Título artículo / Títol article:	**FFM description of the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy in men and women**

Autores / Autors	**Segarra, Pilar ; Poy Gil, Roser ; Moltó Brotons, Javier ; López Penadés, Raúl ; Esteller, Àngels**

Revista:	Psychological Assessment

Versión / Versió:	Postprint de l'autor

Cita bibliográfica / Cita bibliogràfica (ISO 690):	POY, Rosario, et al. FFM Description of the Triarchic Conceptualization of Psychopathy in Men and Women. Psychological Assessment (2014) vol. 26, n.1, 69-76

url Repositori UJI:	http://hdl.handle.net/10234/94770

#

FFM Description of the Triarchic Conceptualization of Psychopathy

in Men and Women

Rosario Poy, Pilar Segarra, Àngels Esteller, Raúl López, and Javier Moltó

Universitat Jaume I

Author Note

Rosario Poy, Pilar Segarra, Àngels Esteller, Raúl López, and Javier Moltó,

Department of Basic and Clinical Psychology, and Psychobiology, Universitat Jaume I.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rosario Poy or

Javier Moltó, Department of Basic and Clinical Psychology, and Psychobiology,

Universitat Jaume I, Avenida Sos Baynat s/n, 12071, Castellón, Spain. E-mail:

poy@uji.es / molto@uji.es

Abstract

This study examined differential associations between phenotypic domains of the Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy (boldness, meanness and disinhibition; Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger, 2009), as assessed by the TriPM, and the Five Factor Model (FFM) of normal personality, as indexed by the NEO PI-R, in 349 undergraduates (96 men). Distinctive patterns of correlations for psychopathy components did not differ significantly across gender, though relations between Meanness and Agreeableness were stronger for men than women. Our findings are largely consistent with the conceptualization of psychopathy in terms of FFM constructs and provide discriminant evidence in support of all three triarchic domains. Thus, *meanness* is marked by low Agreeableness and some degree of low Conscientiousness, whereas *disinhibition* is characterized both by low Conscientiousness and low Agreeableness along with high Neuroticism and Extraversion. Notably, the constellation of low Neuroticism, high Extraversion, and high Openness, with facets of low Agreeableness, supports the idea that *boldness* encompasses some adaptive features of psychological adjustment while depicting the interpersonal features of psychopathy.

Keywords: Triarchic Model of Psychopathy, Five Factor model (FFM), gender differences

FFM Description of the Triarchic Conceptualization of Psychopathy

in Men and Women

Psychopathy is a personality disorder characterized by a constellation of interpersonal and emotional features —including callousness, egocentricity, insincerity, and remorseless use of others— accompanied by a behaviorally deviant lifestyle. In terms of the Five Factor model of personality (FFM), psychopathy has been consistently described as the confluence of high interpersonal antagonism (or low agreeableness) and low conscientioussness/constraint, irrespective of the specific approach used to generate the personality profile of the psychopath —expert ratings, translation of psychopathy measures into FFM traits, or empirical relations (see Lynam & Derefinko, 2006, for a review)— and across psychopathy measures and samples (cf. Decuyper, De Pauw, De Fruyt, De Bolle, & De Clercq, 2009).

In contrast to the robust consistency of the description for overall psychopathy from structural models of personality, somewhat less consistent evidence emerges when examining the two-dimensional conceptualization of the construct in the most frequently used psychopathy measures —the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003), the Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (LSRP; Levenson, Kiehl, & Fitzpatrick, 1995), the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP-III; Williams, Paulhus, & Hare, 2007), and the Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised (PPI-R; Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005). Initial work seemingly supported that the core interpersonal/affective traits of psychopathy (Factor 1) and its behavioral and social deviance features (Factor 2) were commensurately related to low agreeableness but differed in that Factor 2 was more strongly related to low conscientiousness, as well as to high neuroticism (cf. Lynam & Derefinko, 2006; Lynam & Widiger, 2007). However, while confirming the excellent cross-measure convergence about the

personality description of the behavioral maladjustment component of psychopathy, subsequent studies have shown varying relations between Factor 1 measures and agreeableness and the other FFM dimensions (Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Seibert, Miller, Few, Zeichner, & Lynam, 2011). This weak convergence across instruments could be explained in terms of the differential emphasis they place on fearlessness/social dominance versus callousness/lack of empathy as indicators of psychopathy (cf. Gaughan, Miller, Pryor, & Lynam, 2009). Generally, Factor 1 of the PCL-R and its counterparts in self-report measures patterned after the PCL-R (SRP, LSRP) is basically defined in terms of very low agreeableness and somewhat low conscientiousness, and even low extraversion and openness (Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Gaughan, Miller, & Lynam, 2012; Miller, Watts, & Jones, 2011; Ross, Lutz, & Bailley, 2004; Seibert et al., 2011), and thus lacks content related to the positive psychological adjustment features of psychopathy (absence of nervousness, in particular; cf. Patrick, 2006, for categorization of Cleckley's [1976] diagnostic criteria for psychopathy). In contrast, the PPI-R fearless dominance factor (PPI-FD) is best described in terms of low neuroticism and agreeableness and high extraversion and openness (Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Ross, Benning, Patrick, Thompson, & Thurston, 2009; Seibert et al., 2001), lacking indicators of the emotional-interpersonal deficits of psychopathy (e.g., untruthfulness, incapacity for love; cf. Patrick, 2006).

These divergent, but meaningful, configurations of basic personality traits for different Factor 1 measures highlight the need to consider the positive psychological adjustment and the emotional-interpersonal deficits separately in the understanding of psychopathy, in addition to chronic behavioral deviance (see Hall, Benning, & Patrick, 2004, for example, regarding criterion-related evidence for the three-factor model of the PCL-R). The Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy (Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger,

2009) integrates these three prominent components, defining psychopathy in terms of the distinctive phenotypic domains of disinhibition, boldness and meanness. *Disinhibition* describes a propensity toward impulse control problems that entails nonplanfulness, irresponsibility, oppositionality, impaired regulation of emotions and urges, and deficient behavioral restraint; *boldness* encompasses high social efficacy, emotional resiliency, low stress reactivity and venturesomeness; and *meanness* captures deficient empathy, callousness, lack of close attachments with others, exploitativeness, empowerment through cruelty, and excitement seeking (Patrick et al., 2009).

Four recent studies using the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM; Patrick, 2010b) —a self-report measure developed to index the three triarchic domains— have demonstrated expected convergent and discriminant associations of disinhibition, boldness and meanness with conceptually relevant personality criteria (including other psychopathy measures) in mixed-gender incarcerated and nonincarcerated samples (Marion, Sellbom, Salekin, Toomey, Kucharski, & Duncan, 2013; Sellbom & Phillips, 2013; Stanley, Wygant, & Sellbom, 2013; Strickland, Drislane, Lucy, Krueger, & Patrick, 2013). The disinhibition and meanness domains capture unique variance in psychopathy measures, particularly in subscales reflecting impulsivity and social deviance (the former) and coldheartedness, egocentricity and machiavellianism (the latter), while the boldness domain is primarily present in the PPI-FD assessment (Sellbom & Phillips, 2013) —highly consistent with disinhibition, meanness and boldness as unique predictors, respectively, of the lifestyle, affective and interpersonal facets of PCL-R (Patrick, 2010a). Also consistent with expectations, disinhibition is related to both low Conscientiousness and Agreeableness and high Neuroticism, meanness is related to low Agreeableness and, at a lesser extent, to low Conscientioussness and Openness, and boldness is related to high Extraversion and low

Neuroticism (Stanley et al., 2013). The unexpected lack of association between agreeableness/antagonism and boldness, however, could bring the centrality of this domain to psychopathy into question —in the same way that the PPI-FD's lack of relation to the more maladaptive indicators of psychopathy has led to the current debate about the role of these traits in the assessment and conceptualization of the disorder (cf. Marcus, Fulton, & Edens, 2013; Miller & Lynam, 2012).

In line with previous research using general models of personality functioning to understand the nature of psychopathy and to identify its core components (see Lynam & Derefinko, 2006; Lynam & Widiger, 2007), the current study aimed to extend evidence regarding the Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy (Patrick et al., 2009) by examining for the first time the three phenotypic domains of boldness, meanness and disinhibition as indexed by the TriPM within the framework of the FFM of normal personality at both the domain and facet levels, in a mixed-gender undergraduate sample. Based on the theoretical description of the triarchic domains, and previous findings for psychopathy components in relation to FFM domains and facets, specific hypotheses for each TriPM scale were formulated. We hypothesized that TriPM Boldness would be related to high Extraversion and Openness and to low Neuroticism and Agreeableness. At the facet level, TriPM Boldness was expected to be related to high levels of all facets of Extraversion, the Openness facets of Aesthetics, Actions, and Ideas, and the Competence facet of Conscientiousness, as well as to low levels of all facets of Neuroticism (except Impulsiveness), and the Straightforwardness, Compliance and Modesty facets of Agreeableness (cf. Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Ross et al., 2009). TriPM Meanness was hypothesized to be essentially related to very low levels of Agreeableness and to low Conscientiousness. We also expected that TriPM Meanness would be related to low levels of all facets of Agreeableness and most facets of

Conscientiousness (specifically, Dutifulness, Self-Discipline, and Deliberation), as well as to low Warmth and Positive Emotions but high Excitement-Seeking facets of Extraversion, and to low Anxiety but high Angry Hostility facets of Neuroticism (cf. Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Gaughan et al., 2012; Ross et al., 2004). Finally, we hypothesized that TriPM Disinhibition would be related to both low Conscientiousness and Agreeableness and to high Neuroticism, with consistent relationships across all facets of these domains. We also expected that TriPM Disinhibition would show the same relations to facets of Extraversion as those predicted for TriPM Meanness (cf. Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Gaughan et al., 2012; Ross et al., 2004, 2009). Furthermore, as each TriPM scale captures a distinctive component central to the psychopathy construct (Patrick, 2010a), we hypothesized that all three triarchic scores would be related to the expert-based FFM psychopathy prototype (Miller, Lynam, Widiger, & Leukefeld, 2001) —an index of overall psychopathy. In view of previous research (cf. Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Miller et al., 2011), we did not predict gender differences in the FFM description of the Triarchic domains. Nonetheless, correlations between TriPM scales and the FFM domains and facets were examined separately in men and women, in order to determine whether convergence and divergence of personality correlates in the triarchic model of psychopathy differ depending on gender.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study were 349 undergraduates (253 women, 96 men) from Universitat Jaume I (Castellón de la Plana, Spain), administered the TriPM and NEO PI-R inventories anonymously. All participants provided informed consent and received academic credit for their participation.

Materials

Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM). The TriPM (Patrick, 2010b) is a 58-item self-report measure of the three phenotypic domains of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition proposed in the Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy (Patrick et al., 2009). Items are answered using a four-point Likert scale: *true, somewhat true, somewhat false, false*. The Spanish translation of the TriPM was performed with the participation of several independent translators and a back-translation (cf. Hambleton & Patsula, 1998). In the current sample, α coefficients for Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition scores were .82, .85, and .84, respectively, being highly similar to those found in a large sample of North American college students (cf. Sellbom & Phillips, 2013; see also Stanley et al., 2013, for comparable data in a criminal sample). The corresponding mean inter-item correlations were .20, .26, and .16. Intercorrelations between scores on the three scales were .03 (p = .62) for Boldness with Disinhibition, .20 (p < .0002) for Boldness with Meanness, and .62 (p < .0001) for Meanness with Disinhibition. The moderate-level correlation between Meanness and Disinhibition scores reflects the fact that items comprising these scales come from a hierarchical inventory of externalizing tendencies (Krueger, Markon, Patrick, Benning, & Kramer, 2007; see also Venables & Patrick, 2012) whose constituent subscales are interrelated, and it is in the range reported for North American community (cf. Strickland et al., 2013) and incarcerated samples (cf. Stanley et al., 2013).

Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R). The NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Spanish version, Costa & McCrae, 1999) is a 240-item self-report measure that provides score for the five FFM domains of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to

Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, along with six facets within each domain. Items are answered on a five-point Likert scale from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. In the current study, α coefficients for domain scores ranged from .85 (Openness) to .93 (Conscientiousness); α coefficients for facet scores ranged from .49 (Values facet of Openness) to .84 (Depression facet of Neuroticism).

NEO PI-R Psychopathy Resemblance Index (PRI). The PRI (Miller et al., 2001) is an intraclass Q-correlation that reflects the degree of similarity between an individual's NEO PI-R profile and the expert-generated FFM description of the prototypic male and female psychopaths in terms of the 30 facets of the NEO PI-R. It ranges from -1 to 1, with higher scores indicating greater resemblance, and it can be used as an index of psychopathy (cf. Miller et al., 2001). To obtain the Q-correlation, participants' scores on each facet of the NEO PI-R were recomputed by averaging the items making up that facet so as to get individual scores on the same metric as any facet in the prototype (ranging from 1 to 5). In the current sample, scores on the PRI ranged from -.81 to .41 (*M* = -0.27; *SD* = .23).

Results

Mean Gender Differences in Psychopathy Dimensions and FFM Domains

Men scored higher than women in TriPM Boldness (31.57 vs. 27.00), Meanness (16.20 vs. 9.29) and Disinhibition (19.56 vs. 14.78), *t*s(347) = 4.63, 8.19 and 4.79, respectively, *p*s < .0001, as well as in the NEO PI-R Psychopathy Resemblance Index (-0.11 vs. -0.33), *t*(347) = 9.01, *p* < .0001. As regards dimensions of the FFM as indexed by the NEO PI-R, women obtained higher scores than men in Neuroticism (93.55 vs. 85.07; *t*(347) = 3.04, *p* < .003), Agreeableness (124.66 vs. 112.88; *t*(347) = 5.34, *p* <

.0001) and Conscientiousness (116.29 vs. 107.99, $t(347) = 2.87$, $p < .005$). There were

no significant differences between men and women in Extraversion (119.84 vs. 116.55;

$p = .18$) and Openness (119.72 vs. 118.08; $t < |1|$).

Relations Between Psychopathy Dimensions and FFM Domains and Facets

Bivariate correlations between scales in the TriPM and the FFM domains and

facets in the NEO PI-R for men and women are presented in Table 1.

Boldness score correlations with NEO PI-R.

For Boldness, as expected, both men and women's scores were significantly

positively related to Extraversion (E) and Openness (O), and negatively to Neuroticism

(N). Both men and women's Boldness scores were primarily positively related to all

facets of E (with only the relation to Gregariousness not reaching significance for men)

and O (being non significant the relations to Values for women, and to Fantasy and

Aesthetics for men), and significantly negatively related to all but one of the facets of

the N domain (Impulsiveness).

At the domain level, Boldness scores were negatively related to Agreeableness

(A) and unexpectedly positively related to Concientiousness (C), at comparable modest

levels for women and men, although only correlations for the larger female sample

reached significance (both ps < .05). At the facet level, consistent with hypotheses, both

men and women's Boldness scores were significantly negatively related to the

Straightforwardness and Modesty facets of A, and positively related to the Competence

facet of C.

No differences between the correlations for men and women were found for the

Boldness scale.

Meanness score correlations with NEO PI-R.

For Meanness, both men and women's scores were significantly negatively related to A and C; the relation between Meanness and A was stronger for men than women (z = 3.28, p < .001). As hypothesized, Meanness scores were negatively related to all facets of the A and C domains —with only the Order and Deliberation facets of C failing to show a significant correlation for men. Again, the relation between Meanness and the Trust facet of A was stronger for men than women (z = 3.97, p < .0001).

Meanness scores showed an unexpected weak positive association with N, with only the relationship for women reaching significance. Both men and women's Meanness scores were significantly positively related to the Angry Hostility facet of N, as predicted; positive correlations with the Impulsiveness and Vulnerability facets of N also reached significance for women. None of the correlations between Meanness and N scores was significantly different across gender.

Meanness scores were also significantly negatively related to E and O for men but not women; the relation between Meanness and E was significantly different across gender (z = 3.35, p < .0009). Men's Meanness scores were primarily negatively related to most facets of E (with the negative correlations for Warmth, Gregariousness and Positive Emotions being significant, partially confirming hypotheses) and O (with the negative correlations for Feelings and Values being significant). The correlation between Meanness and the Feelings facet of O was significantly different across gender (z = 3.68, p < .0003). In contrast, women's Meanness scores were unrelated to most facets of E and O, with only three of the correlations reaching significance: Meanness was significantly negatively related to the Warmth and positively related to the

Excitement-Seeking facets of E, as predicted, as well as positively related to the Fantasy facet of O.

Disinhibition score correlations with NEO PI-R.

For Disinhibition, as hypothesized, both men and women's scores were significantly negatively related to C and A and positively related to N. Both men and women's Disinhibition scores were significantly negatively related to all facets of C — with the relations to Order and Achievement Striving not reaching significance for men— and to most facets of A —Trust, Straightforwardness, Altruism and Compliance (and also the Modesty facet for women). Disinhibition scores were also significantly positively related to all facets of the N domain for women, and to all but Anxiety and Self-Consciousness for men.

Both men and women's Disinhibition scores were unrelated to E and O. Men's Disinhibition scores were unrelated to most facets of these domains, with only the Warmth facet of E (as expected) and the Values facet of O demonstrating weak significant negative relations (both ps < .05). Women's Disinhibition scores were unrelated to most facets of O —with only Fantasy showing a weak significant positive relation— and weakly related to some of the facets of E in the expected direction: Warmth, Gregariousness, and Positive Emotions showed significant negative relations whereas Excitement-Seeking showed a significant positive relation.

No differences between the correlations for men and women were found for the Disinhibition scale.

Prediction of TriPM scores from the NEO PI-R domains.

In order to determine the unique contributions of the five NEO PI-R domains to the three psychopathy dimensions, as well as to explore possible gender differences, three hierarchical linear regression models were computed with either Boldness, Meanness or Disinhibition scores as the criterion. In all models, scores on the five domains and gender (men = 1, women = 2) were entered as predictors at Step 1, and the five Gender x Domain interactions were entered at Step 2. A significant increase in R^2 on the second step would indicate gender differences in the relation between the criterion and NEO PI-R scores (cf. Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Ross et al., 2004). The FFM domains significantly predicted Boldness (Adj. R^2 = .67, p < .0001), Meanness (Adj. R^2 = .44, p < .0001) and Disinhibition (Adj. R^2 = .53, p < .0001); gender was a significant predictor of Meanness and Disinhibition (βs = -.238 and -.156, respectively, both ps < .0001; Boldness, p = .29). The increase in R^2 on the second step of the model was significant for Meanness ($R^2\Delta$ = .036, p < .001), suggesting that the association between the FFM and this component of psychopathy differed across gender. No significant increases in R^2 on the second step were found for Boldness ($R^2\Delta$ = .003, p = .68) and Disinhibition ($R^2\Delta$ = .010, p = .18).

Gender effects in the FFM prediction of psychopathy dimensions were then followed up by conducting multiple linear regressions on Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition scores for men and women separately, with scores on the five domains as predictors (see Table 2). For both men and women, Boldness was significantly predicted by N(-), E(+), A(-), and O(+), consistent with the bivariate correlations reported in Table 1; predictive power for each equation was commensurate across gender (Adj. R^2s = .66 and .65, respectively, ps < .0001; *Fisher r-to-z* = 0.14, p = .89). In contrast, prediction of Meanness differed depending on gender: for men, Meanness was strongly predicted uniquely by A(-) —accounting for 54% of the variance—,

whereas for women, Meanness was moderately predicted by both A(-) and C(-) —

accounting only for 28% of the variance (*Fisher r-to-z* = 2.61, *p* < .01). Finally, for both

men and women, Disinhibition was significantly predicted by C(-), A(-), N(+), and

E(+); somehow consistent with the tendency toward stronger bivariate correlations

between Disinhibition and C for women (see Table 1), predictive power was slightly

higher for women than men (Adj. R^2 = .57 vs. .34, *p*s < .0001; *Fisher r-to-z* = 2.42, *p* <

.02).

Correlations and prediction of the NEO PI-R Psychopathy Resemblance Index from the TriPM scores.

Men and women's Boldness, Meanness and Disinhibition scores were

significantly positively related to the Miller et al.'s (2001) facet-level NEO PI-R PRI

(see Table 1), as theoretically expected. The unique associations of the three TriPM

scores with the expert-based FFM psychopathy prototype were then explored for each

gender separately through multiple regression analyses on the PRI, with scores on

Boldness, Meanness and Disinhibition as predictors. For both men and women, all three

TriPM dimensions contributed uniquely to the prediction of the PRI (Boldness, βs =

.629 and .539, *p*s < .0001, respectively; Meanness, β = .293, *p* < .001, and β = .154, *p* <

.01, respectively; and Disinhibition, β = .195, *p* < .03, and β = .331, *p* < .0001,

respectively), accounting for a similar proportion of variance across gender (Adj. R^2s =

.57 and .50, respectively, *p*s < .0001; *Fisher r-to-z* = 0.83, *p* = .41).

Discussion

In this study, the three phenotypic domains of the Triarchic conceptualization of

psychopathy (boldness, meanness and disinhibition), as operationalized by the Triarchic

Psychopathy Measure (TriPM), were found to represent distinctive configurations of normal personality traits across gender in a manner consistent with conceptual expectations. Further, each of the triarchic domains captured unique variance in the Miller et al.'s (2001) facet-level FFM description of psychopathy, which especially provides evidence for the importance of boldness features in a full account of psychopathy as represented in FFM terms. Our results (1) extend evidence and clarify previous controversies on the conceptualization of psychopathy components in terms of FFM constructs, (2) corroborate that psychopathy components manifest similarly across gender with relation to basic traits of normal personality, and (3) support the validity of the TriPM assessment of the triarchic domains in general populations, aside from culturally broadening the empirical findings on the Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy.

Triarchic Conceptualization of Psychopathy and the FFM

The pattern of associations obtained in the current study, the first to examine relations between TriPM scales and FFM at both the domain and facet levels, was greatly consistent with conceptual and empirical descriptions of the constructs of boldness, meanness and disinhibition (cf. Patrick et al., 2009, Sellbom & Phillips, 2013; Stanley et al., 2013). The *disinhibition domain* scores were found to be strongly marked by low Conscientiousness, low Agreeableness and high Neuroticism, as well as by high Excitement-Seeking but low Warmth from Extraversion. These results parallel previous empirical FFM descriptions of the externalizing component of psychopathy in terms of low constraint, high interpersonal antagonism, high emotional instability and maladjustment and even internalizing vulnerability (Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Gaughan et al., 2009; Hall et al., 2004; Ross et al., 2004, 2009). Interestingly,

Disinhibition scores were not related in a different manner to either of the FFM domains depending on gender, contrary to evidence showing stronger positive correlations between Openness and traits related to externalizing (SRP-III erratic lifestyle and antisocial behavior) for women than men (cf. Miller et al., 2011).

The *meanness domain* scores primarily consisted of very low Agreeableness (to a greater degree in men) and moderately low Conscientiousness, closely resembling empirical descriptions of the selfish, manipulative and callous/unemotional component of psychopathy in terms of the FFM as substantially antagonistic and coldhearted (Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Gaughan et al., 2009; Hall et al., 2004; Miller et al., 2011; Ross et al., 2004, 2009; Seibert et al., 2011). Besides very low scores across all facets of Agreeableness, Meanness also consisted of low interpersonal connectedness (low Warmth from Extraversion), which, in men, was accompanied by lack of affiliation (low Gregariousness and Positive Emotions from Extraversion) and blunted affect and dogmatism (low Openness to Felings and Openness to Values). Overall, the constellation of traits delineating the meanness domain is notably consistent with Cleckley's (1976) conceptualization of the core features of psychopathy (e.g., general poverty in major affective reactions, pathologic egocentricity and incapacity for love, unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations, untruthfulness) and with the unique relation between Meanness scores and the PCL-R affective facet (Patrick, 2010a). Finally, consistent with poor behavioral inhibition or low constraint, Meanness was related to high interpersonal risk taking in women (Excitement-Seeking from Extraversion) and to high Angry Hostility (and high Impulsiveness in women) while being basically unrelated to other Neuroticism facets assessing anxiousness (Anxiety and Self-Consciousness).

Differentiation between meanness and disinhibition domains of psychopathy just involved the exclusion/inclusion of general distress and emotional lability in addition to the relative weighting of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness —the former is characterized by stronger relations to Agreeableness (as well as low Extraversion and Openness in men) whereas the latter is characterized by stronger relations to Conscientioussness with high levels of Neuroticism. On the other hand, similarities between Meannes and Disinhibition in terms of the FFM domains and facets were not particularly surprising given the robust correlation found between them, which in turn bears consistence with notions that relate high levels of externalizing behaviors to the coldheartedness and interpersonal antagonism believed to be the essential components of psychopathy (cf. Miller & Lynam, 2012; Seibert et al., 2011).

The *boldness domain* scores provided instead a fairly direct assessment, irrespective of gender, of low Neuroticism and Agreeableness (especially, on facets such as Straightforwardness and Modesty) and high Extraversion and Openness, along with high Competence from Conscientiousness. At the domain level, these results are highly consistent with previous evidence that describes the fearlessness and social dominance features of psychopathy (primarily present in PPI-FD scores) in very low negative emotionality, high sociability and agency and high openness to novel experiences (cf. Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Gaughan et al., 2009; Hall et al., 2004; Ross et al., 2009), or stable extraversion (Miller & Lynam, 2012). At the facet level, interestingly, the boldness domain was more richly represented by including manipulative and arrogant tendencies from Agreeableness, in line with Boldness' prediction of narcissistic personality traits (Sellbom & Phillips, 2013) and with its unique relation to manipulativeness traits in the antagonism domain (Strickland et al., 2013). Combined with lack of social anxiety (i.e., low Self-Consciousness from

Neuroticism), this picture fits the theoretical translation of the arrogant and deceitful interpersonal style of the psychopath as assessed by PCL-R (glibness/superficial charm, grandiose sense of self-worth, pathological lying, conning/manipulative) into the facets of the FFM (cf. Widiger & Lynam, 1998). It is also consistent with the unique association between Boldness and the PCL-R interpersonal facet (Patrick, 2010a). Finally, taking into account that higher scores on conscientioussness traits primarily distinguish successful from criminal psychopaths (cf. Mullins-Sweatt, Glover, Derefinko, Miller, & Widiger, 2010), Boldness' association with high self-confidence in our study seems to support the role of the more adaptive features of psychopathy in defining important subtypes of psychopaths (cf. Lilienfeld, Patrick, Benning, Berg, Sellbom, & Edens, 2012; Lynam & Miller, 2012). Differentiation between Boldness and Meanness referred to social efficacy and emotional resiliency vs. lack of interpersonal and social connectedness, as expected, thus confirming that the positive psychological adjustment and the emotional impoverishment features of psychopathy can be reliably indexed as distinctive constructs (cf. Patrick, 2010a; Patrick et al., 2009; Sellbom & Phillips, 2013; Stanley et al., 2013).

In sum, the current findings support fairly good divergence between triarchic domains in relation to FFM description of psychopathy in noninstitutionalized individuals, consonant with a recent study on the construct validity of the TriPM scale scores in an incarcerated sample (cf. Stanley et al., 2013). Triarchic components were significantly represented at the domain level of normal personality —in our study, FFM domains accounted for 67%, 53% and 44% of the variance in Boldness, Disinhibition and Meanness, respectively—, but it is relevant to note that examination of relationships at the facet level provided a more precise description and a clearer insight into the convergent and discriminant correlates of specific components of psychopathy in the

Triarchic conceptualization. Convergence among all three triarchic domains was reflected primarily in low Agreeableness (specifically, on the lower-level traits of Straightforwardness, Modesty and Compliance), greatly consistent with high interpersonal antagonism as the most robust descriptor of psychopathy across methods (cf. Decuyper et al., 2009; Gaughan et al., 2009; Lynam & Derefinko, 2006; see also Strickland et al., 2013). Secondarily, thriarchic domains converged in high Excitement-Seeking (Extraversion) for women, thus replicating prior evidence in a female correctional sample (Sellbom & Phillips, 2013), and in line with the presence of common behavioral activation across all components of psychopathy (cf. Ross, Moltó, Poy, Segarra, Pastor, & Montañés, 2007).

Gender Differences in the FFM Description of Triarchic Domains

Overall, triarchic domains of psychopathy reflected the same underlying constellation of normal personality features in men and women, replicating previous evidence using self-report measures of psychopathy other than TriPM (cf. Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Gaughan et al., 2009; Miller et al., 2011). The only notable differences as a function of gender were found for the Meanness scale, whose scores were more highly related to low Agreeableness in men than in women —paralleling Ross et al.'s (2004) results in regard to LSRP primary psychopathy—, as well as associated to low Extraversion and Openness to Feelings only in men. Further, Agreeableness contributed uniquely to Meanness' prediction in men, with Conscientiousness being also a significant predictor in women. Our findings seem to reflect a higher antagonism and a lower interpersonal and social connectedness (marked by cynicism and suspiciousness) in the manifestation of meanness in men, and an additional contribution of low constraint in the manifestation of this callous/aggressiveness component in women —

consonant with Miller et al.'s (2001) correlations between deficient behavioral constraint and overall psychopathy. Aside from these instances, our data generally provide little support for the existence of psychopathy differences as a function of gender in relation to the FFM.

Implications

This study supports, and culturally broadens, the proposal that triarchic domains are assessing three distinctive categories of traits in the psychopathic personality (cf. Patrick, 2006; Patrick et al., 2009): externalizing tendencies (disinhibition), unemotionality traits (meanness), and a dominant interpersonal style (boldness). In line with recent empirical parsings of psychopathy in three separate factors (cf. Gaughan et al., 2009; Patrick, Hicks, Nichols, & Krueger, 2007; Seibert et al., 2011; Sellbom & Phillips, 2013), our results extend evidence about the utility of the triarchic model in organizing empirical evidence about psychopathy from differing conceptualizations and measures (cf. Stanley et al., 2013). The TriPM separate assessment of boldness and meanness domains could be particularly relevant to this purpose, given the controversial results about Factor 1 of psychopathy that come from basic disagreements about its operationalization (cf. Derefinko & Lynam, 2006; Gaughan et al., 2009; Seibert et al., 2011). Besides advantages for assessment, decomposing psychopathy into triarchic domains may also provide important insights for advancing in the identification of different etiological mechanisms for distinctive psychopathy components (cf. Patrick et al., 2009).

The FFM description of the triarchic domains has also potential benefits for clarifying complex relations between overall psychopathy and important constructs from its nomological network, such as anxiety —associated in our study with both

boldness and disinhibition, but in opposite directions— and externalizing behaviors —
linked particularly with low agreeableness in basic research in personality (cf. Miller,
Lynam, & Jones, 2008) but also with psychopathy-related personality configurations
including high extraversion and openness (cf. Seibert et al., 2011), as it is boldness in
our study. Therefore, the question about whether boldness features represent a different
pathway to maladaptive behavior or a protective factor in regards to social deviance —
as suggested by the lack of association between boldness and disinhibition in the current
study (see also Patrick et al., 2007)— is still in need of further empirical clarification.

Limitations and Future Directions

One of the main limitations to the current study was the reliance on self-report
measures, which could artificially have inflated effect size magnitudes because of
mono-method bias. An additional limitation refers to the use of a homogeneous
undergraduate sample that might have resulted in a restricted range of traits, which
could have attenuated the current effect sizes. Though the pattern of results is largely
consistent with recent data in incarcerated individuals (cf. Stanley et al., 2013), it would
be beneficial to test for the generalizability of our findings across age, economical
status, educational level and criminal background. Accordingly, it will be valuable to
incorporate alternative operationalizations of the triarchic constructs other than the
TriPM scales —e.g., based on items from trait-oriented psychopathy inventories such as
the PPI-R or the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment (EPA; Lynam, Gaughan, Miller,
Miller, Mullins-Sweatt, & Widiger, 2011). Further research should also examine
triarchic domains in relation to relevant external correlates (externalizing behaviors,
laboratory deficits) in order to gain knowledge about the conceptualization of the

distinctive phenotypic components of psychopathy, as well as of complex interactions among them that may lead to different manifestations of this personality disorder.

References

Cleckley, H. (1976). *The mask of sanity* (5th. ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Professional manual: Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI)*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1999). *Inventario de personalidad NEO revisado (NEO PI-R) e Inventario NEO reducido de Cinco Factores (NEO-FFI). Manual profesional*. Madrid: TEA Ediciones.

Decuyper, M., De Pauw, S., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., & De Clercq, B. J. (2009). A meta-analysis of psychopathy-, antisocial PD- and FFM associations. *European Journal of Personality*, *23*, 531-565.

Derefinko, K. J., & Lynam, D. R. (2006). Convergence and divergence among self-report psychopathy measures: A personality-based approach. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *20*, 261-280.

Gaughan, E. T., Miller, J. D., Pryor, L. R., & Lynam, D. R. (2009). Comparing two alternative measures of general personality in the assessment of psychopathy: A test of the NEO PI-R and the MPQ. *Journal of Personality*, *77*, 965-996.

Gaughan, E. T., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2012). Examining the utility of general models of personality in the study of psychopathy: A comparison of the HEXACO-PI-R and the NEO PI-R. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *26*, 513-523.

Hall, J., Benning, S. D., & Patrick, C. J. (2004). Criterion-related validity of the three-factor model of psychopathy: Personality, behavior, and adaptive functioning. *Assessment*, *11*, 4-16.

Hambleton, R. K., & Patsula, L. (1998). Adapting tests for use in multiple languages and cultures. *Social Indicators Research*, *45*, 153-171.

Hare, R. D. (2003). *Hare Psychopathy Checklist Revised* (2nd edition). Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., Patrick, C. J., Benning, S. D., & Kramer, M. D. (2007). Linking antisocial behavior, substance use, and personality: An integrative quantitative model of the adult externalizing spectrum. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *116*, 645–666.

Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 151-158.

Lilienfeld, S. O., Patrick, C. J., Benning, S. D., Berg, J., Sellbom, M., & Edens, J. F. (2012). The role of fearless dominance in psychopathy: Confusions, controversies, and clarifications. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *3*, 327-340.

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Widows, M. R. (2005). *Professional manual for the Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised: (PPI-R)*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Lynam, D. R., & Derefinko, K. J. (2006). Psychopathy and personality. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 133-155). New York: Guilford.

Lynam, D. R., Gaughan, E. T., Miller, J. D., Miller, D. J., Mullins-Sweatt, S., & Widiger, T. A. (2011). Assessing the basic traits associated with psychopathy: Development and validation of the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, *23*, 108–124.

Lynam, D. R., & Widiger, T. A. (2007). Using a general model of personality to identify the basic elements of psychopathy. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *21*, 160-178.

Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J.D. (2012). Fearless dominance and psychopathy: A response to Lilienfeld et al. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *3*, 341-353.

Marcus, D. K., Fulton, J. J., & Edens, J. F. (2013). The two-factor model of psychopathic personality: Evidence from the Psychopathic Personality In- ventory. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *4*, 67-76.

Marion, B. E., Sellbom, M., Salekin, R. T., Toomey, J. A., Kucharski, L. T., & Duncan, S. (2013). An examination of the association between psychopathy and dissimulation using the MMPI-2-RF validity scales. *Law and Human Behavior*, *37*, 219-230.

Miller, J.D., & Lynam, D. R. (2012). An examination of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory's nomological network: A meta-analytic review. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *3*, 305-326.

Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., & Jones, S. (2008). Externalizing behavior through the lens of the Five-Factor Model: A focus on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *90*, 158-64.

Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., Widiger, T., & Leukefeld, C. (2001). Personality disorders as extreme variants of common personality dimensions: Can the Five Factor Model adequately represent psychopathy? *Journal of Personality*, *69*, 253-276.

Miller, J. D., Watts, A., & Jones, S. E. (2011). Does psychopathy manifest divergent relationships with components of its nomological network depending on gender? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *20*, 564-569.

Mullins-Sweatt, S. N., Glover, N. G., Derefinko, K. J., Miller, J. D., & Widiger, T. A. (2010). The search for the successful psychopath. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*, 554-558.

Patrick, C. J. (2006). Back to the future. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 605-617). New York: Guilford.

Patrick, C. J. (2010a). *Operationalizing the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Preliminary description of brief scales for assessment of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition*. Unpublished manual, Department of Psychology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL. Retrieved from http://www.phenxtoolkit.org

Patrick, C. J. (2010b). *Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM)*. PhenX Toolkit Online Assessment Catalog. Retrieved from https://www.phenxtoolkit.org/index.php?pageLink=browse.protocoldetails&id=121601

Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Development and Psychopathology*, *21*, 913-938.

Patrick, C. J., Hicks, B. M., Nichols, P. E., & Krueger, R. F. (2007). A bifactor approach to modeling the structure of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *21*, 118-141.

Ross, S. R., Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Thompson, A., & Thurston, A. (2009). Factors of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Criterion-related validity and relationship to the BIS/BAS and five-factor models of personality. *Assessment*, *1*, 71-87.

Ross, S. R., Lutz, C. J., & Bailley, S. E. (2004). Psychopathy and the Five Factor Model in a noninstitutionalized sample: A domain and facet level analysis. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *26*, 213-223.

Ross, S. R., Moltó, J., Poy, R., Segarra, P., Pastor, M. C., & Montañés, S. (2007). Gray's model and psychopathy: BIS but not BAS differentiates primary from secondary psychopathy in noninstitutionalized young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *43*, 1644-1655.

Seibert, L. A., Miller, J. D., Few, L. R., Zeichner, A., & Lynam, D. R. (2011). An examination of the structure of self-report psychopathy measures and their relations with general traits and externalizing behaviors. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *2*, 193-208.

Sellbom, M., & Phillips, T. R. (2013). An examination of the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy in incarcerated and nonincarcerated samples. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *122*, 208-214.

Stanley, J. H., Wygant, D. B., & Sellbom, M. (2013). Elaborating on the construct validity of the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure in a criminal offender sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *95*, 343-350.

Strickland, C. M., Drislane, L. E., Lucy, M., Krueger, R. F., & Patrick, C. J. (2013). Characterizing psychopathy using DSM-5 personality traits. *Assessment*, *20*, 327-338.

Venables, N. C., & Patrick, C. J. (2012). Validity of the Externalizing Spectrum Inventory in a criminal offender sample: Relations with disinhibitory psychopathology, personality, and psychopathic features. *Psychological Assessment*, *24*, 88-100.

Widiger, T. A., & Lynam, D. R. (1998). Psychopathy as a variant of common personality traits: Implications for diagnosis, etiology, and pathology. In T. Millon (Ed.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal and violent behavior* (pp. 171-187). New York: Guilford.

Williams, K. M., Paulhus, D. L., & Hare, R. D. (2007). Capturing the four-factor

structure of psychopathy in college students via self-report. *Journal of Personality

Assessment*, *88*, 205-219.

Table 1. Correlations between TriPM scales and NEO PI-R domains, facets and Psychopathy

Resemblance Index in women (n = 253) and men (n = 96)

	Boldness		Meanness		Disinhibition	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Neuroticism	**-0,57****	**-0,64****	0,20*	0,19	**0,51****	**0,37****
Anxiety	**-0,52****	**-0,53****	0,08	-0,04	**0,31****	0,15
Angry Hostility	**-0,20***	**-0,45****	**0,29****	**0,35****	**0,47****	**0,43****
Depression	**-0,54****	**-0,53****	0,11	0,20	**0,40****	**0,35****
Self-Consciousness	**-0,64****	**-0,62****	0,09	0,06	**0,25****	0,14
Impulsiveness	0,00	-0,06	0,22**	0,12	**0,53****	**0,37****
Vulnerability	**-0,55****	**-0,62****	0,13	0,15	**0,36****	0,23
Extraversion	**0,68****	**0,53****	0,04 [a]	-0,35** [a]	-0,03	-0,09
Warmth	**0,37****	**0,31***	**-0,20***	**-0,46****	**-0,22****	-0,23
Gregariousness	**0,40****	0,16	-0,04	-0,40**	-0,13	-0,17
Assertiveness	**0,67****	**0,67****	0,02	-0,11	-0,05	-0,02
Activity	**0,44****	**0,36****	0,06	-0,17	0,09	0,08
Excitement-Seeking	**0,32****	0,23	**0,32****	0,13	**0,31****	0,18
Positive Emotions	**0,54****	**0,38****	-0,03	**-0,36****	-0,13	-0,16
Openness	**0,40****	**0,43****	0,07	-0,27*	0,08	-0,08
Fantasy	0,20*	0,18	0,20*	0,05	0,20*	-0,01
Aesthetics	**0,23****	0,07	-0,00	-0,18	0,09	0,02
Feelings	0,37**	0,41**	0,05 [a]	-0,38** [a]	0,09	-0,14
Actions	**0,39****	**0,32***	0,06	-0,16	0,05	-0,02
Ideas	**0,29****	**0,38****	-0,01	-0,05	-0,06	-0,00
Values	0,05	0,27*	-0,05	-0,40**	-0,06	-0,22
Agreeableness	-0,14	-0,18	**-0,45** [a]**	**-0,71** [a]**	**-0,35****	**-0,43****
Trust	0,25**	0,19	**-0,28** [a]**	**-0,64** [a]**	**-0,32****	**-0,42****
Straightforwardness	**-0,36****	**-0,41****	**-0,31****	**-0,39****	**-0,30****	**-0,31***
Altruism	0,10	0,08	**-0,39****	**-0,60****	**-0,24****	**-0,33***
Compliance	-0,14	-0,16	**-0,37****	**-0,44****	**-0,36****	**-0,37****
Modesty	**-0,37****	**-0,32***	**-0,32****	-0,24	**-0,16***	-0,14
Tender-Mindedness	0,02	-0,03	**-0,20***	**-0,49****	-0,02	-0,12
Conscientiousness	0,15	0,12	**-0,36****	**-0,33****	**-0,66****	**-0,44****
Competence	**0,26****	**0,33***	-0,29**	-0,37**	**-0,55****	**-0,43****
Order	0,05	0,10	-0,20*	-0,10	**-0,42****	-0,14
Dutifulness	0,07	0,11	**-0,37****	**-0,42****	**-0,58****	**-0,48****
Achievement Striving	0,23**	0,08	-0,16	-0,30*	**-0,35****	-0,16
Self-Discipline	0,18*	0,12	**-0,31****	**-0,28***	**-0,57****	**-0,34****
Deliberation	-0,04	-0,12	**-0,37****	-0,11	**-0,66****	**-0,44****
Psychopathy Resemblance Index	**0,56****	**0,62****	**0,44****	**0,42****	**0,41****	**0,34****

Note. Values in table are zero-order Pearson correlations calculated separately by gender. Superscript indicates significant differences across gender (Bonferroni's correction for multiple comparisons, *p* < .001), tested via Fisher r-to-z transformation. Significant predicted correlations are in **bold**.

* *p* < .01, ** *p* < .001

Table 2. Multiple regressions predicting TriPM scales from the NEO PI-R domains in women (n = 253) and men (n = 96)

Predictors	Boldness		Meanness		Disinhibition	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Neuroticism	-.47**	-.53**	.02	-.04	.33**	.30*
Extraversion	.42**	.32**	.09	-.14	.17*	.20
Openness	.19**	.26**	.05	-.14	.07	-.01
Agreeableness	-.27**	-.34**	-.39**	-.63**	-.16**	-.35**
Concientiousness	-.05	-.08	-.29**	-.13	-.53**	-.30*
R^2	.65**	.66**	.28**	.54**	.57**	.34**

Note. Values in table are βs in the models computed for each gender separately.

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$