

Operationalizing the Triarchic Conceptualization of Psychopathy: Preliminary
Description of Brief Scales for Assessment of Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition

Christopher J. Patrick

Florida State University

Unpublished manual, 2010. (Revised July, 2012; April, 2018; June, 2018)

Background:

Conceptualizing Psychopathy. The definition of the term psychopathy has been a matter of longstanding debate. As used today, the concept is generally considered to entail persistent behavioral deviancy in the company of emotional-interpersonal detachment. The origins of the term can be traced to French physician Philippe Pinel, who applied the term *manie sans delire* (“insanity without delirium”) to individuals who exhibited impulsively violent behavior while otherwise appearing sound in mind.¹ Modern conceptualizations derive from Hervey Cleckley’s classic book, *The Mask of Sanity*.² Cleckley sought to clarify and narrow the scope of the diagnosis, which had expanded since Pinel to encompass a diverse array of conditions. Cleckley described psychopathy as a deep-rooted emotional pathology masked by an outward appearance of robust mental health. Unlike other psychiatric patients who appear obviously disturbed, psychopaths present initially as confident, personable, and psychologically well adjusted, but reveal their underlying disturbance over time through their attitudes and actions.

Notably, Cleckley did not describe psychopathic patients as characteristically violent, predatory, or deliberately cruel. Rather, he viewed the harm they did to others as a byproduct of their shallow, feckless natures. In contrast, other influential writers of Cleckley’s time who focused on psychopathy in criminal offenders emphasized coldness, viciousness, and exploitativeness. For example, McCord & McCord³ identified ‘lovelessness’ (inability to form deep attachments) and ‘guiltlessness’ (absence of remorse) as the essence of the disorder.

A *triarchic model* was recently proposed to integrate alternative historic conceptualizations of the disorder with empirical findings for the best-established assessment instruments in use with adults and youth.⁴ According to this model, psychopathy encompasses three distinct phenotypic constructs: *disinhibition*—reflecting tendencies toward impulsiveness, irresponsibility, oppositionality, and anger/hostility; *boldness*—defined as the nexus of high dominance, low anxiousness, and venturesomeness; and *meanness*—reflecting tendencies toward callousness, cruelty, predatory aggression, and excitement seeking. From this perspective, Cleckley and his contemporaries differed in the emphasis they assigned to boldness versus meanness in conceptualizing psychopathy, while similarly emphasizing disinhibition (deficient impulse control).

In terms of these three constructs, the adult criteria for antisocial personality disorder in the current edition of the DSM can be viewed as indexing disinhibition to a substantial degree (through criteria of *impulsivity/failure to plan ahead* and *consistent irresponsibility*, as well as through criteria of *repeated wrongdoing*, *deceitfulness*, *irritability/aggressiveness*, and *reckless disregard*), and meanness to a lesser degree (through the criterion “lacks remorse,” and less directly through criteria of *repeated wrongdoing*, *deceitfulness*, *irritability/aggressiveness*, and *reckless disregard*), with negligible representation of the construct of boldness.

Etiologic Influences Contributing to Differing Phenotypic Components of Psychopathy. Recent twin studies point to differing causal factors underlying the disinhibition component as compared to the boldness and meanness components.⁵⁻⁶ In terms of brain mechanisms, disinhibition or *externalizing* (reflecting poor planfulness, impaired affect regulation of affect, and deficient behavioral restraint) can be viewed as arising from impairments in the functioning of higher brain systems—including the prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate cortex—that operate to guide and inhibit behavior and regulate emotional responses.⁷⁻⁸ As a result, high externalizing individuals operate in the present moment, failing

to moderate their actions and reactions as a function of past experiences or anticipated future outcomes.⁹

In contrast, boldness (entailing a capacity to remain calm under pressure and recover quickly from stressors, high social efficacy, and a tolerance for unfamiliarity and danger) can be conceptualized as an adaptive phenotypic expression of an underlying fearless disposition (genotype).^{9, 10} Deviations in responsiveness of lower brain structures including the amygdala have been posited to play a role in this underlying disposition.¹¹ In addition, it seems likely that other factors (e.g., superior functioning of affective-regulatory circuitry in the brain; parental influences that promote competence and mastery) also contribute to phenotypic boldness.^{4, 9}

The third thematic construct, meanness (aka callous-aggressiveness), entails deficient empathy, disdain for and lack of close attachments with others, rebelliousness, excitement seeking, exploitativeness, and empowerment through cruelty. The external correlates of the *callous-unemotional* factor of Frick's Antisocial Process Screening Device (see below)—including low anxiety/emotional stability, diminished behavioral and brain response to aversive events, heightened tolerance for unfamiliarity and risk)^{12-15, 22}—point to low dispositional fear as one substrate for meanness. However, meanness represents a pathological expression of low fear—one involving a profound lack of social connectedness. From this perspective, factors that contribute to interpersonal detachment would be expected to shape fearlessness in the direction of meanness as opposed to boldness. Environmental influences likely to promote meanness include punitive parenting⁴ and early exposure to physical or sexual abuse.¹⁶ There are likely distinctive constitutional-genetic influences that contribute as well.

Procedures for the Assessment of Psychopathy:

Psychopathy in Adult Offender Samples. The Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R)¹⁷ was developed to assess psychopathy as described by Cleckley in incarcerated offender samples. Its 20 items refer extensively to criminal acts/attitudes and capture the affective-interpersonal and behavioral deviancy features identified by Cleckley, but not the positive adjustment features. Most notably, absence of nervousness and anxiety/mood disorder symptomatology is not part of the PCL-R definition. High overall scores on the PCL-R are associated with impulsive and aggressive tendencies, low affiliation, low empathy, Machiavellianism, and persistent violent offending. This picture is more in line with the mean/disinhibited conception of criminal psychopathy advanced by Cleckley's contemporaries than with Cleckley's own portrayal of psychopathic inpatients as bold and disinhibited.

Although developed to index psychopathy as a unitary syndrome, the PCL-R nonetheless contains distinctive factors: an affective-interpersonal factor (divisible into affective and interpersonal facets),¹⁸ and an antisocial deviancy factor (divisible into impulsive-irresponsible and antisocial behavior facets).¹⁷ Reflecting the unitary conception of psychopathy that guided the PCL-R's development, the two factors and their constituent facets show moderate correlations with one another. Factor 1 is associated with pathological proclivities including high narcissism, low empathy, and use of instrumental aggression.^{17, 19} Controlling for overlap with Factor 2, PCL-R Factor 1 also shows some relations with adaptive tendencies (e.g., low fearfulness, low distress/anxiety, low depression⁷). In contrast, Factor 2 is mainly associated with deviant tendencies, including: high impulsivity, general sensation seeking, and aggressiveness (in particular, reactive aggression); early and persistent antisocial deviance; and alcohol and drug problems.^{17, 19}

From the standpoint of the triarchic model of psychopathy, Factor 1 of the PCL-R can be viewed as capturing meanness along with some elements of boldness.⁴ PCL-R Factor 2 can be viewed as tapping disinhibition and to a lesser extent meanness. The correlation between Factor 1 and Factor 2 is largely attributable to overlapping representation of meanness (aka callous-aggressiveness).²⁰

Psychopathy in Conduct-Disordered Youth. A number of clinical-diagnostic instruments have been developed to assess psychopathy in children and adolescents. The most widely researched of these is the Antisocial Process Screening Device (APSD),²¹ designed for use with children exhibiting behavioral problems. The APSD was patterned after the PCL-R and includes 20 items that are completed by parents or teachers. Its items index two distinctive factors: a Callous-Unemotional (CU) factor reflecting emotional insensitivity and interpersonal callousness; and an Impulsive/Conduct Problems (I/CP) factor reflecting impulsiveness, behavioral deviancy, and inflated self-importance. High I/CP children with low scores on the CU factor show diminished intellectual ability, high anxiety and negative emotional reactivity, and frequent reactive (but not instrumental-premeditated) aggression.^{12-14, 23} In contrast, children high in CU as well as I/CP tendencies appear intellectually normal, are attracted to activities entailing novelty and risk, score lower on anxiety and neuroticism measures, and are less reactive to distressing stimuli and learn less readily from punishment. They also exhibit high levels of both proactive and reactive aggression and engage more persistently in violent behavior across time.

Although most research with the APSD has focused on the two factor model, some published work supports an alternative structural model in which some items from the I/CP factor cohere together with some items from the CU factor to form a third “narcissism” factor.²⁵ Three of the items comprising this factor (*can be charming, brags excessively, uses or ‘cons’ others*) are highly similar to items associated with the interpersonal facet of PCL-R Factor 1¹⁸—the component of the PCL-R that is most closely linked to the construct of boldness.^{24,26} Thus, like the PCL-R, the APSD can be viewed as indexing disinhibition and meanness, and to a lesser extent boldness, in its measurement of the psychopathy construct.

Psychopathy in Non-Offender Samples. The most widely-used approach to assessing psychopathy in non-criminal samples has involved self-report inventories. Traditional self-report measures of psychopathy (e.g., MMPI Psychopathic Deviate scale, CPI Socialization scale, MCMII Antisocial PD scale) have emphasized measurement of the antisocial deviancy (Factor 2) component of psychopathy. From the standpoint of the triarchic model, these measures can be viewed as indexing the disinhibitory component of psychopathy, and to a lesser degree the meanness component. A notable exception is the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI),^{27, 28} designed to comprehensively index personality traits embodied in Cleckley’s description.

The original research version of the PPI consisted of 181 items;²⁷ the published revised version consists of 154 items.²⁸ The items of the PPI are organized into unidimensional subscales, each tapping a relevant dispositional construct. Unlike the PCL-R, the PPI includes specific scales tapping lack of anxiousness (Stress Immunity) and deficient fear (Fearlessness), along with scales indexing dominance (Social Potency), impulsivity (Carefree Nonplanfulness), oppositionality (Rebellious Nonconformity), alienation (Blame Externalization), aggressive exploitativeness (Machiavellian Egocentricity), and lack of empathic concern (Coldheartedness). Exploratory factor analyses of the 8 subscales of the PPI

have revealed two higher-order factors.^{29,30} The first (PPI-I) is defined by the Social Potency, Stress Immunity, and Fearlessness subscales, the second (PPI-II) by the Carefree Nonplanfulness, Rebellious Nonconformity, Blame Externalization, and Machiavellian Egocentricity scale. (Note: The eighth PPI subscale, Coldheartedness, does not load distinctively on either of these higher-order factors.) Benning et al.³¹ labeled these factors *Fearless Dominance* and *Impulsive Antisociality*. From the standpoint of the triarchic model, PPI-I can be viewed as indexing boldness more purely than Factor 1 of the PCL-R—which appears to tap meanness more predominantly, and boldness to a lesser degree.⁴ Consistent with this interpretation, scores on PPI-I are associated with some indicators of personal and social efficacy (e.g., higher well-being; higher interpersonal assertiveness; lower anxiousness and depression) as well as with measures of narcissism, low empathy, and thrill seeking. PPI-II can be viewed as tapping the disinhibition component of psychopathy, and to some degree the meanness (callous-aggressiveness) component. In line with this perspective, scores on PPI-II are more uniformly indicative of deviancy—including impulsivity and aggressiveness, child and adult antisocial behavior, substance problems, high negative affect, and suicidal ideation.³¹

Brief Triarchic Scales:

The brief Triarchic scales were developed by our lab group to specifically index the boldness, meanness, and disinhibition components of psychopathy as distinctive constructs; collectively, these scales comprise the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM). Appendix A provides a listing of the items comprising these three scales.

The source of items for the brief (19-item) Boldness scale is a new inventory³² developed to extend and refine measurement of the ‘fearless dominance’ construct indexed by scores on Factor 1 of the PPI. As noted above in the description of the PPI, this factor of the PPI is important to assess because it: (1) captures the imperturbability and social efficacy features of psychopathy highlighted by Cleckley; (2) shows convergent validity in relation to measures of narcissism, thrill-seeking, and (lack of) empathy; and (3) captures unique variance in Factor 1 of the PCL-R—in particular, its Interpersonal facet.³¹ The Boldness Inventory contains 9 subscales consisting of items that index boldness in the realms of interpersonal behavior (Persuasiveness, Social Assurance, and Dominance subscales), emotional experience (Resiliency, Self-Assurance, and Optimism subscales), and venturesomeness (Valor, Intrepidness, and Tolerance for Uncertainty subscales).³¹ The brief Boldness scale includes representation of items from each of these 9 subscales. Scores on the brief Boldness scale correlate very highly with scores on PPI-I computed from the Social Potency, Stress Immunity, and Fearlessness subscales of the PPI (56 items total): $r = .77$ in a sample of 156 male prisoners.³²

The source of items for the brief (20-item) Disinhibition and brief (19-item) Meanness scales is the Externalizing Spectrum Inventory (ESI).^{33,41} The ESI was developed to comprehensively assess problem behaviors and traits within the domain of disinhibitory ('externalizing') psychopathology as represented in DSM-IV. It includes 415 items organized into 23 subscales that index constructs involving impulsivity and stimulation seeking, aggression of various types, alienation and externalization of blame, theft and dishonesty, and substance use and abuse. Confirmatory factor analyses of these 23 scales yielded evidence of an overarching 'externalizing' factor on which all subscales loaded substantially (.45 or higher), and subsidiary 'callous aggression' and 'addictions' subfactors that accounted for residual

variance in some subscales. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics (*Ms*, *SDs*) for the three brief Triarchic scales in different non-offender and offender samples.

Scores on the overarching externalizing factor of the ESI reflect general proneness to disinhibition in varying forms; higher scores on this broad factor are associated with lower CPI Socialization ($r = -.61$), lower dispositional restraint ($r = -.54$), higher dispositional negative affectivity ($r = .74$), and higher scores on established inventories of antisocial deviance ($r = .83$) and alcohol and drug abuse ($r_s = .64$ and $.61$, respectively).³⁴ The brief Disinhibition scale consists of items from the following ESI subscales, which exhibit the highest and purest loadings on the broad ESI externalizing factor: Irresponsibility, Problematic Impulsivity, Theft, Alienation, Boredom Proneness, Impatient Urgency, Fraudulence, Dependability (-), and Planful Control (-). Scores on the brief Disinhibition scale correlate very highly ($r = .97$) with scores on the broad externalizing factor of the full 415-item ESI.⁴¹ Scores on the brief Disinhibition scale correlate minimally with scores on the brief Boldness scale.⁴²

The callous aggression subfactor of the ESI reflects tendencies toward proactive/predatory aggression, distinct from angry/reactive aggressive tendencies associated with general externalizing (disinhibition); ESI scales with appreciable loadings on the callous aggression subfactor include Relational Aggression, Empathy (-), Destructive Aggression, Physical Aggression, Excitement Seeking, and Honesty (-). The brief Meanness scale was formed by selecting items from these scales that operate primarily as indicators of the callous aggression subfactor, and only secondarily as indicators of the general externalizing (disinhibition) factor.⁴¹ In particular, Relational Aggression and Empathy subscales as a whole load more strongly on the callous aggression subfactor than on the general externalizing factor, and thus items from these two scales are represented most strongly in the brief Meanness scale. Scores on the brief Meanness scale correlate highly ($r = .65$) with scores on the callous aggression subfactor of the full 415-item ESI. Scores on the brief Meanness scale correlate moderately ($r \sim .4$) with scores on the brief Disinhibition scale and modestly ($r \sim .2$) with scores on the brief Boldness scale.

Table 2 depicts predictive associations between scores on the brief Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition scales and PCL-R scores in terms of: (1) simple correlations for each individual brief scale, and (2) regression betas for prediction of PCL-R scores using the three brief scales in combination. From the regression betas in particular (i.e., which indicate unique relations for each predictor scale after controlling for overlap with other scales), it can be seen that each brief scale is selectively associated with a particular lower-order facet of the PCL-R:¹⁷ The Boldness scale is most related to the PCL-R Interpersonal facet, reflecting charm, grandiosity, deceitfulness, and manipulativeness; the Meanness scale is most related to the Affective facet, reflecting callousness, absence of remorse, shallow affect, and blame externalization; and the Disinhibition scale is most related to the Lifestyle facet, reflecting impulsiveness, irresponsibility, boredom proneness, parasitic lifestyle, and lack of long-term plans. Notably, all three Triarchic scales contribute separately to prediction of the Antisocial Behavior facet of the PCL-R, reflecting early behavior problems, juvenile delinquency, aggressiveness, criminal versatility, and propensity to re-offend after release from prison. The implication is that dispositions toward boldness, meanness, and disinhibition each contribute to persistent criminal behavior in individuals who become incarcerated. Another notable point that emerges from Table 2 is that, while each brief Triarchic scale shows only a modest ($.2-.3$) correlation with overall PCL-R psychopathy when considered alone, the three scales predict total PCL-R to a markedly higher degree ($r \sim .5$) when used together as predictors. This is

because: (1) scores on the three brief scales are only modestly interrelated, and (2) the three scales account for different aspects of psychopathy as indexed by the PCL-R.

Comparison of Brief Triarchic Scales with Other Existing Self-Report Psychopathy Measures:

Older self-report inventories that purportedly assess for psychopathic tendencies (e.g., MMPI Psychopathic Deviate scale, CPI Socialization scale, MCMI Antisocial PD scale) index mainly the antisocial deviance (Factor 2) component of psychopathy.¹⁷ Newer inventories including the PPI, Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (LSRP),³⁵ and Hare Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP)³⁶⁻³⁷ appear to tap affective-interpersonal (Factor 1) features of psychopathy along with antisocial deviance features. From the standpoint of the Five-Factor Model (FFM) model of personality operationalized in terms of the NEO-PI inventory, Lynam and colleagues⁴⁴ have argued that low dispositional Agreeableness (aka high Antagonism) represents the nexus of affective-interpersonal and social deviance elements of psychopathy.¹⁷ However, each of these approaches to the assessment of psychopathy has certain limitations. The PPI is lengthy for use as a screening instrument (i.e., current revised version consists of 154 items); an abbreviated (56-item) version is available, but minimal published validity data are available for this version. The latest (third) version of the SRP is quite new and has not been extensively validated. In contrast with the PPI, the items of the LSRP and NEO-Agreeableness/Antagonism measures do not include coverage of the Boldness component of psychopathy. As a result, these measures are likely to demonstrate less than optimal convergence with measures such as the PCL-R and PPI that do include Boldness-related item content. For example, a large-sample study reported weaker prediction of PCL-R total scores for the LSRP ($r = .30$) compared with the PPI ($r = .43$).³⁸ In addition, data from this study indicated that the Primary and Secondary subscales of the LSRP both showed substantial convergence with Factor 2 of the PPI ($r_s > .60$), but minimal convergence with PPI Factor 1 ($r_s < .13$).

In contrast with other available self-report measures, the brief Triarchic scales (which collectively comprise the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure [TriPM]) provide systematic coverage of the Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition components of psychopathy in a time-efficient manner. The brief Triarchic scales are not proprietary and thus can be freely disseminated to interested researchers. The items of the brief Boldness scale are drawn from a larger inventory that was developed to refine assessment of the fearless dominance construct indexed by PPI Factor 1; scores on the brief Boldness scale correlate very highly ($\sim .8$) with scores on PPI-I. The implication is that the brief Boldness scale captures features of psychopathy in common with PPI-I that account for variance in PCL-R scores over and above that accounted for by the LSRP.³⁸ Regarding the brief Meanness and Disinhibition scales, items for these scales are drawn from a comprehensive inventory of externalizing problems and traits that has demonstrated validity in relation to criterion measures of child and adult antisocial behavior, alcohol and drug abuse, and traits known to predict problems of these types.^{34, 46}

Data from two male offender samples ($N_s = 157$ and 169 ; see Table 2)²⁶ indicate that scores on the three brief Triarchic scales account for differing facets of PCL-R psychopathy, and in combination predict overall scores on the PCL-R to a level comparable to the highest magnitude reported for the PPI (i.e., $> .5$). It should be noted that correlations in the range of $.4$ -. $.6$ represent associations of expected magnitude for indices of the *same construct* (in this case, psychopathy) assessed in differing measurement domains (i.e., self-report vs. interview-based

clinical diagnosis).^{39, 40} As an illustration of this point, Table 3 depicts (for a large, mixed-gender sample of college students; $N = 631$) predictive associations between scores on the brief Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition scales and overall scores on other established psychopathy inventories in terms of: (1) simple correlations for each individual brief scale, and (2) regression betas for prediction of scores on other measures using the three brief scales in combination. It can be seen that the largest R values in this case (for the PPI, SRP-III, and YPI) all exceed a value of .65, consistent with what one would expect of indices of the same construct assessed within the same measurement domain (i.e., self-report). From the regression betas (i.e., reflecting unique relations for each predictor scale after controlling for overlap with other scales), it can be seen that overall scores on the PPI, SRP-III, and YPI measures reflect all three triarchic constructs (boldness, meanness, disinhibition)—albeit to somewhat varying degrees (i.e., boldness and meanness are weighted more heavily in PPI scores, whereas meanness and disinhibition are weighted more strongly in SRP-III and YPI scores). In contrast, it is evident from the simple correlations and regression betas that scores on the LSRP and NEO-Antagonism measures reflect meanness and disinhibition only—with no representation of boldness in the case of the LSRP and weak representation in the case of NEO-Antagonism.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics (M/SD) for Brief Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition Scales in Non-Offender and Offender Samples

Sample	Boldness		Meanness		Disinhibition		Total	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Non-Offenders								
<i>College Sample 1</i>								
<i>Male (N=121)</i>	--	--	14.56	7.80	13.18	8.10	--	--
<i>Female (N=162)</i>	--	--	8.61	5.88	10.77	7.06	--	--
<i>All (N=283)</i>	--	--	11.15	7.37	11.80	7.60	--	--
<i>College Sample 2</i>								
<i>Male (N=260)</i>	36.13	6.74	15.54	7.51	15.39	7.70	67.24	14.97
<i>Female (N=325)</i>	31.70	7.79	10.91	7.31	14.70	7.06	57.32	14.74
<i>All (N=585)</i>	33.70	7.56	13.19	7.87	15.12	7.16	62.10	15.67
<i>Young Adult Community Sample</i>								
<i>Male (N=3630)</i>	32.15	6.90	18.48	7.44	13.83	8.66	64.46	--
Offenders								
<i>Prison Sample 1</i>								
<i>Male (N=194)</i>	--	--	22.25	12.57	39.47	11.80	--	--
<i>Female (N=118)</i>	--	--	10.73	8.62	33.09	13.32	--	--
<i>All (N=312)</i>	--	--	17.89	12.55	37.05	12.76	--	--
<i>Prison Sample 2</i>								
<i>Male (N=157)</i>	35.09	9.69	--	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Substance Abuse Treatment Sample</i>								
<i>Male (N=169)</i>	34.65	9.05	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: College Sample 1 = University of Minnesota undergraduate participants from Wave 3 of Krueger et al. (2007; Ref #33); College Sample 2 = Florida State University undergraduate participants from Drislane, Patrick, & Arsal (2014; Ref #42); Young Adult Community Sample = 20-year old Finnish soldier participants from Drislane et al. (2015; Ref #45); Prison Sample 1 = Minnesota state prisoner participants from Wave 3 of Krueger et al. (2007); Prison Sample 2 = Minnesota state prisoner participants from Venables, Hall, & Patrick (2014; Ref #43); Substance Abuse Treatment Sample = FL offender Substance-Treatment Program participants from Venables et al. (2014; Ref #43).

* $p < .05$

Table 2

Simple Correlations and Regression Betas for Prediction of PCL-R Total and Facet Scores from Brief Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition Scales in Two Male Offender Samples (Ns = 157 and 169)

PCL-R Score	Boldness		Meanness		Disinhibition		<i>R</i>
	<i>r</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>B</i>	
Prisoner Sample (<i>N</i> =157)							
Total	.35**	.29**	.37**	.12	.28*	.10	.47**
<i>Facet Scores:</i>							
Interpersonal	.38**	.34**	.24**	.06	.15	.06	.42**
Affective	.13	.07	.18*	.15	.07	-.07	.21**
Lifestyle	.15	.13	.36**	.04	.40**	.24**	.44**
Antisocial	.28**	.20**	.28**	.17*	.14	-.04	.36**
Substance Abuse Treatment Sample (<i>N</i> =169)							
Total	.20**	.20**	.40**	.15	.37**	.21**	.47**
<i>Facet Scores:</i>							
Interpersonal	.20**	.19*	.21*	.01	.31**	.33**	.40**
Affective	.18*	.04	.30**	.19*	.16*	.12	.32**
Lifestyle	-.03	.01	.24**	.04	.34**	.23**	.34**
Antisocial	.04	.02	.45**	.26**	.38**	.14	.47**

Note: Prison Sample = Minnesota state prisoner participants from Venables, Hall, & Patrick (2014; Ref #26); Substance Abuse Treatment Sample = FL offender Substance-Treatment Program participants from Venables et al. (2014; Ref #26). Correlations for Meanness and Disinhibition are based on variants of 19- and 20-item brief scales for these triarchic constructs, which correlate very highly ($r_s = .84$ and $.94$, respectively) with the 19- and 20-item scales (for details, see Venables et al., 2014, Note 1). *R* = multiple *R* for prediction of PCL-R scores from Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition scales together.

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

Table 3

Simple Correlations and Regression Betas for Prediction of Overall Scores on other Self-Report Psychopathy Measures from Brief Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition Scales in a Mixed-Gender College Sample (N = 631)

Psychopathy Measure	Boldness		Meanness		Disinhibition		<i>R</i>
	<i>r</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>B</i>	
PPI	.52*	.48*	.61*	.34*	.46*	.36*	.79*
SRP-III	.33*	.29*	.60*	.37*	.50*	.36*	.71*
YPI	.31*	.29*	.52*	.28*	.49*	.40*	.66*
LSRP	-.01	-.03	.38*	.24*	.42*	.30*	.47*
NEO-Antag	.18*	.11	.56*	.45*	.39*	.19*	.59*

Note: Data are from Drislane et al. (2014; Ref #42). PPI = Psychopathic Personality Inventory; SRP-III = Hare Self-Report Psychopathy Scale, vers. 3; YPI = Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory; LSRP = Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale; NEO-Antag = NEO-PI Antagonism factor. *R* = multiple *R* for prediction of PCL-R scores from Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition scales together.

* $p < .001$

References

- ¹ Pinel, P. (1962). *A treatise on insanity* (D. Davis, translator). New York: Hafner. (Original edition published in 1806)
- ² Cleckley, H. (1976). *The mask of sanity, 5th ed.* St. Louis, Mo.: Mosby. (Original edition published in 1941; 3rd edition, 1955)
- ³ McCord, W., & McCord, J. (1964). *The psychopath: An essay on the criminal mind.* Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- ⁴ Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Development and Psychopathology, 21*, 913-938.
- ⁵ Blonigen, D. M., Hicks, B. M., Patrick, C. J., Krueger, R. F., Iacono, W. G., & McGue, M. K. (2005). Psychopathic personality traits: Heritability and genetic overlap with internalizing and externalizing psychopathology. *Psychological Medicine, 35*, 637-648.
- ⁶ Viding, E., Blair, R. J. R., Moffitt, T. E., Plomin, R. (2005). Evidence for substantial genetic risk for psychopathy in 7-year-olds. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 46*, 592-597.
- ⁷ Patrick, C. J. (2008). Psychophysiological correlates of aggression and violence: An integrative review. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B (Biological Sciences), 363*, 2543-2555.
- ⁸ Venables, N. C., Foell, J., Yancey, J. R., Kane, M. J., Engle, R. W., & Patrick, C. J. (2018). Quantifying inhibitory control as externalizing proneness: A cross-domain model. *Clinical Psychological Science*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/2167702618757690
- ⁹ Patrick, C. J. (2018). Cognitive and emotional processing in psychopathy. In: C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy, 2nd ed.* (pp. 422-455). New York: Guilford Press.
- ¹⁰ Lykken, D. T. (1995). *The antisocial personalities.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- ¹¹ Vaidyanathan, U., Patrick, C. J., & Bernat, E. M. (2009). Startle reflex potentiation during aversive picture viewing as an index of trait fear. *Psychophysiology, 46*, 75-85.
- ¹² Frick, P. J., & Dickens, C. (2006). Current perspectives on conduct disorder. *Current Psychiatry Reports, 8*, 59-72.
- ¹³ Frick, P. J., & Morris, A. S. (2004). Temperament and developmental pathways to conduct problems. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*, 54-68.

- ¹⁴ Frick, P. J., & White, S. F. (2008). The importance of callous-unemotional traits for developmental models of aggressive and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49*, 359-375.
- ¹⁵ Marsh, A. A., Finger, E. C., Mitchell, G. V., Reid, M. E., Sims, C., Kosson, D. S. et al. (2008). Reduced amygdala response to fearful expressions in children and adolescents with callous-unemotional traits and disruptive behavior disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 165*, 712-720.
- ¹⁶ Caspi, A., McClay, J., Moffitt, T. E., Mill, J., Martin, J., Craig et al. (2002). Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science, 297*, 851-854.
- ¹⁷ Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist – Revised, 2nd ed.* Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.
- ¹⁸ Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment, 13*, 171-188.
- ¹⁹ Patrick, C. J. (2018). *Handbook of psychopathy, 2nd ed.* New York: Guilford Press.
- ²⁰ Drislane, L. E., & Patrick, C. J. (2017). Integrating alternative conceptions of psychopathic personality: A latent variable model of triarchic psychopathy constructs. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 31*, 110-132.
- ²¹ Frick, P. J., & Hare, R. D. (2001). *Antisocial Process Screening Device.* Toronto, Ontario: Multi Health Systems.
- ²² Brislin, S. J., Yancey, J. R., Perkins, E. R., Palumbo, I. M., Drislane, L. E., Salekin, R. T., Fanti, K. A., Kimonis, E. R., Frick, P. J., Blair, R. J., & Patrick, C. J. (2018). Callousness and affective face processing in adults: Behavioral and brain-potential indicators. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 9*, 122-132.
- ²³ Frick, P. J., Ray, J. V., Thornton, L. C., & Kahn, R. E. (2014). Can callous-unemotional traits enhance the understanding, diagnosis, and treatment of serious conduct problems in children and adolescents? A comprehensive review. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*, 1-57.
- ²⁴ Hall, J., Benning, S. D., & Patrick, C. J. (2004). Criterion-related validity of the three-factor model of psychopathy: Personality, behavior, and adaptive functioning. *Assessment, 11*, 4-16.
- ²⁵ Frick, P. J., Boden, D. S., & Barry, C. T. (2000). Psychopathic traits and conduct problems in community and clinic-referred samples of children: Further development of the Psychopathy Screening Device. *Psychological Assessment, 12*, 382-393.

- ²⁶ Venables, N. C., Hall, J. R., & Patrick, C. J. (2014). Differentiating psychopathy from antisocial personality disorder: A Triarchic model perspective. *Psychological Medicine*, *44*, 1005-1013.
- ²⁷ Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *66*, 488-524.
- ²⁸ Lilienfeld, S.O., & Widows, M.R. (2005). *Psychopathic Personality Inventory—Revised (PPI-R) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- ²⁹ Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Hicks, B. M., Blonigen, D. M., & Krueger, R. F. (2003). Factor structure of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Validity and implications for clinical assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, *15*, 340-350.
- ³⁰ Ross, S. R., Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Thompson, A., & Thurston, A. (2009). Factors of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Criterion-related validity and relationship to the BIS/BAS and Five-Factor models of personality. *Assessment*, *16*, 71-87.
- ³¹ Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Blonigen, D. M., Hicks, B. M., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Estimating facets of psychopathy from normal personality traits: A step toward community-epidemiological investigations. *Assessment*, *12*, 3-18.
- ³² Patrick, C. J., Kramer, M. D., Vaidyanathan, U., Benning, S. D., Hicks, B. M., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2018). *Formulation of a measurement model for the boldness construct of psychopathy*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- ³³ Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., Patrick, C. J., Benning, S. D., & Kramer, M. (2007). Linking antisocial behavior, substance use, and personality: An integrative quantitative model of the adult externalizing spectrum. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *116*, 645-666.
- ³⁴ Hall, J. R., Bernat, E. M., & Patrick, C. J. (2007). Externalizing psychopathology and the error-related negativity. *Psychological Science*, *18*, 326-333.
- ³⁵ Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a non-institutionalized population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 151-158.
- ³⁶ Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., Williams, K. M., & Hare, R. D. (2016). *Manual for the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (4th ed.)*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.
- ³⁷ Williams, K. M., Paulhus, D. L., & Hare, R. D. (2007). Capturing the four-factor structure of psychopathy in college students via self-report. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *88*, 205-219.

- ³⁸ Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., Skeem, J. L., Douglas, K. S., Edens, J. F., Epstein, M., & Patrick, C. J. (2010). Using the PCL-R to help evaluate the validity of two self-report measures of psychopathy with offenders. *Assessment, 17*, 206-219.
- ³⁹ Campbell, D.T., & Fiske, D.W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multi-trait, multi-method matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*, 81-105.
- ⁴⁰ Blonigen, D. M., Patrick, C. J., Douglas, K. S., Poythress, N. G., Skeem, J. L., Lilienfeld, S. O., Edens, J. F., & Krueger, R. F. (2010). Multimethod assessment of psychopathy in relation to factors of internalizing and externalizing from the Personality Assessment Inventory: The impact of method variance and suppressor effects. *Psychological Assessment, 22*, 96-107.
- ⁴¹ Patrick, C. J., Kramer, M. D., Krueger, R. F., & Markon, K.E. (2013). Optimizing efficiency of psychopathology assessment through quantitative modeling: Development of a brief form of the Externalizing Spectrum Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 25*, 1332-1348.
- ⁴² Drislane, L. E., Patrick, C. J., & Arsal, G. (2014). Clarifying the content coverage of differing psychopathy inventories through reference to the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure. *Psychological Assessment, 26*, 350-362.
- ⁴⁴ Drislane, L. E., Patrick, C. J., & Arsal, G. (2014). Clarifying the content coverage of differing psychopathy inventories through reference to the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure. *Psychological Assessment, 26*, 350-362.
- ⁴⁵ Drislane, L. E., Patrick, C. J., Sourander, A., Sillanmäki, L., Aggen, S. H., Elonheimo, H., Parkkola, K., & Kendler, K. S. (2014). Distinct variants of extreme psychopathic individuals in society at large: Evidence from a population-based sample. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 5*, 154-163.
- ⁴⁶ Venables, N. C., & Patrick, C. J. (2012). Validity of the Externalizing Spectrum Inventory in a criminal offender sample: Relations with disinhibitory psychopathology, personality, and psychopathic features. *Psychological Assessment, 24*, 88-100.

Appendix A:**Items Comprising the Subscales of the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM)**

Note: The conceptual referent for the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure is the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy.⁴ Items comprising the brief Boldness scale are from a new inventory developed to index the fearless dominance component of psychopathy through a structurally-coherent set of facet scales.³² Items comprising the brief Meanness and Disinhibition scales are from the Externalizing Spectrum Inventory.^{33,41}

Boldness Scale items:

I'm optimistic more often than not.

I have no strong desire to parachute out of an airplane. [F]

I am well-equipped to deal with stress.

I get scared easily. [F]

I'm a born leader.

I have a hard time making things turn out the way I want. [F]

I have a knack for influencing people.

I function well in new situations, even when unprepared.

I don't think of myself as talented. [F]

I'm afraid of far fewer things than most people.

I can get over things that would traumatize others.

It worries me to go into an unfamiliar situation without knowing all the details. [F]

I can convince people to do what I want.

I don't like to take the lead in groups. [F]

It's easy to embarrass me. [F]

I stay away from physical danger as much as I can. [F]

I don't stack up well against most others. [F]

I never worry about making a fool of myself with others.

I'm not very good at influencing people. [F]

Meanness Scale items:

How other people feel is important to me. [F]

I would enjoy being in a high-speed chase.

I don't mind if someone I dislike gets hurt.

I sympathize with others' problems. [F]

I enjoy a good physical fight.

I return insults.

It doesn't bother me to see someone else in pain.

I enjoy pushing people around sometimes.

I taunt people just to stir things up.

I don't see any point in worrying if what I do hurts someone else.

I am sensitive to the feelings of others. [F]

I don't have much sympathy for people.

For me, honesty really is the best policy. [F]
I've injured people to see them in pain.
I sometimes insult people on purpose to get a reaction from them.
Things are more fun if a little danger is involved.
I don't care much if what I do hurts others.
It's easy for me to relate to other people's emotions. [F]
It doesn't bother me when people around me are hurting.

Disinhibition Scale items:

I often act on immediate needs.
I've often missed things I promised to attend.
My impulsive decisions have caused problems with loved ones.
I have missed work without bothering to call in.
I jump into things without thinking.
I've gotten in trouble because I missed too much school.
I have good control over myself. [F]
I have taken money from someone's purse or wallet without asking.
People often abuse my trust.
I keep appointments I make. [F]
I often get bored quickly and lose interest.
I have conned people to get money from them.
I get in trouble for not considering the consequences of my actions.
I have taken items from a store without paying for them.
I have a hard time waiting patiently for things I want.
I have lost a friend because of irresponsible things I've done.
Others have told me they are concerned about my lack of self-control.
I have robbed someone.
I have had problems at work because I was irresponsible.
I have stolen something out of a vehicle.