briefly. During the scoring of the PCL-R items 11, 17 and 20 are omitted. This has a profound effect on the accuracy of the scoring for females. Eleven is promiscuous sexual behavior, 17 is many short-term marital relationships, and 20 is criminal versatility. These three factors are often the exact traits expressed by antisocial and psychopathic females. If these three traits were included in the scoring figures, most of the females in general, and especially those in this study, would score much higher. This also puts a limitation on the correct scoring for those exhibiting Paraphilia. The Paraphilia appears to mask various characteristics in the PCL-R causing skewed results. Because the sexual components are eliminated from scoring, the true measure of their deviant lifestyle component cannot be determined. It is the intention of the researcher and author for this thesis to be used to provoke further discussion and research on the potential improvements and structural revisions that could make the PCL-R an even more accurate and efficient tool for diagnosing psychopathy in both males and females with and without Paraphilia present.

## REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (Revised 4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Balfour- Browne, J.H. (1875). *The medical jurisprudence of insanity*. San Francisco, CA: Sumner Whitney
- Baring-Gould, S. (1865). *The book of Werewolves*. London: Smith-Elder.
- Barratt, E. S., Stanford, M.S., Felthous, A.R., & Kent, T.A. (1997, October). The effects of phenytoin on impulsive and premeditated aggression: A controlled study. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 17, 341-349.
- Bartels, R., & Parsons, C. (2009). The social construction of a serial killer. *Feminism and Psychology*, 19, 276-280.
- Blair, R. J. (2006). The emergence of psychopathy: Implications for the neuropsychological approach to developmental disorders. *Cognition*, 101, 414-442.
- Bolt, D. M., Hare, R. D., Vitale, J. E., & Newman, J. P. (2004). A multigroup item response theory analysis of the psychopathy checklist-revised. *Psychological Assessment*, 16, 155-168.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss, Volume 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bradley, M. M., & Lang, P. J. (2001). Affective reactions to briefly presented pictures. *Psychophysiology*. 38, 474-478.

- Bunson, M. (1994). *Encyclopedia of the Roman Empire*. New York: Facts on File, Inc.
- Burgess, A. W., Hartman, C. R., Ressler, R. K., Douglas, J. E., & McCormack, A. (1986). Sexual homicide: A motivational model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*, 251-272.
- Carlo, P. (1996). *The night stalker: The life and crimes of Richard Ramirez*. New York: Kensington.
- Carozza, D., (2008). These men know snakes in suits. *Fraud Magazine, 22(4)*, 36-43.
- Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. (1999). *Handbook of attachment*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Cleckley, H. (1941/1964/1976). *The mask of sanity* ( 5th ed.). St Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (1999). Psychopathy across cultures: North America and Scotland compared. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 108*, 55–68.
- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment, 13*, 171–188.
- Cruise, K. R., Colwell, L. H., Lyons, P. M., & Baker, M. D. (2003). Prototypical analysis of adolescent psychopathy: Investigating the juvenile justice perspective. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 21*: 829–846
- Davis, M. H. (1983). The effects of dispositional empathy on emotional reactions and helping: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality, 51*, 167-184.
- Douglas, J. E., Burgess, A. W., & Ressler, R. K. (1995). *Sexual homicide: Patterns and motives*. New York, NY: Free Press.

- Douglass, J., & Dodd, J. (2007). *Inside the mind of BTK: The true story behind the thirty-year hunt for the notorious Wichita serial killer*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Downe-Wamboldt, B. (1992). Content analysis: Method, applications, and issues. *Health Care for Women International, 13*, 313-321.
- Eisenberg, N., & Strayer, J. (1987). Critical issues in the study of empathy. *Cambridge Studies in Social and Emotional Development, 406*, 3-13.
- Everitt, D. (1993). *Human monsters: An illustrated encyclopedia of the world's most vicious murders*. Chicago: Contemporary Books.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2005). *Serial murder: Multi-disciplinary perspectives for Investigators*. National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime Critical Incident Response Group Federal Bureau of Investigation: *Serial Murder Symposium Working Group*.
- Florescu, R., & McNally, R. (1989). *Dracula: Prince of many faces*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Forth, A. E., Brown, S. L., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1994). The assessment of psychopathy in male and female noncriminals: Reliability and validity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 20*, 531-543.
- Fulero, S. M. (1995). Review of the Hare psychopathy checklist—revised. *Twelfth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Buros Institute: Lincoln, NE: Conoley & Impara.

- Grann, M., Langstrom, N., Tengstrom, A., & Stalenheim, E. G. (1998). Reliability of the file-based retrospective ratings of psychopathy with the PCL-R. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 70*, 416-426.
- Grann, M. (2000). The PCL-R and gender. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 16*, 147-149.
- Guze, S. (1976). *Criminality and psychiatric disorders*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hare, R. D. (1970). *Psychopathy: Theory and research*. New York: John Wiley.
- Hare, R. D. (1980). A research scale for the assessment of psychopathy in criminal populations. *Personality and Individual Differences, 1*, 111-119.
- Hare, R. D. (1991). *The Hare psychopathy checklist-revised*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D. (1993). *Without conscience: The disturbing world of psychopaths among us*. Toronto: Pocket Books.
- Hare, R. D. (2004). *Hare psychopathy checklist-revised (PCL-R) (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D., Clark, D., Grann, M., & Thornton, D. (2000). Psychopathy and the predictive validity of the PCL-R: An international perspective. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 18*, 623-645.

- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Psychopathy checklist-revised technical manual, (2n ed.)*. Toronto: Multi Health Systems.
- Hart, S. D., Forth, A. E., & Hare, R. D. (1990). Performance of criminal psychopaths on selected neuropsychological tests. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 99*, 374-379.
- Healey, J. (2005). The etiology of paraphilia: A dichotomous model. *Sex Crimes and Paraphilia, 18*, 57-68.
- Hemphill, J. F., Hare, R. D., & Wong, s. (1998). Psychopathy and recidivism: A review. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 3*, 139-170.
- Hickey, E. (1997). *Serial murderers and their victims*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hickey, E. (2001). *Serial murderers and their victims* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Hickey, E. (Ed.). (2003). *Encyclopedia of murder and violent crimes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hickey, E. (2006). *Sex crimes and paraphilia*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Holmes, R. M., & De Burger, J. (1985/1988). *Serial murder*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Holmes, R. M., & Holmes, S. T. (1998). *Serial murder* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holmes, R. M. & Holmes, S. T. (1994). *Murder in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Jones, R. G. (2004). *Women who kill*. Edison, NJ: Castle Books.

- Kelleher, M. D., & Kelleher, C. L. (1998). *Murder most rare: The female serial killer*. Westport, CT: Dell.
- Kosson, D. S., Smith, S. S., & Newman, J. P. (1990). Evaluation of the construct validity of psychopathy in black and white male inmates: Three preliminary studies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 99*, 250-259.
- Kraft-Ebbing, R. V. (1886). *Psychopathia Sexualis*. New York: Stein & Day.
- Krippendorff, K. (1994). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Leibman, F. H. (1989). Serial murders: Four case histories. *Federal Probation, 53*, p. 41.
- Levin, J., & Fox, J. A. (1985). *Mass murder: America's growing menace*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lewis, B. R. (2009). *Mapping the trail of a serial killer*. Guilford, CT: Lyons Press.
- Lilienfeld, S. O. (1992). The association between antisocial personality and somatization disorders: A review and integration of theoretical models. *Clinical Psychology Review, 12*, 641-662.
- MacCulloch, M. J., Snowden, P. R., Wood, P. J., & Mills, H. E. (1983). Sadistic fantasy, sadistic behavior, and offending. *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 143*, 20-29.
- Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Newman, D. L., Fagan, J., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21-year-olds: Bridging

- the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 68-78.
- McCord, W., & McCord, J. (1982). *The psychopath in milieu therapy*. New York: Academic Press.
- Meloy, J. R. (1992). *The psychopathic mind: Origins, dynamics, and treatment*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson..
- Meyers, W. C., Gooch, E., & Meloy, J. R. (2005). The role of psychopathy and sexuality in a female serial killer. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 50, 652-657.
- Michaud, S., & Aynesworth, H. (1989). *Ted Bundy: Conversations with a killer*. New York: Signet Books.
- Million, T., Simonson, E., Davis, R., & Birket-Smith, M. (1998). *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal, and violent behavior*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Money, J. (1980). *Love and sickness: The science of sex, gender difference, and pair-bonding*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Newton, M. (2000). *The encyclopedia of serial killers*. New York: Checkmark Books.
- Norris, J. (1990/1998). *Serial killers*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Penrose, V. (1970). *The Blood Countess: Atrocities of Erzebet Bathory*. London: Calder & Boyers.
- Philbin, T., & Philbin, M. (2009). *The killer book of serial killers: Incredible stories, facts, and trivia from the world of serial killers*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

- Quincey, V.L., Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., & Cormier, C.A. (2006) *Violent offenders. Appraising and managing risk*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Raine, A. (1985). A psychometric assessment of Hare's checklist for psychopathy on an English prison population. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 24, 247-258.
- Ressler, R., Burgess, A., & Douglass, J. (1988). *Sexual homicide*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Robertson, J., & Bowlby, J. (1952). Responses of young children to separation from their mothers. *Courr Centere International de l'Enfance*, 2, 131-142.
- Rule, A. (1980). *The stranger beside me*. New York: Norton.
- Rush, B. (1812/1835). *Medical inquiries and observations upon diseases of the mind* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Philadelphia: Grigg & Elliot.
- Russell, S. (2002). *Lethal intent*. New York: Kensington.
- Rutherford, A. (1993). *Criminal justice and the pursuit of decency*. Winchester, MA: Waterside Press.
- Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., & Sewell, K. W. (1996). Review and meta-analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist and Psychopathy Checklist-Revised: Predictive validity of dangerousness. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 3, 203-215.

- Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., & Sewell, K. W. (1997). Construct validity of psychopathy in a female offender sample: A multitrait–multimethod evaluation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 106*, 576–585.
- Salekin, R. T. (2002). Psychopathy and therapeutic pessimism: Clinical lore or clinical reality? *Clinical Psychology Review, 22*, 79–112.
- Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., Ustad, K., & Sewell, K. W. (1998). Psychopathy and recidivism among female inmates. *Law & Human Behavior, 22*, 109-128.
- Schechter, H. (2003). *The serial killer files*. New York: Ballantine.
- Schechter, H., & Everitt, D. (1997). *The A to Z encyclopedia of serial killers*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Singular, S. (2006). *Unholy messenger: The life and crimes of the BTK serial killer*. New York: Scribner.
- Seto, M., & Barbaree, H. (1999). Psychopathy, treatment behavior, and sex offender recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 1235–1248.
- Stone, M. (2000). Forensic psychology: Criminal personality profiling. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 12*, 32–37.
- Suedfeld, P., & Landon, P. B. (1978). Approaches to treatment. In R. D. Hare, & D. Schalling (Eds.), *Psychopathic behavior: Approaches to research*. New York: Wiley.

- Tyrer, P., & Sievewright, H. (1988). Studies of treatment outcomes. *Personality disorders: Diagnosis, management and course*. London: Wright.
- Vitale, J.E., & Newman, J.P. (2001). Using the psychopathy checklist-revised with female samples: Reliability, validity, and implications for clinical utility. *Clinical Psychology, 8*, 117-132.
- Vitale, J. E., Smith, S. S., Brinkley, C. A., & Newman, J. P. (2002). The reliability and validity of the psychopathy checklist—Revised in a sample of female offenders. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 29*, 202-231.
- Vronsky, P. (2007). *Female serial killers: How and why women became monsters*. New York: Berkley.
- Wahlund, K., & Kristiansson, M. (2009). Aggression, psychopathy, and brain imaging: Review and future recommendations. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 32*, 266-271.
- Weber, R.P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wilson, C. (1991). *The giant book of true crime*. London: Magpie Books.
- Wilson, C. (1994). *The history of murder*. Edison, NJ: Castle Books.
- Wong, S., & Hare, R.D. (2005). *Program guidelines for the institutional treatment of violent psychopaths*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Zagon, I. K., & Jackson, H. J. (1994). Construct validity of a psychopathic measure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 17*, 125-135

## VITA

CHASITY S. NORRIS

### Personal Data

Date of Birth: July 28, 1977  
Place of Birth: Johnson City, Tennessee  
Marital Status: Single

### Education

August 2008-August 2011  
M.A. Criminal Justice & Criminology  
East Tennessee State University

August 2010-May 2011  
Graduate Certificate in Epidemiology  
East Tennessee State University

August 2008-May 2010  
Graduate Certificate in Forensic Document Examination  
East Tennessee State University

Graduated Magna Cum Laude  
January 2006-May 2008  
B.S. Criminal Justice/Criminology  
East Tennessee State University

Graduated Magna Cum Laude  
June 2002-December 2004  
A.S. Medical Laboratory Technology  
Northeast State Community College

### Experience

Instructor  
January 2010-May 2010  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN  
*Crime Scene Investigation*  
Creating and delivering educational lectures  
Maintaining attendance records  
Proctoring and grading exams  
Creating, Instructing, and grading hands-on classroom activities relevant to lecture

Graduate Assistant  
August 2009-May 2010  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN.  
Assist the professor's in the department with their classroom activities  
Maintain attendance records for assigned professor's classes  
Proctoring and grading exams for assigned professor

Teaching Assistant  
August 2009-May 2010  
*Crime Scene Photography*  
*Criminal Justice Statistics*  
Assisting Professor with Lecture preparation/delivery as needed  
Proctoring and grading exams  
Maintaining attendance records

#### Awards

Andrea Wells Memorial Scholarship, East Tennessee State University, 2008

American Society of Clinical Pathology National Scholarship, Northeast State Community College, 2004

Phi Theta Kappa National Honor Society

Dean's List East Tennessee State University

Vice President's List Northeast State Community College

#### Publications

Ethics and Policing; *Instructors Manual, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*, 2009