

SELF- AND INFORMANT-PERCEPTIONS OF PSYCHOPATHIC TRAITS: DO
ATTITUDES PREDICT BEHAVIOR BEYOND PERSONALITY RATINGS?

A Thesis

by

SHANNON ELAINE KELLEY

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Chair of Committee,	John F. Edens
Committee Members,	Holly Foster
	Leslie C. Morey
Head of Department,	Douglas W. Woods

May 2015

Major Subject: Psychology

Copyright 2015 Shannon Elaine Kelley

ABSTRACT

Recent empirical evidence suggests that psychopathic individuals are capable of accurately self-reporting on their personality style and externalizing behaviors; however, little is known about their attitudes toward those traits and behaviors. The present study examined the convergence of self- and informant-reports of psychopathic personality traits as well as antisocial and prosocial externalizing behaviors among a sample of undergraduate roommate dyads ($N = 164$). Further, analyses explored the attitudes toward psychopathic traits, including judgments of psychopathic traits as normal, socially desirable, and advantageous to the self or others, and potential variations in attitudes according to the rater's own psychopathic trait severity. Results indicated moderate to strong correspondence between self- and roommate-reports of psychopathic traits (i.e., boldness, meanness, disinhibition). Within perspectives, psychopathy ratings were significantly associated with reported antisocial behavior (e.g., physical aggression) and prosocial activities. Psychopathy ratings from the reciprocal perspective, however, generally demonstrated little incremental utility in predicting outcomes. Concerning value judgments, boldness in particular was viewed favorably; however, only attitudes toward meanness and disinhibition demonstrated responsiveness to psychopathic trait severity, with those relatively elevated in such traits holding more approving views. Contrary to hypotheses, incremental utility of these attitudes was not generally observed. Overall, the present findings suggest that psychopathic individuals do possess insight into their core personality traits, but may have distorted views concerning the value of these characteristics.

DEDICATION

Lovingly dedicated to Evan, Pancakes, and Nalley,
who remind me that all things are possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to extend immense gratitude to my advisor, Dr. John Edens, for his consistent support, guidance, and inspiring scientific curiosity throughout this endeavor. In addition, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Les Morey and Dr. Holly Foster for their insightful feedback and commitment to the success of the present research. Thanks are given to Karolina Sörman and Elyse Mowle as well for their assistance with data collection. Lastly, I would like to express my appreciation for the support of my family and for the invaluable friendship of my fellow graduate students in the clinical psychology area. Your unparalleled encouragement and humor have been a daily source of strength to persevere and am I so grateful for your presence in my life.

NOMENCLATURE

CAPP	Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality
FFM	Five Factor Model
PAI	Personality Assessment Inventory
PAS	Personality Assessment Screener
PCL-R	Psychopathy Checklist-Revised
PIM	Positive Impression Management
PPI-R	Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised
SRA	Self-Report Altruism Scale
STAB	Subtypes of Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire
TriPM	Triarchic Psychopathy Measure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
NOMENCLATURE.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Layperson Perceptions of Psychopathy.....	2
Current Conceptualizations of Psychopathy	4
Self and Informant Assessment of Psychopathy	7
Summary	15
The Present Study.....	16
METHOD.....	18
Participants	18
Measures.....	18
Procedure.....	21
RESULTS.....	23
Roommate Similarity	23
Self-Roommate Convergence	24
General Dysfunction and Roommate Agreement on Psychopathic Traits....	29
Utility of Self- and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy in Predicting Antisocial Behavior.....	30
Psychopathic Trait Interaction in Predicting Antisocial Behavior.....	34
Utility of Self- and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy in Predicting Altruistic Behavior	35
Psychopathic Traits and Positive Impression Management	37
Value Judgments of Psychopathic Traits	37

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY.....	44
REFERENCES.....	54

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Self and Roommate Convergence Across Personality and Behavioral Measures.....	26
Table 2	Gender Differences in Self-Reported Personality and Behavioral Measures.....	28
Table 3	Correlations Between Self and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy and Self-Reported Antisocial Behavior.....	31
Table 4	Correlations Between Self and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy and Roommate-Reported Antisocial Behavior.....	32
Table 5	Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Self-Reported STAB Scores.....	35
Table 6	Correlations Between Self and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy and Altruism.....	37
Table 7	Value Judgments of Psychopathic Traits.....	38
Table 8	Comparison of Value Judgments in Upper and Lower Psychopathy Terciles.....	39
Table 9	Incremental Utility of Value Judgments in Predicting Antisocial Behavior.....	42

INTRODUCTION

An extensive research base exists on the clinical indicators of psychopathic personality (psychopathy), a disorder characterized by maladaptive personality traits (e.g., grandiosity, cunning, lack of empathy), but also traits with the potential for adaptive behavioral manifestations (e.g., social dominance, emotional detachment, risk-taking). A relatively limited number of empirical investigations have addressed layperson perceptions of psychopathy and the perceived correlates of core psychopathic traits. Furthermore, no known extant research has investigated the self-perceptions of individuals relatively elevated in psychopathic attributes in terms of the utility and desirability of these core personality traits. That is, do more psychopathic individuals tend to view their personality traits as normal—believing that such traits are an expected quality of the average person—rather than unusual? Do more psychopathic individuals judge their personality traits to be socially desirable, viewed favorably in interpersonal relations? Similarly, does this population identify psychopathic traits as personally advantageous, achieving social, economic, or emotional benefits for the self? Lastly, research has yet to explore whether or not more psychopathic individuals generally consider their personality traits as prosocial, bestowing benefits to others or society as a whole, perhaps through interpersonal exchanges, organizational contributions or other influential behaviors.

The primary purpose of the proposed study is to analyze the convergence of self- and informant-reports of psychopathic personality traits as well as assess individuals' perceptions of the normalcy, social desirability, and advantageousness of psychopathic

traits. Additionally, this investigation seeks to analyze the potential of such attitudes towards one's personality to incrementally predict prosocial and antisocial behavior beyond self- and informant-ratings of the presence of psychopathic features. The following discussion introduces (1) current layperson attitudes toward psychopathy, (2) competing conceptualizations of the disorder— particularly focusing on the role of ostensibly adaptive personality traits—and (3) the advantages and limitations of self- and informant-reports of psychopathic personality traits, specifically in the prediction of externalizing behaviors.

Layperson Perceptions of Psychopathy

Perhaps not surprisingly, laypersons generally judge psychopathy as being socially undesirable and causing deleterious consequences for others (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2012). Laypersons are, however, able to discriminate between a self- and other-perspective (e.g., “How desirable is the action for me personally?” and “How desirable is the action for people in general?”). For example, empirical findings indicate that laypersons show a tendency to rate psychopathy as resulting in favorable personal outcomes for people in general who engage in psychopathic behaviors (e.g., manipulation), but resulting in slightly detrimental personal consequences from a self-perspective (i.e., “If I were to do it.”). Similarly, laypersons view psychopathic traits as less desirable for themselves to possess than for others to possess. Interestingly, this trend was reversed for reports on the repercussions of psychopathic acts towards others. That is, psychopathic deeds were viewed as less harmful when enacted by the self than when performed by others. These findings provide evidence that perceptions of

psychopathic traits may differ when appraising oneself and when evaluating others, although it is unknown whether these results generalize from a hypothetical situation to one in which raters themselves are in fact relatively elevated in psychopathic traits.

A cluster of studies suggests that laypersons tend to think of psychopaths as relatively bright and socially assertive, but also monstrous individuals that pose a threat of future dangerousness (Edens, Clark, Smith, Cox, & Kelley, 2013; Furnham, Daoud, & Swami, 2009; Helfgott, 1997; Roger, Dion, & Lynett, 1992; Smith, Edens, Clark, & Rulseh, 2014). For example, Furnham et al. (2009) analyzed a series of attitudinal statements concerning perceptions of the behavioral manifestations of psychopathy provided by 232 community members in Great Britain and found that participants viewed psychopaths as smarter and more socially adept, but also more prone to crime and violence relative to non-psychopaths.

Expanding on these findings, Edens et al. (2013) examined the correlates of perceived psychopathic traits among a sample of 285 community members attending jury duty. Ratings of core features of psychopathy for a hypothetical defendant were loosely based on trait indicators from the Psychopathy Checklist – Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003), a widely used assessment instrument consisting of 20 items intended to measure psychopathic traits and behaviors based on information from a semi-structured interview and collateral reports (e.g., institutional records). Results revealed that these ratings were strongly predicted by ratings on measures of interpersonal boldness (i.e., social dominance and fearlessness), intelligence, probability of future violence, and perceptions that the defendant was “evil.” Subsequent findings regarding venireperson

perceptions of psychopathy similarly indicate public views that the disorder is largely characterized by dominance, egocentricity, and deficits in remorse and empathy (Smith et al., 2014).

Returning to the Edens et al. (2013) study, participants were also asked open-ended queries as to whom they tended to think of when they heard the term “psychopath.” Mirroring previous findings (Helfgott, 1997), the most common figures identified by participants as exemplars of psychopathy were famous serial or mass murderers, including Charles Manson (20%), Jeffrey Dahmer (14%), and Ted Bundy (11%).

Current Conceptualizations of Psychopathy

The general public perceives psychopaths as monstrous, violent and amoral, yet simultaneously intelligent, bold, and socially adept. However, these latter characteristics, representing typically valued and adaptive traits, are arguably underrepresented in the most widely researched conceptualization of psychopathy based on Hare’s (2003) PCL-R. In addition to containing interpersonal, affective, and impulsive lifestyle domains, Hare’s four-factor model emphasizes antisocial and criminal features (e.g., irresponsibility, juvenile delinquency) as important components of the disorder. One factor contributing to this orientation is that the majority of research on the validity of the PCL-R model has involved incarcerated populations and, accordingly, the assessment instrument is primarily used in forensic and correctional settings, such as prisons and forensic psychiatric units. However, the centrality of criminal deviance to the construct of psychopathy has been hotly debated (e.g., Hare & Neumann, 2010;

Skeem & Cooke, 2010), with recent arguments suggesting that antisociality is more likely a behavioral sequela of the disorder's core personality traits. From the latter perspective, antisociality is considered one possible manifestation of psychopathic traits, which may alternatively present in noncriminal or "successful" ways, promoting adaptive functioning in certain domains (Cleckley, 1941; Lykken, 1995; Hall & Benning, 2006). For example, high-ranking executives and military personnel may benefit professionally from the inclination to take risks and the ability to remain calm and rational in threatening situations.

These continuing disputes on the nature of psychopathy are echoed in emergent approaches to the disorder that challenge the primacy of Hare's model and offer alternative methods to its corresponding family of assessment instruments. Specifically, Patrick, Fowles, and Krueger (2009) recently developed the Triarchic Model of psychopathy, which attempts to reconcile extant theories through conceptualization of the disorder as a triumvirate of disinhibition, meanness, and boldness. The relevance of boldness to psychopathy has been a particularly contentious topic in the field (see Lilienfeld, Patrick, Benning, Berg, Sellbom, & Edens, 2012; Lynam & Miller, 2012), as it encompasses the ostensibly positive traits of fearlessness, venturesomeness, and social potency and tends to be positively associated with healthy psychological adjustment and negatively associated with common problems in daily living that often follow from hostile and impulsive dispositions (e.g., Hart, Lim, & Cook, 2015).

An additional emergent model worth noting is the Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality Disorder (CAPP; Cooke, Hart, Logan, & Michie, 2004), which

diverges from Hare's traditional model in its inclusion of several psychopathy-relevant concepts that are conspicuously absent from the PCL-R. In contrast to the criminal history aspect of the PCL-R, the domains of the CAPP emphasize dynamic characteristics such as mental flexibility, mood regulation, dominance, and interpersonal affiliation, implying that traits may be amenable to treatment or impacted by the environment.

The preeminence of Hare's four-factor model and the PCL-R coincides with an overwhelming focus on incarcerated populations and the association between psychopathy and maladjustment (e.g., violence, substance abuse). Despite evidence that psychopathic individuals are able to successfully navigate their communities in ways that avoid entanglements with the criminal justice system (DeMatteo, Heilbrun & Marczyk, 2006), psychopathy among nonincarcerated populations remains poorly understood. Research examining psychopathy in the community, as opposed to forensic settings, may better inform the debate about the conceptual relevance of putatively adaptive personality traits to the disorder. Extant research involving nonincarcerated populations suggests that self-reported psychopathic traits are positively associated with self-reported altruism and everyday heroism, or prosocial acts that entail some degree of physical or social risk (Lilienfeld, 1998; Smith et al., 2013). Particular features of psychopathy, such as fearlessness, are also associated with personally advantageous qualities, such as positive emotionality, healthy adjustment, decreased neuroticism, and positive self-image (Marcus, Fulton, & Edens, 2012; Lopez, Poy, Patrick, & Molto, 2013). Likewise, increased rational economic decision-making may be a consequence of

psychopathic traits (Osumi & Ohira, 2010). However, aforementioned concerns that characteristics of fearless dominance are distinct from the psychopathy construct due to their associations with positive outcomes overlook emerging evidence noting the potential for elevations in boldness to amplify the injurious effects of meanness and disinhibition. Previous findings specifically suggest an important interaction between severities of boldness and disinhibition, such that more pronounced boldness significantly strengthens the association between impulsive tendencies and undesirable behaviors, including accepting attitudes toward sexually coercive tactics (Marcus & Norris, 2014) and predatory aggression among psychiatric inpatients (Smith, Edens, & McDermott, 2013). Despite these advances, continued research on the nature of boldness in relation to psychopathy under diverse conditions is needed to delineate its utility in the conceptualization of the disorder.

Self and Informant Assessment of Psychopathy

Although the assessment of psychopathy traditionally has relied on clinical interview and corroborating file information, there is an increasing interest in the use of alternative methodologies, such as self-report. Self-report questionnaires are appreciably less resource intensive but subject to numerous controversies in terms of their clinical utility (Edens, Hart, Johnson, Johnson, & Olver, 2000). A long-standing lack of agreement has been found between self-report and observer based assessments of personality disorders (Zimmerman & Coryell, 1990) as well as evidence that assessment methods may be differentially sensitive to various problematic personality traits and behaviors (Blackburn, Donnelly, Logan, & Renwick, 2004). Observers, such as peers

and clinicians, could possess access to important information that is missed by self-reports for a variety of reasons (e.g., poor insight, self-aggrandizing, instability). Likewise, the self may have privileged knowledge of rather covert thoughts and behaviors, rendering observer reports somewhat valid, but incomplete.

Psychopathy presents the same quandary because it is comprised of features (e.g., cunning, shallow affect, superficial charm) that might similarly interfere with accurate assessment depending on the chosen method. The disadvantages of self-reported psychopathy have been conceptualized using the Johari window, a schematic illustrating the four possible quadrants of self and other awareness of personality (Fowler & Lilienfeld, 2013). The four quadrants consist of personality known to both self and others (“open”); personality known to the self but not others (“hidden”); personality known to others but not the self (“blind”); and personality known to neither the self nor others (“unknown”). Observers may therefore augment the accuracy of assessment by reporting qualities from the “blind” quadrant that psychopathic selves are either unable or unwilling to disclose. Accordingly, emerging research (Fowler & Lilienfeld, 2007; Jones & Miller, 2012; Miller, Jones, & Lynam, 2011) has begun to analyze the accuracy of self-report measures of psychopathy in order to identify the specific traits and behaviors that others detect more precisely than the self (and vice versa) in addition to the predictive validity of each source for important outcomes.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Self-Reports

Both clinical and research practices are driven by the assumption that self-reports of psychopathy may be especially vulnerable to response distortion. The primary

concerns are that psychopathic individuals either (1) lack insight into their current and past behaviors and personality traits or (2) engage in deceitfulness and/or distortion when providing information. Lack of insight has long been considered a characteristic feature of psychopathy, beginning with the seminal work of Cleckley (1941), who described the psychopath as having “absolutely no capacity to see himself as others see him” (p. 350). Several mechanisms have been proposed to account for these deficits in accurate self-perception. First, psychopaths may be unaware of their abnormal status in comparison with the general population and have a misguided frame of reference for what constitutes typical personality traits and normative behaviors (Vitacco & Neumann, 2008). These beliefs about normality may be particularly detrimental to self-report questionnaires that rely on relative statements, for example, “I lie more often than most people.” Similarly, psychopaths also have an impaired ability to accurately verbalize emotional states, a phenomenon Cleckley (1941) termed semantic aphasia. Their markedly shallow affective experiences and unfamiliarity with feelings of guilt, empathy, or remorse create an obstacle to identifying their absence.

Impression management and outright lying have also been identified as limitations of the utility of self-report measures of psychopathy (Lilienfeld, 1994). Psychopathic individuals may intentionally minimize the extent and consequences of their own pathology, particularly in settings where response manipulation is motivated by external incentives, such as in forensic contexts. Moreover, only one self-report measure of psychopathy, the Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised (PPI-R; Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005) currently contains validity indices to assess deviant

responding and impression management, though only limited research has examined their utility (Anderson, Sellbom, Wygant, & Edens, 2013; Nikolova, Hendry, Douglas, Edens, & Lilienfeld, 2012). Lastly, self-reports of psychopathy may lack discriminant validity for distinguishing this condition from other psychopathologies that involve negative emotionality and antisocial behaviors (Lilienfeld & Fowler, 2006).

Despite these tentative constraints, self-reports also possess unique advantages over other assessment methods, primarily because they gain access to privileged observations of the self. Specifically, self-reports are capable of gathering information on less observable traits, unexpressed emotions, covert behaviors, sensitive behaviors unwilling to be shared in-person, and general patterns across time and contexts. Self-reports also possess an economical asset. In contrast with clinical interviews, they require minimal training to administer, are brief and simple to complete, and avoid unreliable observer judgments (Lilienfeld & Fowler, 2006). For example, concerns have been raised regarding the generalizability of published reliability statistics for the PCL-R from research contexts to applied settings (Edens, Magyar, & Cox, 2013; Edens & Petrila, 2006; Edens, Skeem, & Kennealy, 2009). Factor 1 scores of the PCL-R, which assess interpersonal and affective facets of psychopathy, demonstrate particularly poor agreement across examiners in real world settings, perhaps due to examiners' idiosyncratic thresholds or interviewing styles (Edens, Boccaccini, & Johnson, 2010; Miller, Kimonis, Otto, Kline, & Wasserman, 2012; Sturup, Edens, Sörman, Karlberg, Fredriksson, & Kristiansson, 2014). Miller et al. (2012) found that rater agreement for PCL-R item scores when two evaluators independently assessed a single offender ranged

from $ICC_1 = .09$ to $.73$, with Factor 1 scores ($ICC_1 = .48$) exhibiting substantially lower rater agreement in comparison with Factor 2 scores ($ICC_1 = .72$). Furthermore, forensic examiner judgments show evidence of adversarial allegiance, or bias in favor of the position taken by those retaining their services. For example, experimental evidence demonstrates that examiners led to believe they are retained by the prosecution assign higher PCL-R scores to offenders than those under the impression they are working for the defense (Murrie, Boccaccini, Guarnera, & Rufino, 2013). Therefore, self-report possesses an advantage over clinical interview by eliminating the high proportion of variance in psychopathy scores attributable to individual characteristics of the examiner.

Finally, although psychopaths' lack of insight has historically been deemed problematic, the advancement of self-reports beyond face validity could capitalize on such inaccurate reflections of reality (Lilienfeld, 1994). Psychopaths may endorse statements that are untrue, such as "I am often punished for behaviors even though no one really suffered"; however, their agreement is itself a valid indicator of psychopathy, signifying minimization, blame externalization, or rationalization of actions.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Informant Reports

Informant reports (by non-experts) are much less frequently used in the assessment of psychopathy, possibly because the nature of the disorder typically results in a series of brief, shallow, relationships rather than any stable attachments. Aside from the difficulties in procuring knowledgeable and impartial informants, this external source of information could provide unique data untapped by self-reports and circumvent the resource expenditures of clinical interview. Previous research has supported self-other

knowledge asymmetries in personality disorders more generally. In comparing how well assessment methods of five factor model (FFM) personality traits predicted composite ratings of personality disorder, Carlson, Vazire, and Oltmann (2013) found that self- and informant-reports each demonstrated incremental validity over the other in specific domains. Consistent with the idea of the self as a privileged observer of internal states, self-reports were more valid for internalizing personality disorders, particularly those high in neuroticism. Conversely, informant-reports were more valid for personality disorders characterized by externalizing and antagonistic behaviors, particularly those featuring low agreeableness.

Research has found that psychopathy can be adequately represented by FFM personality dimensions (Miller, Lynam, Widiger, & Leukefeld, 2001). Specifically, FFM descriptions of psychopathy include low warmth, high excitement-seeking, low self-consciousness, high impulsiveness, and multiple deficits indicating low agreeableness and low conscientiousness. Therefore, findings by Carlson et al. (2013) that disorders featuring low agreeableness were associated with relatively more valid informant-reports suggests that the assessment of interpersonal manifestations of psychopathy, such as aggressiveness and callousness, may benefit from multi-method approaches to measurement.

Comparison of Self- and Informant-Reports of Adult Psychopathy

Research on self-other knowledge asymmetries has only recently emerged in the field of psychopathy, beginning with a direct examination of the incremental validity of informant-reports beyond self-reports in an undergraduate sample. Fowler and Lilienfeld

(2007) administered several widely used questionnaire measures of psychopathy as well as a psychopathy prototype, the Psychopathy Q-Sort, to participants and their provided peers. Not surprisingly, psychopathy ratings correlated more strongly for older participants who had purportedly known each other for longer periods of time. This finding reinforces the idea that the use of informant-reports may be hindered by the ability to find willing individuals with a close understanding of the target when highly psychopathic individuals characteristically maintain only short-lived, artificial, and/or parasitic relationships. Self- and informant-reports from the Q-Sort, called Q-correlations, correlated significantly with each other as well as with PPI total scores and self-reported antisocial behaviors. Additionally, both self- and informant-Q-correlations were independent of a measure of global distress. Although there were several significant correlations between self-Q-correlations and other psychopathy measures that were not observed for informant Q-correlations, analyses of incremental validity of informant-reports beyond self-reports in predicting scores on other measures of psychopathy were difficult to interpret due to low statistical power. These analyses yielded the only instance of incremental validity, with informant-reports of PPI fearlessness demonstrating evidence of incremental validity beyond corresponding self-reports.

Miller et al. (2011) similarly examined the convergence of self- and informant-reports of psychopathy using multiple validated questionnaire measures among community adults, with selves oversampled for elevations in psychopathy. Again, overall psychopathy scores consistently showed substantial convergence for self- and

informant-reports (PPI, $r = .67$; Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale [LSRP], $r = .64$; FFM of Psychopathy, $r = .83$). The authors argue that if the long-standing association of psychopathy with reduced insight was credible, scores from self-reports should, on average, be lower than those from informant reports, reflecting the tendency of psychopaths to unknowingly minimize their problematic traits and behaviors. On the contrary, target individuals did not report substantially lower (or higher) levels of psychopathic traits than informants, suggesting that such persons are generally capable of and willing to accurately report on interpersonal antagonism and socially deviant behaviors, at least in a context free from external motivators. The authors posit that the loss of insight highlighted by Cleckley (1941) and others may be better understood as a lack of concern for the consequences of their actions or a lack of awareness of the harmfulness inflicted on others. That is, psychopathic individuals may have insight into their personality traits and behaviors, but possess distorted views on the normalcy, social desirability, or advantageousness of these traits.

These two studies indicate that informant-reports of psychopathic traits generally converge with corresponding self-reports. But might each source differentially relate to important outcomes of psychopathy? Using the same data as the previous study, Jones and Miller (2012) examined the incremental validity of self- and informant-reports of psychopathic traits in the prediction of externalizing behaviors and revealed a clear asymmetry in self-other knowledge. Although both sources provided valid information related to externalizing behaviors, self-report psychopathy scores provided greater incremental validity for gambling, substance use, and antisocial behavior, whereas

informant-reports provided greater incremental validity in relation to intimate partner violence. The reasons for this discrepancy are unclear, but one can speculate that the self may be more guarded or dishonest in reports of abuse, or possess different knowledge and perceptions than others in this domain.

Summary

Emergent conceptualizations of psychopathy acknowledge the capacity for psychopathic traits to result in either adaptive or maladaptive functioning, with particular emphasis on the construct of boldness as a largely advantageous feature of the disorder (Patrick et al., 2009). These theoretical arguments are also echoed by layperson beliefs that in certain circumstances, psychopathic traits may be beneficial (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2012; see also Sörman et al., 2014). But do psychopathic individuals hold similar attitudes toward their personality and its ramifications? Recent evidence suggests that, contrary to claims of socially desirable responding and lack of insight, psychopathic individuals are able to accurately self-report on their antagonistic personality style and externalizing behaviors (Jones & Miller, 2012; Miller et al., 2011; Ray et al., 2013). Nevertheless, convergence of self- and informant-reports for interpersonal and impulsive tendencies does not necessarily translate to similar attitudes toward those traits and behaviors. Psychopathic individuals may be adequately aware of their symptoms, yet view such traits as normative, relatively harmless, or even advantageous for the self and others. For example, one self-claimed and clinically corroborated “successful” psychopath writes in her memoir, “...most people who interact with sociopaths are better

off than they otherwise would be. Sociopaths are part of the grease that makes the world go round” (Thomas, 2013, p. 7).

Understanding psychopathic individuals’ attitudes about their personalities and behaviors and how these attitudes relate to prosocial and antisocial behavior is an important extension of contemporary studies that bears both theoretical and practical implications. Knowledge of these value judgments can provide further appreciation of the level of insight psychopathic individuals possess and the comparability of specific attitudes with those of the general public. Furthermore, examining the association between these value judgments and important external correlates has implications for treatment efforts in terms of identifying potential cognitive distortions that may motivate and maintain harmful behaviors. Lastly, the relative contribution of self- and informant-reports to the prediction of important behaviors has implications for optimal assessment in a variety of contexts.

The Present Study

The purpose of this proposed research is to examine the convergence of self- and informant-reports of psychopathic personality traits and both antisocial and prosocial externalizing behaviors among a sample of undergraduate students. This study also seeks to explore whether relatively psychopathic individuals differ from less psychopathic individuals in their attitudes, including judgments of psychopathic traits as normal, socially desirable, and advantageous to the self or others. Furthermore, this investigation will analyze the potential of the preceding trait value judgments to incrementally predict

antisocial and prosocial behavior beyond the contribution of self- and informant-reports on the presence of psychopathic traits.

Consistent with previous findings on the convergence of self- and informant-reports of psychopathic traits (Miller, Jones, & Lynam, 2011), it is expected that selves and informants will display good agreement on the presence of such traits. Based on findings that attitudes towards psychopathic personality traits diverge for self- and other-perspectives (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2012), psychopathic individuals' grandiose and minimizing tendencies, and the lack of voluntary treatment seeking in this population, it is expected that relatively psychopathic individuals will perceive psychopathic personality traits as more normal, more socially desirable, and more advantageous for the self and others in comparison to their counterparts exhibiting few psychopathic tendencies. Lastly, given that attitudes, such as those pertaining to personality, drive behavior (Fazio, 1986), it is expected that selves' value judgments of personality will relate to antisocial and prosocial outcomes as well as provide incremental validity over self- and informant-ratings of personality in these behavioral patterns.

METHOD

Participants

Participants included 87 undergraduate students recruited from the psychology subject pool at a large university in the Southwestern United States. Eligibility criteria required that participants bring a current roommate with whom they were not romantically involved to the in-person study session ($N = 174$). Intimate partners were excluded from the study due to their heightened potential for providing unrealistically positive informant-ratings. The majority of participants were female (64.4%) and Caucasian (59.8%; Hispanic, 22.4%; Asian American, 9.2%; African American 3.4%; Other 4.6%) with a mean age of 19.1 years ($SD = 2.8$). On average, roommate dyads had lived together 1.0 years ($SD = 2.9$) with an average acquaintanceship of 3.7 years ($SD = 5.2$). Most participants chose to live with their current roommate (63.2%), as opposed to living with an assigned roommate. The data for one participant were discarded because this individual was the recruited student's parent. An additional 4 participants were excluded from data analysis for failing to follow questionnaire instructions, resulting in a final sample of 82 complete dyads and 169 individual participants.

Measures

Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM; Patrick, 2010)

The TriPM is a self-report psychopathy inventory that consists of 58 items assessing the triarchic model facets of Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition. The Boldness subscale captures tendencies toward interpersonal dominance, stress immunity, and venturesomeness; the Meanness subscale reflects callousness, sensation-seeking,

and brutality; and the disinhibition subscale measures impulsiveness, irresponsibility, defiance, and hostility. Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale as “true,” “somewhat true,” “somewhat false,” or “false.” In the present sample, internal consistency for this scale was good ($\alpha = .86$). TriPM subscales likewise demonstrated good internal consistency (Boldness $\alpha = .80$; Meanness $\alpha = .82$; Disinhibition $\alpha = .80$).

Value Judgments of Psychopathic Traits

Participants rated each item of the TriPM (with stems modified) concerning the extent to which they perceived the trait or behavior (e.g., “Enjoying a good physical fight.”) as (1) normal, (2) socially desirable, (3) advantageous for the self, and (4) prosocial. Definitions of these terms were provided as follows. “Normal” refers to the extent to which an item is an expected quality of the average individual, rather than rare or unusual. “Socially desirable” refers to the extent to which an item is viewed favorably in interpersonal situations. “Advantageous for the self” refers to the extent to which an item benefits the self, such as by social, economic, or emotional rewards. “Prosocial” refers to the extent to which an item benefits others or society as a whole, such as through interpersonal relationships or organizational contributions. Each of these value judgments, or descriptors, was rated on a 6-point Likert scale, with 0 indicating that the descriptor was “not at all” characteristic of the item and 5 indicating that the descriptor was “extremely” characteristic of the item.

Self-Report Altruism Scale (SRA; Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken, 1981).

The SRA is a 20-item self-report questionnaire that measures the frequency with which individuals report engaging in altruistic behaviors. Items are rated on a 5-point

Likert scale, with 1 indicating “never” and 5 indicating “very often” for the frequency of each behavior. The measure contains two subscales: altruistic behavior towards strangers, and altruistic behavior towards charities. The SRA has demonstrated significant and positive correlations with several measures of prosocial orientation and other indicators of altruistic behavior (Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken, 1981). Several items on this scale were modified to reflect modern language or geographical restrictions (e.g., “helped push a stranger’s car out of the snow” was modified to “helped push a stranger’s disabled car off of the road”).

Subtypes of Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire (STAB; Burt & Donnellan, 2009)

The STAB is a self-report questionnaire containing 32-items that measure three types of antisocial behavior: physical aggression, rule-breaking, and social aggression. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale indicating frequency of engagement in target behaviors during the previous six months, with 1 indicating “never” and 5 indicating “nearly all the time.” In previous research using undergraduate samples, the STAB has demonstrated strong internal consistency (Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .78 to .87 for the 3 subscales) and criterion-related validity with other measures of externalizing behavior and Big Five personality traits (Burt & Donnellan, 2009). In the present sample, internal consistency of the measure was similarly strong ($\alpha = .88$).

Personality Assessment Screener (PAS; Morey, 1997)

The PAS is a 22-item self-report questionnaire that screens for multiple domains of emotional and behavioral problems. Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale as “false, not at all true,” “slightly true,” “mainly true,” and “very true.” Raw scores are converted

into probability scores that assess the likelihood that clinically significant psychopathology would be observed for a respondent upon completion of the parent instrument, the Personality Assessment Inventory (Morey, 1991).

Positive Impression Management Scale of the Personality Assessment Inventory (PIM; Morey, 1991)

The PIM scale is composed of nine items that assess response style using common foibles (e.g., impatience, thoughtlessness) to which most people will readily admit. Low scores suggest a general candidness whereas high scores indicate systematic positive distortion, which may be either effortful (e.g., “faking good”) and/or non-effortful (e.g., self-deception). Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale as “false, not at all true,” “slightly true,” “mainly true,” and “very true.”

Procedure

Following informed consent procedures, participants completed questionnaires in separate rooms using online survey software. For the TriPM, SRA, STAB, PAS and PIM Scale, participants provided ratings for themselves as well as for their roommates. Self- and roommate-report versions of these measures were presented in a counter-balanced manner to assess the potential presence of order effects. Participants then provided value judgment ratings for the individual items of the TriPM. In addition, participants subsequently read brief descriptions of the core features of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition and provided the four value judgment ratings noted above for each of these triarchic model factors. Lastly, information about demographics and the roommate relationship was collected. Participants enrolled in the psychology subject pool were

compensated with two research credits in partial fulfillment of course requirements. Roommates enrolled in the psychology subject pool also received two research credits; the remaining roommates received no compensation for their participation.

RESULTS

First, a series of ten Bonferroni-corrected t -tests were used to investigate whether the order in which participants provided self- versus informant-report systematically influenced ratings. Results showed that there were no significant differences on any study measure between participants providing self-report first and those providing informant-report first at $p < .005$.

Roommate Similarity

The study design included each participant as both a target (self-report) and an informant (roommate-report). Reciprocal self- and roommate-reports create the potential for nonindependence of self and roommate scores. Non-independence of self and roommate ratings may stem from multiple sources, including the potential selection of likeminded roommates and the possibility that roommates become more similar over time by exerting mutual influence on one another. Accordingly, the similarity of dyads' self-ratings for psychopathic traits and psychological functioning was investigated to determine if the use of individual targets, as opposed to dyads, as the unit of analysis would be appropriate in analyzing self-roommate agreement. Preliminary analyses of intraclass correlation coefficients for indistinguishable, or exchangeable, dyads ($N = 82$) revealed two similarity correlations that exceeded that recommended cut-off of .30 (Kenny, 1995): TriPM Total, $ICC(1, 1) = .35$, and Meanness, $ICC(1, 1) = .38$. The similarity between roommates for Boldness, Disinhibition and PAS Total, however, suggested minimal bias due to nonindependence in the present sample.

Due to concerns regarding roommate similarity for TriPM Total and Meanness, we assessed self-roommate convergence controlling for self-reports of the “other” dyadic member. These partial correlations remained consonant with the zero-order correlations for self-roommate agreement reported below (Table 1). In fact, attenuation of the zero-order correlation after controlling for the self-reports of informing roommates did not surpass .06 units. These results suggest that any observed correspondence between self- and roommate-reports is not an artifact of co-occurring actual and assumed similarity within dyads. Accordingly, self-roommate agreement was analyzed at the individual level utilizing reciprocal ratings ($N = 164$).

Self-Roommate Convergence

Correlations between self- and roommate-reports on study measures are presented in Table 1 alongside descriptive statistics. Convergent correlations ranged from .20 (STAB Social Aggression) to .56 (TriPM Total), with a median of .31. Self- and roommate-reported total psychopathy scores strongly converged, as did ratings on the Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition subscales. Additionally, selves and roommates tended to agree on the target’s more global emotional and behavioral functioning as measured by the PAS. Self- and roommate-reports showed significant agreement for antisocial behavior as measured by the STAB, though only for the Social Aggression and Physical Aggression subscales. Upon closer examination of the STAB Rule-Breaking subscale, the lack of a significant agreement between perspectives appears to be due to a restricted range of responses, with few participants endorsing engagement in any of these primarily criminal behaviors. Finally, self-roommate

convergence was observed for altruistic behaviors (SRA) and, interestingly, positive impression management (PIM). These results suggest that individuals can accurately report on their own psychopathic tendencies and do possess insight into the expression of social and physical aggression.

We further examined self and roommate ratings for mean differences between perspectives (Table 1). The effect sizes ranged from $-.69$ (PIM) to $.45$ (PAS), with an overall tendency for selves to provide relatively elevated scores. Across psychopathy subscales, there was only one significant difference, with selves tending to report relatively higher levels of Disinhibition than roommates ($d = .25$). Likewise, self-reported Physical Aggression was, on average, higher than the corresponding roommate ratings ($d = .20$). For the SRA and PAS, observed mean differences ($d = .42$; $d = .45$, respectively) again suggest that selves may be more willing and/or able to report aspects of their psychological and behavioral functioning, both positive and negative, relative to roommates. In line with selves reporting comparatively higher levels of unfavorable characteristics, the greatest discrepancy between self and roommate-reported scores was for PIM ($d = -.69$).

Table 1

Self and Roommate Convergence Across Personality and Behavioral Measures

Scale	Self-Roommate <i>r</i>	Self-Report		Roommate-Report		<i>d</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
TriPM Total	.56**	64.88	15.95	62.52	16.92	.14*
TriPM Boldness	.46**	34.90	8.40	34.74	8.57	.02
TriPM Meanness	.30**	14.61	7.45	14.34	9.63	.03
TriPM Disinhibition	.29**	15.37	8.71	13.31	7.69	.25**
STAB Total	.30**	48.93	8.99	46.85	10.93	.21*
STAB Rule-Breaking	.07	11.60	1.08	11.49	1.00	.11
STAB Social Aggression	.20*	19.52	4.40	18.68	5.76	.16
STAB Physical Aggression	.39**	17.80	5.43	16.68	5.94	.20*
SRA Total	.24**	55.04	10.97	50.01	12.75	.42**
PAS Total	.45**	18.34	6.60	15.23	7.32	.45**
PIM Total	.32**	13.63	4.29	16.81	4.97	-.69**

Note. TriPM = Triarchic Psychopathy Measure; STAB = Subtypes of Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire; SRA = Self-Reported Altruism Scale; PAS = Personality Assessment Screener; PIM = Positive Impression Management Scale.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Several relationship variables were then examined for potential moderating effects, including length of acquaintanceship, length of rooming together, how well the roommate was reportedly known (0 = “Not at All”, 5 = “Extremely Well”), and how well the roommate was reportedly liked, as indexed by the likelihood the self would continue living with his or her roommate if given the opportunity (0 = “Not at All Likely”, 5 = “Extremely Likely”). We conducted moderated regression analyses to assess whether relationship variables are related to the magnitude of agreement on reports of global psychopathy. Of these variables, only length of rooming together significantly moderated self-roommate agreement for TriPM Total scores ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $p < .05$). In particular, roommate dyads with a lengthier history of shared housing tended

to display stronger self-roommate agreement.

In addition, we examined the role of gender in the extent to which participants self-reported traits and behaviors of interest (Table 2) and the observed agreement between roommates. Significant gender differences emerged across multiple domains, with males self-reporting more antisocial behaviors (STAB Physical Aggression, STAB Rule-Breaking) *and* more positive qualities (SRA, PIM) relative to females. In addition, males self-reported higher levels of global psychopathy and were significantly more prone to endorse qualities of Boldness and Meanness compared to females¹. Notably, our results revealed no gender differences with respect to self-reported Social Aggression or Disinhibition. Dyads included in the present analyses were, incidentally, exclusively same-sex roommates. Therefore, regarding self-roommate convergence, we assessed gender differences in correlation coefficients for self- and roommate-reports using Fisher *r*-to-*z* significance testing. Findings indicated no differences in self-roommate agreement between male and female dyads. However, a marginal tendency for males to converge more strongly on ratings of Meanness ($r = .36$) relative to females ($r = .14$) did emerge, $p = .08$. Likewise, the magnitude of agreement for males on PIM ($r = .43$) was marginally greater than that for females ($r = .22$), $p = .08$.

¹ We further tested for gender differences in perceptions of roommates and similarly found that on average, men viewed their roommates as appreciably more psychopathic overall (TriPM Total) as well as elevated in Meanness, Physical Aggression, Rule-Breaking compared with reports of female informants ($ps < .05$). These findings are consistent with the incidental inclusion of only same-sex dyads in the present analyses; however, it is worth mentioning that men did not construe their roommates as higher in Boldness and PIM compared with women, as was observed for self-reported personality.

Table 2
Gender Differences in Self-Reported Personality and Behavioral Measures

Scale	SR-Males M (SD)	SR-Females M(SD)	<i>t</i>
TriPM Total	72.89 (13.77)	59.80 (15.09)	5.58**
Boldness	38.90 (6.76)	33.20 (7.97)	4.68**
Meanness	16.79 (7.05)	11.02 (7.48)	4.91**
Disinhibition	17.16 (7.60)	15.59 (7.00)	1.36
STAB Total	51.20 (9.87)	47.56 (8.04)	2.59*
Social Aggression	19.75 (4.65)	19.38 (4.27)	0.52
Physical Aggression	19.41 (5.91)	16.85 (4.82)	3.05**
Rule-Breaking	12.03 (1.44)	11.33 (0.66)	3.63**
SRA Total	57.49 (12.39)	53.87 (9.83)	2.09*
PIM Total	14.77 (4.44)	13.02 (3.99)	2.63**
PAS Total	18.50 (6.89)	18.33 (6.34)	.163

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

We also examined correlations between self and roommate perspectives across the three psychopathy subscales to assess potential variations in how selves versus others may interpret these characteristics. Of note, self-reported Boldness and Disinhibition both significantly predicted roommate perceptions of Meanness ($r = .23, p < .01$; $r = .34, p < .01$), suggesting that participants' self-report of ostensibly socially dominant, fearless, and impulsive behaviors may be experienced by close others as relatively more exploitative and insensitive. However, a marginal effect of gender was observed suggesting that this phenomenon could be more apparent with female roommates ($r = .23$) than with male roommates ($r = .00, p = .08$). Significant gender divergence was similarly observed regarding the association between self-reported Boldness and roommate-reported Disinhibition, with male roommates displaying a modest negative

correlation between the two ratings ($r = -.16$) and female roommates a modest positive correlation ($r = .18$), $p < .05$.

General Dysfunction and Roommate Agreement on Psychopathic Traits

Many self-report measures that intend to assess psychopathy may be heavily saturated with negative emotionality (Lilienfeld & Fowler, 2006) or reflect a more general pattern of dysfunction for an individual. Accordingly, one potential explanation for observed convergence between self- and roommate-reports of psychopathy is that the association is an artifact of agreement concerning higher-order personality constructs encapsulating negative affectivity and psychological difficulties. To provide evidence in support of self and roommate convergence concerning specific psychopathic personality traits independent of general dysfunction, we conducted a series of correlational and semipartial correlational analyses. First, we found that the PAS significantly and positively correlated with TriPM Total ($r = .29$, $p < .01$), Meanness ($r = .45$, $p < .01$), and Disinhibition ($r = .42$, $p < .01$), although this measure demonstrated a negative association with Boldness ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$). Controlling for self-reported PAS scores, self and roommate reports of psychopathic traits continued to display strong convergence for TriPM Total ($sr = .51$, $p < .01$) and Boldness ($sr = .41$, $p < .01$). Agreement between selves and roommates remained significant for Meanness ($sr = .18$, $p < .05$) and Disinhibition ($sr = .18$, $p < .05$), but was noticeably attenuated, suggesting that these domains may be most contaminated by indicators of general psychological distress.

Utility of Self-and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy in Predicting Antisocial Behavior

With respect to externalizing behaviors, self-reported psychopathy was positively correlated with self-reported STAB Total ($r = .50, p < .01$). The bivariate correlations between self- and roommate-reported psychopathic traits and self-reported antisocial behaviors are presented in Table 3. As can be seen, self-reported Meanness and Disinhibition were positively associated with STAB Total and each subtype of aggression, whereas self-reported Boldness had no relation to either total or subscale scores. A similar pattern emerged predicting selves' STAB scores from roommate-reported psychopathy. Specifically, roommate-reported Meanness and Disinhibition were positively correlated with STAB Total and Physical Aggression, with Meanness additionally predicting Social Aggression. Boldness again did not demonstrate significant relations with any STAB scores.

The strength of association between self-reported psychopathy and antisociality differed between genders in several ways. In particular, the correspondence between Boldness and both STAB Total and Physical Aggression remained sizeable for males ($r_s = -.28, -.30$, respectively), but virtually disappeared for females ($r_s = .05, .04$, respectively), $p_s < .05$. Additionally, correlations between Disinhibition and STAB Total, Rule-Breaking, and Physical Aggression differed between genders, with greater effects for males ($r_s = .53 - .58$) relative to females, ($r_s = .18 - .35$) $p_s < .05$. No significant gender differences in associations between roommate-reported psychopathy and self-reported antisociality were observed.

Table 3

Correlations Between Self and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy and Self-Reported Antisocial Behavior

Scale	STAB Total		Rule-Breaking		Physical		Social	
	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>
<u>Self-Report</u>								
TriPM Total	.50**	.43**	.37**	.36**	.49**	.40**	.34**	.29**
TriPM Boldness	.01	.02	.14	.11	.01	.04	-.03	-.04
TriPM Meanness	.59**	.39**	.27**	.22**	.59**	.38**	.41**	.27**
TriPM Disinhibition	.46**	.48**	.37**	.35**	.42**	.43**	.33**	.35**
<u>Roommate-Report</u>								
TriPM Total	.25**	-.03	.12	-.11	.27**	.00	.16*	-.04
TriPM Boldness	-.05	-.06	.04	-.01	-.09	-.10	-.01	.01
TriPM Meanness	.32**	.19**	.10	.03	.35**	.22**	.20*	.11
TriPM Disinhibition	.22**	.07	.10	-.01	.26**	.12	.11	.01

Note. Bolded correlations indicate significant semipartial correlations controlling for the alternative perspective. *sr* = semipartial correlations; STAB = Subtypes of Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire; TriPM = Triarchic Psychopathy Measure.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The bivariate correlations between self- and roommate-reported psychopathic traits and roommate-reported antisocial behaviors are presented in Table 4. Roommate-reported psychopathy significantly predicted roommate-reported STAB Total ($r = .54$, $p < .01$) and was also a significant predictor of each subtype of misconduct. In particular, Meanness and Disinhibition generally demonstrated moderate to strong positive correlations with total and subscale ratings of antisocial behavior. Boldness, however, was significantly associated with only STAB Total and Social Aggression and in a *negative* direction. In contrast, self-reported Meanness and Disinhibition were modestly correlated with roommate-reported STAB Total, Rule-Breaking and Physical

Aggression. Self-reported Boldness demonstrated a positive association with Physical Aggression. Interestingly, neither the total nor subscale scores from self-reported psychopathy predicted roommate-reported Social Aggression.

Table 4
Correlations Between Self and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy and Roommate-Reported Antisocial Behavior

Scale	STAB Total		Rule-Breaking		Physical		Social	
	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>
<u>Self-Report</u>								
TriPM Total	.26**	-.05	.30**	.18*	.33**	.03	.10	-.16*
TriPM Boldness	.14	.26**	.13	.17*	.19*	.28**	.04	.17*
TriPM Meanness	.16*	-.03	.24**	.18*	.20*	.01	.06	-.11
TriPM Disinhibition	.20**	.03	.23**	.12	.24**	.09	.10	-.06
<u>Roommate-Report</u>								
TriPM Total	.54**	.47**	.27**	.11	.53**	.41**	.43**	.45**
TriPM Boldness	-	-	-.04	-.12	-.12	-	-	-
	.21**	.29**				.24**	.27**	.29**
TriPM Meanness	.64**	.62**	.22**	.15	.61**	.58**	.55**	.55**
TriPM Disinhibition	.61**	.56**	.37**	.32**	.53**	.48**	.54**	.52**

Note. Bolded correlations indicate significant semipartial correlations. *sr* = semipartial correlations; STAB = Subtypes of Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire; TriPM = Triarchic Psychopathy Measure.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Again, several zero-order correlations displayed differences according to gender. For roommate-reported Rule-Breaking, self-reported Meanness was a more useful predictor for women ($r = .35$) relative to men ($r = .04$), $p < .05$. For roommate-reported Meanness, however, this trend did not reach significance. In fact, substantial gender differences were instead observed in the relation of these ratings with STAB Total, Physical Aggression, and Social Aggression. The magnitude of these association was

significantly greater for women ($r_s = .68-.73$) compared with those for men ($r_s = .44-.49$). Disinhibition followed this pattern in its relation with Social Aggression (Male $r = .39$, Female $r = .62$, $p < .05$).

Next, we examined the incremental validity of self- and roommate-reports of psychopathy in the prediction of self- and roommate-reports of antisocial behavior using semipartial correlations. Results are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Self-report psychopathy scores generally manifested modest positive semipartial correlations with self-reported antisocial behavior (mean semipartial $r = .28$) and small positive semipartial correlations with informant-reported antisocial behavior (mean semipartial $r = .07$). Similarly, informant-report psychopathy scores generally manifested only slight positive semipartial correlations with self-reported antisocial behavior (mean semipartial $r = .03$) that were non-significant and modest to moderate semipartial correlations with informant-reported antisocial behavior (mean semipartial $r = 0.27$).

Self-report psychopathy scores provided the greatest evidence of incremental utility in relation to rule-breaking (i.e., 6 of 8 analyses) and social aggression (i.e., 5 of 8), followed by physical aggression (i.e., 4 of 8). Informant-report psychopathy scores, however, provided the greatest evidence of incremental validity for physical aggression (i.e., 5 of 8) and social aggression (i.e., 4 of 8), with only one instance of significant semipartial correlations for rule-breaking behavior. Notably, for roommate-reported psychopathy, the Meanness subscale alone provided incremental validity in predicting self-reported antisocial behavior. Additionally, for self-reported psychopathy, incremental validity in predicting roommate-reported antisocial behavior was observed

primarily on the Boldness subscale.

Psychopathic Trait Interactions in Predicting Antisocial Behavior

We conducted three hierarchical multiple regressions to examine the contributions of Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition and the interaction between Boldness and Disinhibition to the prediction of each STAB subscale. In each regression analysis, the main effects for the three subscales were entered in the first step and the interaction between Boldness and Disinhibition was entered in the second step. TriPM scales were centered for these analyses. The first step of the model predicting the STAB Rule-Breaking subscale was significant, $F(3, 165) = 11.51, p < .001, R^2 = .17$, although a significant main effect emerged only for the Disinhibition subscale (Table 5). Addition of the interaction term produced a significant increase in explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .05$). The final model was significant, $F(4, 164) = 9.86, p < .001, R^2 = .19$, with Boldness, Disinhibition, and the interaction term for Boldness and Disinhibition as significant predictors. The interaction revealed that at high levels of Boldness, increases in Disinhibition were especially associated with increases in Rule-Breaking.

The first step of the model predicting the STAB Physical Aggression subscale was significant, $F(3, 165) = 37.60, p < .001, R^2 = .41$, with significant main effects for all TriPM subscales. Addition of the interaction term failed to significantly increase explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p = .097$). The final model remained significant, $F(4, 164) = 29.20, p < .001, R^2 = .42$, and all TriPM subscales remained significant as well.

The first step of the model predicting the STAB Social Aggression subscale was significant, $F(3, 165) = 15.28, p < .001, R^2 = .22$, with significant main effects for

Meanness and Disinhibition, but not Boldness. Addition of the interaction term did not significantly increase explained variance ($\Delta R^2 < .01, p = .383$). The final model was significant, $F(4, 164) = 11.64, p < .001, R^2 = .22$. In the final model, both Meanness and Disinhibition emerged as significant predictors.

Table 5
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Self-Reported STAB Scores

Variable	STAB Rule-Breaking			STAB Physical			STAB Social		
	B	SE	β	B	SE	β	B	SE	β
STEP 1									
Boldness	.02	.01	.14	-.10	.04	-.15*	-.07	.04	-.13
Meanness	.01	.01	.08	.39	.05	.56**	.22	.05	.39**
Disinhibition	.05	.01	.35**	.14	.05	.18**	.10	.05	.16*
STEP 2									
Boldness	.02	.01	.17*	-.11	.04	-	-.08	.04	-.14
						.16**			
Meanness	.01	.01	.08	.39	.05	.57**	.22	.05	.39**
Disinhibition	.05	.01	.36**	.13	.05	.18**	.10	.05	.16*
Boldness X Disinhibition	.00	.00	.15*	-.01	.01	-.10	-.01	.01	-.06

Note. STAB = Subtypes of Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Utility of Self-and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy in Predicting Altruistic Behavior

The bivariate correlations between self-and roommate-reported psychopathic traits and altruistic behaviors are presented in Table 6. Self-reported psychopathy was positively correlated with self-reported altruism ($r = .20, p < .01$), but not roommate-reported altruism. Interestingly, for self- and roommate-reported psychopathy, each subscale was positively associated with self-reported altruism, although only the correlations for Boldness reached significance. Notably, this finding appears to be

primarily driven by ratings from female roommates ($r = .45$), with male roommates instead demonstrating a negative, though nonsignificant, association between self-reported Boldness and prosocial behavior ($r = -.11$). Self- and roommate-reported Boldness were also significantly and positively correlated with roommate-reported altruism, in the absence of significant differences according to gender. In contrast with these positive associations, roommate-reported Meanness negatively predicted roommate-reported altruism. The Disinhibition subscale did not demonstrate significant relations with altruism within or across perspectives.

The semipartial correlations for self- and roommate-reported psychopathy and altruism are reported in Table 6. Evidence of incremental validity for altruism was restricted to within perspective ratings. Specifically, self-reported Boldness incrementally predicted self-reported altruism, whereas roommate-reported Boldness and Meanness incrementally predicted roommate-reported altruism.

Table 6

Correlations Between Self and Roommate-Reported Psychopathy and Altruism

Scale	Self-Reported SRA		Roommate-Reported SRA	
	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>sr</i>
Self-Report				
TriPM Total	.20**	.14	.05	.09
TriPM Boldness	.27**	.17*	.16*	.03
TriPM Meanness	.01	.12	.03	.11
TriPM Disinhibition	.14	.03	-.09	-.06
Roommate-Report				
TriPM Total	.15	.04	-.07	-.10
TriPM Boldness	.18*	.09	.28**	.24**
TriPM Meanness	.02	-.02	-.26**	-.27**
TriPM Disinhibition	.13	.11	-.14	-.10

Note. Bolded correlations indicate significant semipartial correlations. *sr* = semipartial correlations; SRA = Self-Reported Altruism Scale; TriPM =Triarchic Psychopathy Measure.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Psychopathic Traits and Positive Impression Management

In terms of impression management, self-reported PIM was negatively associated with self-reported Disinhibition ($r = -.38, p < .01$) and Meanness ($r = -.15, p < .01$). Self-reported Boldness and PIM, however, demonstrated a strong positive correlation ($r = .48, p < .01$). Perhaps related to previously described gender differences regarding elevations in average self-reported Boldness and PIM for men, the association between Boldness and PIM was significantly stronger for male participants ($r = .64$) relative to female participants ($r = .39, p < .05$).

Value Judgements of Psychopathic Traits

Table 7 presents average ratings of normalcy, social desirability, personal advantageousness, and prosociality for TriPM items by subscale. Results suggest that

individuals view Boldness relatively favorably ($M = 3.54-3.76$, $SD = .46-.48$) compared with Meanness ($M = .63-1.09$, $SD = .55-.70$) and Disinhibition ($M = .56-.88$, $SD = .45-.59$), though all were described as somewhat uncommon ($M = 1.96-2.31$, $SD = .46-.75$).²

Table 7
Value Judgments of Psychopathic Traits

Subscale	Normal <i>M (SD)</i>	Soc. Desirable <i>M (SD)</i>	Advantageous <i>M (SD)</i>	Prosocial <i>M (SD)</i>
TriPM Boldness	2.31 (.46)	3.58 (.47)	3.76 (.48)	3.54 (.46)
TriPM Meanness	1.96 (.66)	.80 (.55)	1.09 (.70)	0.63 (.56)
TriPM Disinhibition	2.14 (.75)	.60 (.45)	.88 (.59)	.56 (.47)

Note. Ratings were based on a 6-point Likert scale (0 = “Not at All”; 5 = “Extremely”).

Comparisons between participants resembling “primary psychopathy” (i.e., those in the upper tercile of both TriPM Boldness and Disinhibition in the present sample; Gauracci et al., 2013; $n = 13$) and participants substantially lacking characteristics of this presentation (i.e., those in the lower tercile of both TriPM Boldness and Disinhibition; $n = 15$) suggest that individuals elevated in psychopathy perceive Meanness as more normative, $t(26) = 2.34$, $p < .05$, Cohen’s $d = .89$, more socially desirable, $t(26) = 2.35$, $p < .05$, Cohen’s $d = .89$, more personally advantageous, $t(26) = 2.66$, $p < .05$, Cohen’s $d = 1.01$, and more prosocial, $t(20) = 2.34$, $p < .05$, Cohen’s $d = .92$ (see Table 8). Further, those in the “primary” psychopathy group also rated Disinhibition as more normative,

² We further examined potential gender differences in attitudes towards each psychopathic dimension and found no significant differences for Boldness or Disinhibition; however men tended to view Meanness as more socially desirable, advantageous, and prosocial relative to women, $ps < .05$.

$t(23) = 2.20, p < .05$, Cohen's $d = .80$, more socially desirable, $t(15) = 3.63, p < .01$, Cohen's $d = 1.45$, more personally advantageous, $t(16) = 4.08, p < .01$, Cohen's $d = 1.26$, and more prosocial, $t(16) = 2.67, p < .05$, Cohen's $d = 1.06$. Participants resembling "primary" psychopathy and those lacking core psychopathic traits did not significantly differ in their attitudes towards Boldness.

Table 8
Comparison of Value Judgments in Upper and Lower Psychopathy Terciles

Group	<u>Boldness</u>			
	Normal <i>M (SD)</i>	Soc. Desirable <i>M (SD)</i>	Advantageous <i>M (SD)</i>	Prosocial <i>M (SD)</i>
Lower Tercile	2.34 (.36)	3.72 (.67)	3.79 (.62)	3.67 (.65)
Upper Tercile	2.57 (.72)	3.46 (.44)	3.74 (.52)	3.49 (.43)
Group	<u>Meanness</u>			
	Normal <i>M (SD)</i>	Soc. Desirable <i>M (SD)</i>	Advantageous <i>M (SD)</i>	Prosocial [†] <i>M (SD)</i>
Lower Tercile	1.53 (.71)*	.56 (.56)*	.66 (.56)*	.42 (.43)*
Upper Tercile	2.11 (.57)*	1.10 (.65)*	1.28 (.67)*	.95 (.70)*
Group	<u>Disinhibition</u>			
	Normal [†] <i>M (SD)</i>	Soc. Desirable [†] <i>M (SD)</i>	Advantageous [†] <i>M (SD)</i>	Prosocial [†] <i>M (SD)</i>
Lower Tercile	1.66 (.87)*	.33 (.21)**	.41 (.30)**	.30 (.24)**
Upper Tercile	2.24 (.50)*	.91 (.54)**	1.19 (.63)**	.75 (.56)**

Note. Ratings were based on a 6-point Likert scale (0 = "Not at All"; 5 = "Extremely"). Lower Tercile and Upper Tercile refer to participants with Boldness and Disinhibition scores in the lower or upper tercile of the sample, respectively.

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

[†] Equal variances not assumed.

In addition to group comparisons, we conducted exploratory analyses investigating the potential association between attitudes toward psychopathic traits and

prosocial/antisocial behaviors across the continuum of psychopathy scores in the present sample. Results demonstrated that participants' attitudes toward Boldness generally did not significantly relate to self-reported antisocial or altruistic behavior; however, perceptions of Boldness as normal were negatively associated with Social Aggression ($r = -.18, p < .05$) and perceptions of Boldness as personally advantageous were negatively associated with STAB Rule-Breaking ($r = -.19, p < .05$).

Participants' judgments related to Meanness, however, evinced more associations with self-reported antisocial, but not altruistic, behavior. In particular, participants' views of Meanness as normal positively predicted STAB Total ($r = .22, p < .01$), Rule-Breaking ($r = .18, p < .05$), and Physical Aggression ($r = .21, p < .01$). Judgments of Meanness as socially desirable were similarly related to STAB Total ($r = .17, p < .05$) and Rule-Breaking ($r = .28, p < .01$). Participant perceptions of meanness as personally advantageous were positively correlated with STAB Total ($r = .34, p < .01$) as well as each subtype of misconduct (Rule-Breaking, $r = .20, p < .05$; Physical Aggression, $r = .30, p < .01$; Social Aggression, $r = .28, p < .01$). Lastly, participants' perceptions of Meanness as prosocial were positively associated with STAB Total ($r = .19, p < .05$), Rule-Breaking ($r = .22, p < .01$), and Physical Aggression ($r = .18, p < .05$).

Value judgments of Disinhibition likewise displayed several significant positive associations with self-report antisocial, but not altruistic, behavior. Participants' views of Disinhibition as normal positively predicted STAB Total ($r = .19, p < .05$) and Social Aggression ($r = .22, p < .01$). Viewing Disinhibition as socially desirable was related to STAB Total ($r = .16, p < .05$) and Rule-Breaking ($r = .20, p < .05$). Perceptions of

Disinhibition as personally advantageous showed a relatively strong and pervasive association to antisocial behavior, predicting STAB Total ($r = .26, p < .01$) and each subtype of misconduct (Rule-Breaking, $r = .23, p < .01$; Physical Aggression, $r = .21, p < .01$; Social Aggression, $r = .22, p < .01$). Judgments of Disinhibition as prosocial were significantly related only to Rule-Breaking ($r = .18, p < .05$).

Finally, we used a series of hierarchical regression analyses to examine the incremental validity of value judgments in predicting behavior beyond the predictive utility of self- and roommate psychopathy ratings. Contrary to the study hypothesis, the addition of participants' value judgment ratings to the models did not increase explained variance for any self-reported behaviors ($\Delta R^2 n.s.$, see Table 9). Results provided weak evidence for several individual value judgments contributing unique variance to the prediction of specific subtypes of antisocial behavior. For example, findings suggest that perceptions of Disinhibition as normal and perceptions of Meanness as personally advantageous may incrementally predict the frequency of social aggression beyond self and informant-ratings of psychopathic traits. In general, however, no clear pattern emerged regarding these results.

Table 9
Incremental Utility of Value Judgments in Predicting Antisocial Behavior

Variable	STAB Rule-Breaking				STAB Physical				STAB Social			
	B	SE	β	ΔR^2	B	SE	β	ΔR^2	B	SE	β	ΔR^2
STEP 1				.02				.02				.00
Self-Boldness	.02	.01	.16		.05	.06	.08		-.02	.05	-.04	
Other-Boldness	-.01	.01	-.07		-.11	.06	-.17		-.01	.05	-.01	
STEP 2				.06				.03				.05
Self-Boldness	.02	.01	.17		.06	.06	.09		-.02	.05	-.03	
Other-Boldness	-.01	.01	-.05		-.12	.06	-.19*		-.02	.05	-.03	
Boldness NRM	-.24	.17	-.11		-.95	.95	-.08		-1.77	.76	-.19*	
Boldness SD	-.24	.27	-.11		-.20	1.46	-.02		-1.66	1.18	-.18	
Boldness ADV	-.49	.24	-.24*		1.93	1.31	.17		.93	1.06	.10	
Boldness PRO	.57	.26	.26*		-1.63	1.44	-.14		.21	1.16	.02	

Variable	STAB Rule-Breaking				STAB Physical				STAB Social			
	B	SE	β	ΔR^2	B	SE	β	ΔR^2	B	SE	β	ΔR^2
STEP 1				.05*				.26**				.13**
Self-Meanness	.03	.01	.20*		.27	.06	.37**		.17	.05	.28**	
Other-Meanness	.01	.01	.06		.15	.04	.26**		.07	.04	.15	
STEP 2				.05				.04				.04
Self-Meanness	.02	.01	.13		.25	.06	.33**		.14	.05	.24**	
Other-Meanness	.01	.01	.05		.13	.04	.23**		.06	.04	.12	
Meanness NRM	.09	.13	.06		1.23	.63	.15		.39	.56	.06	
Boldness SD	.35	.21	.19		-1.25	1.02	-.13		.26	.90	.03	
Meanness ADV	.08	.13	.06		.99	.62	.13		1.20	.54	.19*	
Meanness PRO	-.05	.20	-.03		.51	.98	.05		-.64	.86	-.08	

Table 9 Continued

Variable	STAB Rule-Breaking				STAB Physical				STAB Social			
	B	SE	β	ΔR^2	B	SE	β	ΔR^2	B	SE	β	ΔR^2
STEP 1				.10**				.28**				.15**
Self-Disinhibition	.04	.01	.30**		.34	.05	.49**		.22	.04	.39**	
Other- Disinhibition	.00	.01	.03		.07	.05	.09		-.01	.04	.05	-.01
STEP 2				.03				.02				.04
Self- Disinhibition	.04	.01	.27**		.33	.05	.48**		.18	.05	.33**	
Other- Disinhibition	.00	.01	.01		.06	.05	.08		-.01	.05	-.01	
Disinhibition NRM	.05	.11	.04		.45	.54	.06		.92	.46	.16*	
Disinhibition SD	-.17	.28	-.07		-2.02	1.34	-.17		-.09	1.15	-.01	
Disinhibition ADV	.15	.17	.09		.56	.82	.06		.90	.71	.12	
Disinhibition PRO	.32	.26	.15		1.62	1.27	.14		-.03	1.09	.00	

Note. STAB = Subtypes of Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire; NRM = Normal; SD = Socially Desirable; ADV = Personally Advantageous; PRO = Prosocial.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The present study investigated self and informant agreement on reports of psychopathic traits and both antisocial and prosocial behaviors among a sample of undergraduate roommate dyads. Consistent with previous studies (Fowler & Lilienfeld, 2007; Miller et al., 2011) and our hypothesis, findings indicated significant convergence between self- and roommate-reports of triarchic model psychopathic traits at both the total and subscale levels. Further, analyses of mean differences in ratings between perspectives provided little evidence to suggest that selves in general are prone to under-reporting, or over-reporting, psychopathic tendencies ($d = .02-.25$). Overall, these results support the notion that individuals, including those relatively elevated in psychopathic traits, are cognizant of their personality characteristics and capable of providing self-reports that reasonably reflect the impressions of close others. Similarly, the observed self and roommate agreement concerning the frequency of social and physical aggression suggests that concerns about self-report measures' vulnerability to deceitfulness, socially desirable responding, and poor insight among antisocial individuals lack sufficient empirical justification, at least in undergraduate settings.

Importantly, however, the magnitude of self-informant agreement displayed in our sample was not as substantial as that observed in Miller et al. (2011) among community member participants (median $r = .64$). The population of study may at least partially account for this relative attenuation. In particular, Miller et al. specifically recruited individuals with elevations in psychopathic traits comparable to those found in incarcerated offenders, whereas our sample consisted of undergraduates possessing

ostensibly less severe psychopathic traits, and largely in the absence of high levels of criminal deviance (at least relative to other college student samples). It is possible that clinically significant levels of self-reported psychopathy enhance the convergence between self- and informant-reports of such traits, perhaps due to reduced ambiguity concerning their presence. Future studies examining self-other knowledge of psychopathy across the broad continuum of trait severity would allow for investigation of this potential moderator of agreement.

In addition, participants in Miller et al. had, on average, been acquainted for 12.5 years compared with 3.7 years in the present study. Although our results do indicate that psychopathic traits are readily detectable by peers in close proximity, the strength of self-roommate agreement was moderated by the length of time dyads had shared a residence, and, surprisingly, unrelated to the length of mere dyad acquaintanceship, as previous studies have found (e.g., Fowler & Lilienfeld, 2007). The importance of cohabitating a private space, as opposed to exclusively interacting in public venues, suggests that first impressions may not be sufficient to reliably detect psychopathic traits among undergraduate students. This finding runs contrary to previous results that individuals are capable of assessing the psychopathic traits of serious offenders rather accurately based on only brief behavioral observations (Fowler, Lilienfeld, & Patrick, 2009). Future research on particular contexts in which psychopathic traits are more easily discerned and the length of observational or interactional time necessary to make reliable and valid judgments of others present interesting avenues for future research.

Both self- and roommate-reports of psychopathic traits predicted antisocial behaviors, though different patterns of associations emerged depending on the source of information related to misconduct. Across psychopathy ratings, Meanness and Disinhibition generally manifested strong correlations with self- and roommate-reported antisociality. Boldness, however, was only predictive of roommate-reported antisociality and, interestingly, the direction of this association depended on the source of psychopathy ratings. Whereas self-reported Boldness was positively related to aggressive conduct, informant-reported Boldness tended to negatively relate to these behaviors, a divergence consistent with our findings that self-reported Boldness translates to roommate perceptions of Meanness and Disinhibition. Further, these findings are consonant with the association observed between psychopathy and altruistic behavior. Self-reported Boldness incrementally predicted self-, but not roommate-reported altruism, whereas roommate-reported Boldness and Meanness incrementally predicted roommate-reported altruism.

Returning to antisocial behavior, self-reported psychopathy scores provided the greatest evidence of incremental validity in the prediction of rule-breaking and social aggression, followed by physical aggression. When antisocial behavior was based on roommate-report, unique variance was contributed primarily by the Boldness subscale. On the other hand, for roommate-reported psychopathy, the Meanness subscale alone incrementally contributed to the prediction of self-reported antisocial behavior. These results generally reflect previous findings that informant ratings of psychopathy are of limited utility beyond self-report (Fowler & Lilienfeld, 2007; Jones, & Miller, 2011), but

restricts this conclusion to situations in which ratings of antisociality are also provided by self-report. That is, psychopathy and antisocial behavior are preferentially associated when ratings are perspective-consistent, with only one specific subscale of the alternative perspective of use in obtaining unique information.

These findings first contribute to the ongoing debate regarding the relevance of Boldness to psychopathy by identifying the source of predictor and criterion variables as an important factor in the magnitude and direction of associations between Boldness and antisocial outcomes. The centrality of Boldness to the construct of psychopathic personality disorder has largely been called into question due to its overwhelming association with healthy psychological adjustment and the absence of problems in daily living (e.g., Hart, Lim, & Cook, 2015). However, these findings are based on the use of perspective-consistent measurement of psychopathic traits and social-psychological outcomes. Based on findings of the present study, Boldness appears to be an egosyntonic trait, affording a favorable self-image and perceivable advantages with a characteristic optimism and carefreeness that could spuriously inflate associations with positive outcomes. Individuals who are the recipients of another's tendencies toward social dominance and fearlessness, on the other hand, may be more apt to perceive and experience harmful consequences. That is, just because Boldness does not incur negative ramifications from the perspective of the self does not necessarily mean this pattern of behavior is immune to injurious repercussions for others.

Secondly, our findings note that Boldness in relation to psychopathy can be better understood by evaluating its functioning alongside co-occurring psychopathic

traits. In examining interactions between Boldness and Disinhibition in the prediction of antisocial behavior, as demonstrated in previous studies (e.g., Marcus & Norris, 2014; Smith et al., 2013), we did find evidence of such an effect. The interaction revealed that at elevated levels of Boldness, increases in Disinhibition were especially associated with increases in criminal deviance. That is, the combination of a fearless, optimistic disposition with impulsive and reckless tendencies may substantially enhance the likelihood that an individual engages in opportunistic criminal activity.

Findings concerning participants' attitudes toward psychopathic traits revealed favorable impressions of Boldness in terms of social desirability, advantageousness for the self, and prosociality compared to Disinhibition and Meanness, with all domains described as somewhat atypical. The observed preference for characteristics of Boldness is consistent with our finding that this subscale was strongly linked to positive impression management (i.e., viewing oneself as free of minor faults and common shortcomings). Although psychopathy has traditionally been viewed in a negative light, the association between Boldness and positive impression management is not necessarily problematic in terms of the compatibility of the construct with historical conceptualizations of the disorder. In fact, Cleckley specifically described psychopaths as presenting with "desirable and superior human qualities" (p. 339). The parallelism between items on the TriPM Boldness subscale and the PIM scale (e.g., imperviousness to social avoidance, common worries, and moodiness) similarly indicates overlap in the measurement of these constructs.

Nevertheless, the potentially obfuscating presence of elevated positive impression management in conjunction with Boldness should be further explored. As mentioned, prior studies identifying associations between fearless features of psychopathy and healthy psychological adjustment have thus far exclusively employed self-report measures (e.g., Hart et al., 2015; Marcus et al., 2012). The present findings regarding impression management encourage replication of these associations using a variety of assessment modalities to reduce the possibility of spuriously inflated correlations from participant attempts to present themselves favorably. Indeed, while no mean differences in Boldness ratings were evident to suggest that selves systematically over-reported levels of social potency and venturesomeness, the modest magnitude of self-other agreement reflects considerable variability in reports at the dyadic level with a number of participants (17.2%) self-reporting a degree of Boldness one standard deviation or more above that reported by their roommate. Investigation of these particular individuals who perceive themselves as much more fearless and equanimous than others would attest presents an interesting avenue for continued research. Future studies among diverse samples (e.g., offender populations) should explore the potential for inflated Boldness ratings that overestimate informant perceptions, as well as the sources and associated variables of such discrepancies.

Results also support previous conjecture by Miller et al. (2011) that individuals elevated in core psychopathic features may hold distorted views concerning the deviant and harmful nature of their characteristic patterns of behavior. Participants resembling “primary” psychopathy judged Meanness and Disinhibition to be more normative,

socially desirable, advantageous, and prosocial than did those lacking psychopathic traits. Importantly, no difference between groups emerged regarding attitudes toward the social and personal value of Boldness, demonstrating that these discrepancies are not wholly attributable to a self-enhancing bias whereby present and absent traits are inherently valued and disparaged, respectively. Lastly, our analyses demonstrated that approving attitudes toward Meanness and Disinhibition are positively associated with multiple forms of antisocial behavior, though further investigation is needed to determine the causal direction of these relations.

Contrary to the study hypothesis, attitudes towards psychopathic traits did not generally predict prosocial or antisocial behavior beyond self- and roommate psychopathy ratings. Despite these limitations in incremental validity, however, systematic variation in attitudes toward psychopathic traits according to trait severity and the zero-order relation of these attitudes with subtypes of misconduct represents a novel contribution to the field with both theoretical and practical implications. For example, misguided appreciation of psychopathic traits may serve as motivation or justification for a variety of maladaptive behaviors, and the outcomes of challenging such cognitive distortions in a therapeutic setting merits further empirical attention. With respect to the assessment of psychopathy, these findings have the potential to add to the growing literature on “examiner effects” identified in studies on the field reliability of instruments employing structured clinical judgment, including the PCL-R and CAPP. Extant research on the relation between rater personality traits (e.g., Agreeableness, Extroversion) and perceptions of psychopathy in others is currently characterized by

mixed findings, with some evidence that raters' own psychopathic characteristics can lead to normalization of such traits and tendencies to provide lower psychopathy scores when evaluating others (Edens et al., 2013; Miller et al., 2011). For example, individuals relatively elevated in Meanness may possess a higher threshold for endorsing callous and egocentric actions as atypical or dysfunctional, leading to systematically lower ratings of psychopathy in others (Klimley & Carbonell, 2014). Further investigation of this possibility and direct examination of attitudes toward psychopathic traits presents an interesting extension of inquiries into the field reliability of psychopathy assessments.

Limitations of the present study should be noted. First, our sample was derived from a population of undergraduate roommates and examined an arguably restricted range of psychopathic traits. Accordingly, the extent to which our findings generalize to other populations (e.g., community, correctional, forensic) requires further investigation, as clinically significant elevations in psychopathy may be more frequently observed in these settings. In addition, it is important to acknowledge that participants in the present study did not experience contingencies related to the disclosure of psychopathic traits and antisocial behaviors. Discrepancies between self- and informant-reporting leading to differential predictive utility may be more evident when selves are motivated by real-world consequences (e.g., sentencing decisions) to conceal such characteristics. Relatedly, few participants in our sample endorsed engaging in criminal behavior, and our results concerning the relation of psychopathic traits and attitudes with rule-breaking are thus restricted by truncated range.

The relatively modest self-roommate agreement regarding psychopathic personality traits may likewise be accounted for by the use of an undergraduate sample. As mentioned, participants in the present study had, on average, been acquainted for 3.7 years, and a notable portion of participants (14.9%) had known each other for one month or less. Undergraduate students may further display comparatively smaller magnitudes of agreement due to the continuing development of personality that occurs during young adulthood (e.g., Caspi & Roberts, 2001). Future research is likewise required to comprehensively examine the moderating effects of participant characteristics, such as age and gender, on self-roommate agreement in psychopathic personality domains. Longitudinal studies would provide a particularly interesting avenue of research, allowing for the measurement of changes in self-roommate agreement over time, as well as possible changes in self-roommate similarity.

Related to participant characteristics, we were able to identify several important gender differences, including greater endorsement of psychopathy, antisociality, prosocial behavior, and positive impression management among men relative to women, as well as variations in the strength (and sometimes direction) of associations between variables. Gender differences in the behavioral manifestation of psychopathic traits represents an understudied area in psychopathy research that merits further attention to better understand the nature and potential sources of these discrepancies. Importantly, our analyses incidentally included only same-sex roommates and the extent to which our findings generalize to opposite-sex informants requires additional investigation. Although we did not find conventionally significant differences in self-roommate

agreement between male and female dyads, it is possible that differences in convergence between same and opposite-sex dyads exist.

Finally, the present study does not answer the question of which perspective better reflects reality. For example, are individuals reporting elevations in Boldness far beyond informant-ratings expressing an ideal or fantastical view of the self rather than actual tendencies? Or do their roommates simply not know them well enough to have observed these genuine characteristics? And how can the source(s) of discrepancy be confidently ascertained in such dyads? Incorporating behavioral, physiological, and neurobiological referents of psychopathic traits into future studies of self-other convergence will likely assist in reliably identifying who is more accurate in his or her reporting. Similarly, prospective studies could be useful in assessing the value of self- and informant-reports of psychopathic traits in predicting future antisocial behaviors, in contrast with the concurrent measurement of our study design that captures only past misconduct. Given the large number of analyses and modest sample size, replication of findings is necessary before firm conclusions can be drawn. However, this research contributes to a growing body of literature suggesting that selves do possess insight into psychopathic aspects of their personality, as indicated by significant self-informant agreement on personality ratings. Furthermore, our findings extend on this line of inquiry with novel empirical evidence that relatively psychopathic individuals instead lack complete insight into the normalcy and harmfulness of their behavior.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. L., Sellbom, M., Wygant, D. B., & Edens, J. F. (2013). Examining the necessity for and utility of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory—Revised (PPI-R) validity scales. *Law and Human Behavior, 37*(5), 312-320.
- Blackburn, R., Donnelly, J. P., Logan, C., & Renwick, S. J. (2004). Convergent and discriminative validity of interview and questionnaire measures of personality disorder in mentally disordered offenders: A multitrait-multimethod analysis using confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 18*(2), 129-150.
- Burt, S. A., & Donnellan, M. B. (2009). Development and validation of the Subtypes of Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior, 35*(5), 376-398.
- Carlson, E. N., Vazire, S., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2013). Self-other knowledge asymmetries in personality pathology. *Journal of Personality, 81*(2), 155-170.
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The mask of sanity*. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby.
- Cooke, D. J., Hart, S. D., Logan, C., & Michie, C. (2004). *Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality-Institutional Rating Scale (CAPP-IRS)*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Glasgow Caledonian University.
[Website] <http://www.gcu.ac.uk/capp/index.html>
- Edens, J. F., Boccaccini, M. T., & Johnson, D. W. (2010). Inter-rater reliability of the PCL-R total and factor scores among psychopathic sex offenders: Are personality features more prone to disagreement than behavioral features?. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 28*, 106-119.

- Edens, J. F., Clark, J., Smith, S. T., Cox, J., & Kelley, S. (2013). Bold, smart, dangerous and evil: Perceived correlates of core psychopathic traits among jury panel members. *Personality and Mental Health, 7*, 143-153.
- Edens, J. F., Hart, S. D., Johnson, D. W., Johnson, J. K., & Olver, M. E. (2000). Use of the Personality Assessment Inventory to assess psychopathy in offender populations. *Psychological Assessment, 12*(2), 132-139.
- Edens, J. F., Magyar, M. S., & Cox, J. M. (2013). Taking psychopathy measures “out of the lab” and into the legal system: Some practical concerns. In K. A. Kiehl, & W. Sinnott-Armstrong (Eds.), *Handbook on psychopathy and law* (pp. 250-272). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Edens, J. F., & Petrila, J. (2006). Legal and ethical issues in the assessment and treatment of psychopathy. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 573-588). New York: Guilford.
- Edens, J. F., Skeem, J. L., & Kennealy, P. (2009). The Psychopathy Checklist in the courtroom: Consensus and controversies. In J. L. Skeem, K. S. Douglas, & S. O. Lilienfeld (Eds.), *Psychological science in the courtroom: Consensus and controversy* (pp. 175-201). New York: Guilford.
- DeMatteo, D., Heilbrun, K., & Marczyk, G. (2006). An empirical investigation of psychopathy in a noninstitutionalized and noncriminal sample. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 24*(2), 133-146.

- Fazio, R. H. (1986). How do attitudes guide behavior. In: R. M. Sorrentino, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior*. (pp. 204-243). New York: Guilford
- Fowler, K. A., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2007). The Psychopathy Q-Sort: Construct validity evidence in a nonclinical sample. *Assessment*, *14*(1), 75-79.
- Fowler, K. A., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2013). Alternatives to the Psychopathy Checklist - Revised. In K. A. Kiehl, & W. Sinnott-Armstrong (Eds.), *Handbook on psychopathy and law* (pp. 34-57). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, K. A., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Patrick, C. J. (2009). Detecting psychopathy from thin slices of behavior. *Psychological Assessment*, *21*, 68-78.
- Furnham, A., Daoud, Y., & Swami, V. (2009). "How to spot a psychopath:" Lay theories of psychopathy. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *44*, 464-472.
- Guarraci, S. M., Fishalow, J. L., Strickland, K. J., Strickland, C. M., Drislane, L. E., & Patrick, C. J. (2013, June). *Validation of a recruitment strategy using transdiagnostic dimensions*. Poster presented at the 5th Biennial Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Psychopathy, Washington, DC.
- Hall, J. R., & Benning, S. D. (2006). The "successful" psychopath: Adaptive and subclinical manifestations of psychopathy in the general population. In: C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy*. (pp. 459-481). New York: Guilford.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised manual (2nd ed.)*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

- Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2010). The role of antisociality in the psychopathy construct: Comment on Skeem & Cooke (2010). *Psychological Assessment, 22*, 446-454.
- Hart, S. D., Lim, Y., & Cook, A. (2015, March). *Evaluating the Triarchic Model of psychopathy: Is Boldness associated with problems in daily living?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, San Diego, CA.
- Helfgott, J. B. (1997, March). *The popular conception of the psychopath: Implications for criminal justice policy and practice.* Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Louisville, KY.
- Jones, S., & Miller, J. D. (2012). Psychopathic traits and externalizing behaviors: A comparison of self-and informant reports in the statistical prediction of externalizing behaviors. *Psychological Assessment, 24*(1), 255-260.
- Kenny, D. A. (1995). The effect of nonindependence on significance testing in dyadic research. *Personal Relationships, 2*, 67-75.
- Klimley, K. E., & Carbonell, J. (2014). *The influence of personality on individuals' ratings of psychopathy* (Honors thesis). Retrieved from <http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/uhm/435>
- Lilienfeld, S. O. (1994). Conceptual problems in the assessment of psychopathy. *Clinical Psychology Review, 14*(1), 17-38.
- Lilienfeld, S. O. (1998). Methodological advances and developments in the assessment of psychopathy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 36*, 99-125.

- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Fowler, K. A. (2006). The self-report assessment of psychopathy. In: C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy*. (pp. 107-132) New York: Guilford.
- 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). *Psychopathic Personality Inventory – Revised (PPI-R)*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- López, R., Poy, R., Patrick, C. J., & Moltó, J. (2013). Deficient fear conditioning and self-reported psychopathy: The role of fearless dominance. *Psychophysiology, 50*(2), 210-218.
- Lykken, D. T. (1995). *The antisocial personalities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.
- 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. (2012). The two-factor model of psychopathic personality: Evidence from the Psychopathic Personality Inventory. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 3*(2), 140-154.
- Marcus, D. K., & Norris, A. L. (2014). A new measure of attitudes toward sexually predatory tactics and its relation to the triarchic model of psychopathy. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 28*, 247-261.

- Miller, A. K., Rufino, K. A., Boccaccini, M. T., Jackson, R. L., & Murrie, D. C. (2011). On individual differences in person perception: Raters' personality traits relate to their Psychopathy Checklist-Revised scoring tendencies. *Assessment, 18*, 253-260.
- Miller, C. S., Kimonis, E. R., Otto, R. K., Kline, S. M., & Wasserman, A. L. (2012). Reliability of risk assessment measures used in sexually violent predator proceedings. *Psychological Assessment, 24*(4), 944-953.
- Miller, J. D., Jones, S. E., & Lynam, D. R. (2011). Psychopathic traits from the perspective of self and informant reports: Is there evidence for a lack of insight?. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 120*(3), 758-764.
- Miller, J. D., Lyman, D. R., Widiger, T. A., & Leukefeld, C. (2001). Personality disorders as extreme variants of common personality dimensions: Can the Five factor model adequately represent psychopathy?. *Journal of Personality, 69*(2), 253-276.
- Morey, L.C. (1991). *Personality Assessment Inventory professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Morey, L.C. (1997). *Personality Assessment Screener professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Murrie, D. C., Boccaccini, M. T., Guarnera, L. A., & Rufino, K. A. (2013). Are forensic experts biased by the side that retained them? *Psychological Science, 24*(10), 1889-1897.

- Nikolova, N. L., Hendry, M. C., Douglas, K. S., Edens, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2012). The inconsistency of inconsistency scales: A comparison of two widely used measures. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *30*, 16-27.
- Osumi, T., & Ohira, H. (2010). The positive side of psychopathy: Emotional detachment in psychopathy and rational decision-making in the ultimatum game. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *49*(5), 451-456.
- Patrick, C. J. (2010). *Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM)*. PhenX Toolkit Online assessment catalog. Retrieved from <http://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*(3), 913-938.
- Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2012). How “dark” are the Dark Triad traits? Examining the perceived darkness of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*, 884-889.
- Ray, J. V., Hall, J., Rivera-Hudson, N., Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Morano, M. (2013). The relation between self-reported psychopathic traits and distorted response styles: A meta-analytic review. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *4*(1), 1-14.
- Rogers, R., Dion, K. L., & Lynett, E. (1992). Diagnostic validity of antisocial personality disorder. *Law and Human Behavior*, *16*(6), 677-689.

- Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D., & Fekken, G. C. (1981). The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 2*(4), 293-302.
- Skeem, J. L. & Cooke, D. J. (2010). Is criminal behavior a central component of psychopathy? Conceptual directions for resolving the debate. *Psychological Assessment, 22*, 433-445.
- Smith, S. T., Edens, J. F., Clark, J., & Rulseh, A. (2014). “So, what *is* a psychopath?” Venireperson perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes about psychopathic personality. *Law and Human Behavior, 38*, 490-500.
- Smith, S. T., Edens, J. F., & McDermott, B. E. (2013). Fearless dominance and self-centered impulsivity interact to predict predatory aggression among forensic psychiatric inpatients. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 12*, 33-41.
- Smith, S. F., Lilienfeld, S. O., Coffey, K., & Dabbs, J. M. (2013). Are psychopaths and heroes twigs off the same branch? Evidence from college, community, and presidential samples. *Journal of Research in Personality, 47*(5), 634-646.
- Sörman, K., Edens, J. F., Smith, S. T., Svensson, O., Howner, K., Kristiansson, M., & Fischer, H. (in press). Forensic mental health professionals’ perceptions of psychopathy: A prototypicality analysis of the Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality in Sweden. *Law and Human Behavior*.

Sturup, J., Edens, J. F., Sörman, K., Karlberg, D., Fredriksson, B., & Kristiansson, M.

(2014). Field reliability of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised among life sentenced prisoners in Sweden. *Law and Human Behavior*, 38, 315-324.

Thomas, M. E. (2013). *Confessions of a sociopath: A life spent hiding in plain sight*.

New York: Crown.

Vitacco, M. J., & Neumann, C. S. (2008). The clinical assessment of psychopathy. In: R.

Jackson (Ed.), *Learning forensic assessment*. (pp. 129-152). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Zimmerman, M., & Coryell, W. H. (1990). Diagnosing personality disorders in the

community: a comparison of self-report and interview measures. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 47(6), 527-531.