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ABSTRACT
The main focus of this article is to conduct an exploratory investigation of self-compassion, a positive indicator of mental health, as a predictor of violence and criminality within a sample of prisoners. Correlation and regression analyses were used to explore the relationship that self-compassion has with self-control, self-esteem, and social connectedness. Associations between self-compassion and the subscales of self-control were also examined. Results from both correlational analysis and regression indicate that self-compassion is correlated with all 3 variables. Correlations revealed that self-compassion was related to all 6 subscales of self-control. Regression, however, revealed that impulsivity was the only predictor of self-compassion. Further analysis revealed problems with multicollinearity. Implications and limitations of these results are discussed.

The United States dominates the world in the number of people it incarcerates (Kurian, 1997; Liptak, 2008; Walmsley, 2011), with more than 2,266,800, as of 2010 (Glaze, 2011). Even if perpetrators of crime are arrested, convicted, and sent to prison, they usually return to society after they have served their sentences. Understanding the characteristics of criminals has an extensive utility for preparing effective corrective programs that help offenders integrate back into society. To achieve this goal, researchers have traditionally sought to identify traits associated with risk. In the process of identifying risk factors, social scientists have linked criminality to self-control (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), the ability to form social bonds (Sampson & Laub, 2009), and self-esteem (Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996; Oser, 2006; Toch, 1969/1993). In recent years, however, some researchers have focused on positive psychological states that improve risk outcomes (Woldgabreal, Day, & Ward, 2014). One possible construct that matches this criterion, called self-compassion, has been conceptualized as a positive indicator of mental health (K. Neff, 2003). Despite the scarcity of research investigating its relationship to criminality, the current literature indicates that self-compassion shows promise as a negative correlation of violent criminality.
Self-control, social connectedness, and self-esteem as predictors of criminality

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) theorized that criminality is characterized by a lack of self-control. Self-control refers “to the extent to which they (people) are vulnerable to the temptations of the moment” (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990, p. 87). Hirschi and Gottfredson (1995) stated that low self-control is characterized by six elements. These factors include a lack of future orientation, self-centeredness, proneness to anger, lack of diligence, an orientation toward physical activities as compared to mental activities, and a preference for risk taking (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1995). Although all of the aforementioned characteristics are, to a certain extent, related to the crime, the chief feature related to the crime is impulsivity, the extent to which someone can adequately evaluate consequences of his or her behavior (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990, p. 95).

To test Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) control theory, Grasmick, Title, Bursik, and Arneklev (1993) developed a 24-item scale, entitled the Grasmick Self-Control scale, to empirically test the self-control construct, utilizing principal component analysis. Their study confirmed self-control as a “unidimensional trait” (Grasmick et al., 1993 p. 23). They also investigated the extent to which “low self-control” predicts “fraud” and “force.” The self-control variable was measured by the 24-item Grasmick Self-Control scale. The results indicated that when controlling for gender, age, and race, the independent variables of low self-control, opportunity, and the product of low self-control and the opportunity to engage in crime predicted fraud.

The Meneses and Akers (2011) study conducted with U.S. college students indicated that the following components of the self-control variable predicted marijuana use: risk taking, physical activity, and simple tasks. As anticipated by the theory, risk taking and simple tasks were positively correlated to the commission of a crime. Unlike the prediction of the theory, physical activity was negatively correlated with marijuana use in the U.S. college population.

Other studies (Nagin & Paternoster, 1993; Netter, Hennig, Rohrmann, Wyhlidal, & Hain-Hermann, 1998) have focused on self-control’s association with anger and impulsivity. Specifically, these studies confirmed the negative correlation between self-control and aggression (Netter et al., 1998), lack of the ability to deter gratification (Nagin & Paternoster, 1993), and violent reoffending among violent criminals.

Sampson and Laub (1993) first appreciated social connectedness as a characteristic of criminality when they found a negative relationship between the ability to form social bonds and criminality. More precisely, Sampson and Laub described in a 35-year follow-up of Glueck and Glueck’s (1950) study that life circumstances, like marriage and employment, played a significant role in the desistance of crime. Following this study, other
researchers have found similar results (Horney, Osgood, & Marshall, 1995; Laub, Nagin, & Sampson, 1998). Moreover, the ability to form social connections has been demonstrated to reduce anger provoked by social rejection (Tweng et al., 2007). Finally, Taylor, Loney, Bobadilla, Iacono, and McGue (2003) found that antisocial personality traits are negatively correlated with social connectedness. Specifically, they found that the antisocial and social detached subscales of the Minnesota Temperament Inventory were positively associated in 508 boys aged 16 to 18 years old.

Morris, Gerber, and Menard (2011) compared the effectiveness of two different conceptualizations of self-control (SC), specifically self-control and social control/social bonding conceptualizations (SC/SB) in predicting offending. Whereas SC was measured utilizing the Grasmick Self-Control scale, the new measure, SC/SB, included the following measures of social bonds: “spouse or partner, children, friends, career, involvement in community activities, and religiosity” (Morris et al., 2011, p. 589) and the rating of the importance of these bonds. The results suggested that both SC and SC/SB were significantly related to the offending, although self-control produced slightly higher coefficients in most of the analyses compared to SC/SB.

In addition to self-control and social connectedness, research suggests that high self-esteem has a negative relationship with violent criminality (Anderson, 1994; Long, 1990; Oser, 2006; Toch, 1969/1993). Research supporting this relationship indicates that high self-esteem has a negative relationship with aggression (Murphy, Stosny, & Morrel, 2005) and the number of violent offenses committed by violent criminals (Oser, 2006). Researchers also have revealed that the construct of narcissism moderates the relationship between self-esteem and violent criminality (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Papps & O’Carroll, 1998; Sullivan & Geaslin, 2001). The studies suggested that individuals with high self-esteem and narcissism have a greater propensity toward violence compared to persons with low self-esteem or high self-esteem with low narcissism.

Self-compassion and its relationship to criminality

Self-compassion has been proposed as an alternative way to conceptualize healthy self-attitudes (K. Neff, 2003). According to Neff, self-compassion is comprised of three interrelated components, including self-kindness, mindfulness, and awareness of a common humanity. Research indicates that self-compassion has a negative relationship with anger (Neff & Vonk, 2009), and a positive relationship with self-esteem, concern for others, and social connectedness (Murphy et al., 2005; K. Neff, 2003; Stosny, 1995). Stosny (1995) described self-compassion as being “incompatible with antisocial behavior” (p. 82) and antagonistic to narcissism.
Even though there is a line of research that indicates the significance of self-compassion development for preventing the commission of crimes, studies are highly limited in this field. Self-compassion, as compared to self-esteem, was shown to be a stronger negative predictor of personal distress and shame, and a stronger positive predictor of social functioning in sex offenders (Lo, 2007). In addition to the aforementioned negative relationship between violent criminality and self-compassion, positive treatment effects were reported in interventions with self-compassion content with violent criminals. More specifically, treatment studies designed to increase self-compassion in violent criminals have been shown to decrease future violent behavior (Murphy et al., 2005; Stosny, 1995).

Another possible link to self-compassion and criminality relates to the mindfulness component of self-compassion. Mindfulness is the practice whereby people are nonjudgmentally and intentionally aware of their thoughts and actions in the present moment (Grossman et al., 2003; Neff, 2003). Because mindfulness involves an intentional awareness of thoughts and actions, it is believed that mindfulness involves self-control (Bowlin & Baer, 2012; Masicampo & Baumeister, 2007). Mindfulness is positively associated with the practice of meditation (Grossman, Niemann, Schmidt, & Walach, 2004). Likewise, K. Neff (2003) found that self-compassion scores correlate with years of training in meditation; the practice of meditation was shown to have reduced the rate of rearrest followed by conviction by 43% in a 15-year study at Folsom Prison (Rainforth, Alexander, & Cavanaugh, 2003).

Currently, research has not linked self-compassion to social connectedness and self-control among heterogeneous categories of criminals. Moreover, a very small amount of research investigated the connection between the self-compassion scale, social connectedness, and self-esteem among jail inmates.

The objective of this exploratory study is to investigate the relationship between compassion and these three criminogenic traits among a criminal population. One potential consideration of note that merits further investigation beyond this study is the disproportional incarceration rates of some minority groups, as well as persons of a lower socioeconomic status (SES; Gordon, Bindrim, McNicholas, & Walden, 1988; Kramer & Steffensmeir, 1993; Mitchell, 2005). Due to such overrepresentation, it is important to consider the influence of race and SES on the relationship that self-compassion has with self-control, self-esteem, and social connectedness. Evidence indicates that self-compassion provides neuronal changes to areas associated with these variables (Desbordes et al., 2012; Engström & Söderfeldt, 2010; Klimecki, Leiberg, Lamm, & Singe, 2012; Longe et al., 2010). Specifically, the effect of race and SES are correlated, and the relationships these variables display with crime are mediated by other variables such as exposure to violence (McNulty & Bellair, 2003; Neumayer, 2005). Research findings suggest that exposure to
violence leads to abnormalities in the prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and striatum (Hart & Rubia, 2012; McCrory, De Brito, & Viding, 2010; Yang & Raine, 2009), which are areas tied to impulse control, empathy, and goal formation. Exposure to violence can lead to the development of antisocial personality disorder, which is characterized as low self-control, impaired ability to form social bonds, and problematic self-esteem (American Psychiatric Association, 2000, 2013). Research has linked self-compassion to the same neurological structures (Desbordes et al., 2012; Engström & Söderfeldt, 2010; Klimecki et al., 2012; Longe et al., 2010). Because these variables are neurological, they should generalize across all groups.

**Methods**

**Participants**

Participants for this study included a convenience sample of 94 inmates, including 74 men and 20 women, between the ages 18 and 54 incarcerated at a county jail in a metropolitan area in the southwest United States. The group was composed of 47% White non-Hispanic, 19% White Hispanic, 19% African American, and 6% other (consisting of multiracial, Asian, and Native American). These demographics are similar to the demographics of other county jails in the metropolitan areas in the region (Watson et al., 2004).

**Procedure**

Prior to recruiting any participants, this study underwent a full institutional review board review. The researcher was assured by the manager of special programs at the jail that all participants were allowed to refuse participation in this study. A copy of each participant’s consent form was obtained. Participants were recruited through the special programs department at the jail. Researchers were given access to speak with inmates in their unit or prior to engagement in classes, and invite them to participate in this study. Interested participants were placed on a list and asked to report to rooms designed for education purposes. As indicated by the manager of special programs, several participants did not show up. The researchers provided written consent forms to the participants prior to providing any measures. Moreover, researchers allowed for participants to ask any questions concerning the study prior to completing any measures and instructed them that they could choose not to participate at any time. One participant chose not to participate after beginning the survey. This participant’s competed surveys were shredded immediately. Once written consents were signed and given to the researcher, the participants were presented a packet containing the instruments. The scales were presented in the following order: the demographics
form, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the self-control measure, the social connectedness measure, and finally the self-compassion measure. This study predicted that self-compassion would be correlated with all three variables.

**Measures**

A demographic form was included with the research measures. This demographic form asked questions about age, race, and ethnicity.

**Self-compassion scale**

The Self-Compassion scale is a 26-item self-report instrument scale that was developed by K. D. Neff (2003). It contains six subscales including three positive scales and three negative scales. The positive subscales include the following: Self-Kindness (e.g., I try to be loving toward myself when I’m feeling emotional pain), Common Humanity (e.g., When I’m down and out, I remind myself that there are lots of other people in the world feeling like I feel), and Mindfulness (e.g., When something upsets me, I try to keep my emotions in balance). Further, it contains the following three negative subscales: Self-Judgment (e.g., I’m disapproving and judgmental about my own flaws and inadequacies), Isolation (e.g., When I think about my inadequacies, it tends to make me feel more separate and cut off from the rest of the world), and Overidentification (e.g., When I’m feeling down, I tend to obsess and fixate on everything that’s wrong). Negative items (self-judgment, isolation, and overidentification) are reverse scored prior to completing the total mean. Validation studies (K. D. Neff, 2003) have demonstrated good internal consistency (.92) with subscales ranging from .75 to .81 and good test–retest reliability ranging from .80 to .88 across subscales. This scale also has been shown to predict social functioning among convicted sex offenders (Lo, 2007).

**Social connectedness revised**

Social Connectedness Revised is a scale developed by Lee and Robbins (1995) to measure the emotional closeness that individuals report between themselves and other people. The social connectedness scale consists of statements inversely related to social connectedness, such as “I feel so distant from others” and “I catch myself losing all sense of connectedness with society.” These statements are scored on a rating scale ranging from 1 (agree) to 6 (disagree). Higher scores reflect more social connectedness and belongingness. This scale was shown to have good internal reliability (.92; Lee & Robbins, 2001). This scale has been shown to predict criminal offending among female offenders (Taylor, Convery, & Barton, 2013).
**Self-control scale**

Grasmick et al.’s (1993) Self-Control scale has been the most widely used measure of self-control in the literature (Gibson, 2005). This scale was designed to measure the personality trait of self-control as defined by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), who described a lack of self-control as having six components. These six components include impulsivity (e.g., I often act on the spur of the moment without thinking), a preference for simple rather than complex tasks (e.g., I try to avoid projects I think are difficult), risk-seeking behavior (e.g., I test myself now and then by doing something risky), a preference for physical activities over cerebral activities (e.g., I like to get out and do things more than I like to read or contemplate ideas), self-centered orientation (e.g., I try to look after myself even if it means making things difficult for other people), and temper (e.g., I lose my temper pretty easy). This 24-item scale includes four items for each component. These items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (almost always). Seven of the items are reverse coded. Higher scores on this scale indicate a lower level of self-control; however, for clarification, we reversed the direction of measure. This scale was shown to have high reliability (.87) for incarcerated men (Gibson, 2005). Moreover, this scale has been shown to predict criminal offending (Grasmick et al., 1993) and reoffending (Nagin & Paternoster, 1993).

**Self-esteem scale**

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1979) was used to measure global self-esteem. This scale is the most frequently cited self-report measure of self-esteem (Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001). This self-report scale consists of 10 items that are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items include statements such as, “On the whole I am satisfied with myself,” and “I feel I do not have much to be proud of.” Items are scored and summed to compute a total self-esteem score, with lower scores reflecting low self-esteem and higher scores reflecting high self-esteem. According to research, convergent and discriminant validity have been found with self-ideal (.67), self-image (.83), and a psychiatrist’s rating (.56) (Rosenberg, 1979). This measure has been shown to have good construct validity among sampled prisoners (Boduszek, Shevlin, Mallett, Hyland, & O’Kane, 2012).

**Missing data**

All missing items were replaced with the participants’ subscale mean. If participants were missing more than half the subscale items, they were not scored for that measure. Moreover, if participants circled two adjacent scores on the same item, the items were averaged.
Results

Correlations were conducted to measure the relationship among the inmates’ self-compassion, self-esteem, self-control, and social connectedness scores; regression analyses were conducted to measure the extent to which the participants’ self-control, self-esteem, and social connectedness scores are independently associated with self-compassion. Table 1 lists the descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations, and Table 2 presents the correlation coefficients of the psychological variables. In most cases the observed pattern of associations was as predicted. Self-compassion displayed a significant positive relationship with self-esteem ($R = .48, p < .05$), social connectedness ($R = .29, p < .05$), and self-control ($R = .30, p < .05$). Self-esteem, additionally, appeared to be associated with self-control ($R = -.17, p < .05$) and social connectedness ($R = .18, p < .05$). Moreover, self-control was correlated with social connectedness ($R = .25, p < .05$).

In addition to Pearson’s correlation analysis, multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the extent to which participants’ self-compassion trait was associated with their self-control, self-esteem, and social connectedness. Table 3 describes the unstandardized and standardized coefficients of this regression model. Multiple regression model with all three predictors was revealed to be significant, $F(3.90) = 13, p < .05$, adjusted $R^2 = .28$. Both self-esteem, $T = 4.6, p < .05$, adjusted $R^2 = .23$; and social connectedness were significantly positively associated with self-compassion, $T = 1.81, p < .05$, adjusted $R^2 = .29$. Likewise, low self-control was a negative correlate of self-compassion, $T = -2.04, p < .05$, adjusted $R^2 = .28$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Variables.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Compassion scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Correlation Coefficients Among Psychological Variables.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-compassion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social connectedness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Regression Coefficients for Self-Compassion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unstandardized</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Conditional on a significant correlation between self-compassion and self-control scores, Pearson’s $R$ and multiple regression were conducted to see if there was an association between self-compassion scores and the subscales of self-control. Table 4 describes the correlation coefficients between self-control subscales and self-compassion. As with the previous study, Bonferroni’s correction was applied. Self-compassion displayed significant negative correlations with impulsivity ($R = -0.44$, $p < .05$), temper ($R = -0.48$, $p < .05$), risk-seeking ($R = -0.29$, $p < .05$), and self-centeredness ($R = -0.28$, $p < .05$). Neither simple task ($R = -0.2$, $p > .05$) nor physical activities ($R = -0.1$, $p > .05$) were revealed to be correlates of self-compassion.

The conditional multiple regression model revealed a significant regression model, $F(6,87)$, $p < .05$, adjusted $R^2 = .25$. Out of the subscales, only impulsivity was found to be a significant correlate of self-compassion, $T = 2.8$, $p < .05$. The Variance Factor Inflation (VIF) values suggest that multicollinearity is a likely factor for the change in significance, demonstrated by risk seeking (VIF = 1.64), self-centeredness (VIF = 1.56), and temper (VIF = 1.57) (O’brien, 2007). Sobel’s test was conducted, employing impulsivity as a potential mediator for the self-compassion and the other correlated subscales. Impulsivity was not a mediator for temper ($Z = -0.61$, $p > .05$), self-centeredness ($Z = -0.6$, $p > .05$), or risk seeking ($Z = -1.01$, $p > .05$).

**Discussion**

The goal of this study was to explore the association between self-compassion and various risk factors associated with criminality, including self-control, social connectedness, and self-esteem among incarcerated participants. Accordingly, these findings identify associations between self-compassion and all three predictors. Moreover, these findings provide evidence of convergent validity for the use of self-compassion to evaluate inmates on the grounds that participants’ self-compassion scores correlated with both self-esteem and social connectedness. Overall, the findings support our hypothesis that self-compassionate inmates tend to have more self-control, more social connectedness, and higher self-esteem.
In terms of the magnitude of these associations, the results indicate that self-compassion has a moderate correlation with self-control, social connectedness, and strong relationship with self-esteem (Cohen, 1988). Interestingly, these factors displayed only a small correlation with each other (Cohen, 1988). Although this is not a new finding when considering the association of self-compassion to self-esteem and social connectedness (Murphy et al., 2005; K. Neff, 2003; Stosny, 1995), the novelty that this study provides concerns the way these traits relate to population sampled. Previous studies mostly sampled from university students. This study focused on prisoners, providing evidence of convergent validity for the implementation of the self-compassion scale for this population.

Concerning self-control and the impulsivity subscale, these results confirm the hypotheses outlined earlier and tend to collaborate with other findings regarding the potential of self-compassion to reduce impulsivity by overcoming the unpleasantness of self-awareness (Adams & Leary, 2007; Heatherton & Baumeister, 1991; Webb & Forman, 2013). Specifically, Heatherton and Baumeister (1991) found that impulsivity stems from an unwillingness to be self-aware due to the unpleasantness of the experience of self-awareness. Evidence suggests that self-compassion empowers people to overcome this unpleasantness, thereby reducing impulsivity among college students with eating disorders (Adams & Leary, 2007; Webb & Forman, 2013). Although it is beyond the scope of this study to cross-validate these findings, the analysis confirms that self-compassion is negatively correlated to impulsivity. There is a distinct potentiality that this correlation involves the unpleasantness of self-awareness phenomena. Future studies will have to investigate the causal relationship of these variables.

In addition to impulsivity, this study found that self-compassion was negatively associated with risk taking, self-centeredness, and temper subscales. Self-compassionate people are more aware of their actions and are, therefore, likely to be more mindful of the long-term consequences of risky behavior. Such people tend to have a more balanced sense of self and other, which contradicts self-centered perspectives (Stosny, 1995). Self-compassion has also been shown to be negatively correlated with state anger (Neff & Vonk, 2009), a construct similar to the temper.

Overall, the results of these analyses imply that self-compassion is related to predictors of criminality among inmates. Although these findings are very preliminary, they demonstrate that self-compassion shows promise in criminological and forensic research. Future studies will need to investigate the link between self-compassion and criminality further. Considering the correlative strength found between self-compassion and the predictors of criminality, an obvious direction could evaluate the causal link between self-compassion and the criminogenic traits discussed in this study. Although previous studies have found that therapeutically targeted increases...
in self-compassion can increase self-esteem among perpetrators of domestic violence (Murphy et al., 2005), there has yet to be a study replicating this finding with other violent criminals. Likewise, evidence shows that increasing self-compassion magnifies social connectedness (Neff, Rude, & Kirkpatrick, 2007) and decreases impulsivity (Adams & Leary, 2007; Web & Forman, 2013) among noninmates, but there has yet to be a study cross-validating this finding among criminals. Considering also that this is the first study investigating the relationship of K. Neff’s (2003) self-compassion scale and Grasmick’s (1993) self-control scale, more research is required exploring the correlation between these scales, as well as the role they conjointly play in violence and criminality.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations that need to be addressed. First, these findings were based on self-reported information, indicating that they relate to the inmates’ self-perceptions. They should not be taken as an objective measurement of the different variables used in this study. Future studies should consider research methods other than surveys. Moreover, our sample was taken from a population of low- and medium-risk inmates who expressed an interest in meditation at the county jail. These sampling parameters potentially introduced a bias to the study’s findings. Furthermore, results might not be generalized to high-risk inmates or those not interested in meditation. This interest could bias our results. Future studies should attempt to replicate these findings with other types of offenders or offenders incarcerated for more serious crimes. Finally, our interpretation of the link between self-compassion and criminality among inmates is based on theoretical correlates of traits of crime. Future studies should investigate the more direct link between self-compassion and criminality.
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