

TRIARCHIC PSYCHOPATHY MEASURE: VALIDITY IN RELATION TO NORMAL-RANGE TRAITS, PERSONALITY PATHOLOGY, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT

Pavel S. Blagov, PhD, Christopher J. Patrick, PhD, Kathryn M. Oost, MA, Joshua A. Goodman, MA, and Alan T. Pugh, BA

The triarchic model of psychopathy replaces a syndromal view of this pathological personality condition with a tripartite trait-based conception, positing three distinct phenotypic dispositions as building blocks for what theorists have traditionally termed psychopathy. The Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM) offers an efficient means for measuring the three dimensions to facilitate research on the model's validity. We tested the reliability of the TriPM as well as its convergent and discriminant validity with respect to differing models of personality and other criterion variables reflecting social-emotional adjustment and mental health in an undergraduate participant sample ($n = 120$). The TriPM evidenced excellent internal consistencies, good test-retest reliability, and strong validity consistent with the triarchic model. We discuss the results with respect to prior research and offer suggestions for future research on the validity of the TriPM and the triarchic model.

Based on the triarchic model of psychopathy (Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger, 2009), the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM; Patrick, 2010) was developed to capture three distinct phenotypic dimensions: disinhibition, meanness, and boldness. We review research on its validity, drawing attention to the less consistent findings, and present tests of its internal and test-retest reliability and convergent and discriminant validity vis-à-vis an original set of validation measures.

Boldness reflects tendencies toward fearlessness, adventure seeking, social dominance, and low stress reactivity (Patrick et al., 2009), and it relates closely to fearless-dominance (Benning, Patrick, Hicks, Blonigen, & Krueger, 2003). By facilitating glibness, it may enable highly psychopathic individuals to appear well adjusted (as described by Cleckley, 1982). Disinhibition, as the tendency not to constrain behavior in the context of activation by appetitive pursuit or anger, may facilitate irresponsibility, poor planning, impulsivity, and angry

From Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington (P. S. B., A. T. P.); Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida (C. J. P.); University of Montana, Missoula, Montana (K. M. O.); and University of California, Santa Barbara (J. A. G.).

Address correspondence to Pavel S. Blagov, PhD, 345 Boyer Ave., Walla Walla, WA 99326. E-mail: blagovp@whitman.edu

outbursts. Finally, meanness corresponds to an emotionally callous and instrumental way of relating to others that enables unempathic exploitativeness and cruelty. In its behavioral expression, meanness may overlap with boldness in the excitement-seeking domain (Sellbom & Phillips, 2013) and with disinhibition in antisociality and aggression. However, meanness-related callousness promotes instrumental aggression (Kahn et al., 2013) linked to low empathy (Stanley, Wygant, & Sellbom, 2013), whereas disinhibition appears to underlie reactive aggression (Patrick et al., 2009) and recklessness (Venables & Patrick, 2012).

Research thus far supports the TriPM's validity (Crego & Widiger, 2014; Drislane, Patrick, & Arsal, 2014; Poy, Segarra, Esteller, Lopez, & Molto, 2014; Sellbom & Phillips, 2013; Stanley et al., 2013), and we summarize the most theoretically coherent and robust findings here. First, TriPM Boldness correlates reliably with most facets of extraversion and related constructs (social potency, well-being, and social closeness), as well as most facets of emotional stability/low neuroticism (except hostility) and low stress reactivity. Thus, Boldness aligns itself closely with fearless-dominance. In addition, replicable links to the thrill/adventure- and experience-seeking domains of sensation seeking, to the drive facet of behavioral activation, and to low behavioral inhibition have emerged. Second, Meanness correlates uniquely and robustly with all facets of antagonism/low agreeableness and with measures of callousness, cold-heartedness, angry hostility, and aggressiveness. It has shown linkages to extraversion facets that index alienation or lack of social closeness as well as specific conscientiousness-related constructs (harm avoidance and self-control). Third, Disinhibition appears to be linked robustly to conscientiousness/self-control (negatively), impulsivity, nonplanfulness, egocentricity, antisociality, and neuroticism/stress reactivity. Its associations with sensation seeking (mainly boredom susceptibility) and behavioral activation (but not low inhibition) have been replicated. It may correlate with alienation-related extraversion facets and antagonism/low agreeableness, but to a lesser extent than does Meanness. Finally, Boldness, Disinhibition, and Meanness each contribute variance to overall scores on psychopathy measures.

Findings have been less consistent with regard to Boldness's links to narcissism-related constructs. In adults, Boldness correlated at .24 and .65 with two narcissism measures and .18 and .10 with Machiavellianism (Maples, Lamkin, & Miller, 2014). Strong correlations with narcissism (.58–.63) also appeared in community lawbreakers (Crego & Widiger, 2014). In female inmates, Boldness correlated moderately ($\beta = -.26$) with Machiavellianism and strongly with narcissism ($\beta = .64$) when controlling for Disinhibition and Meanness (Sellbom & Phillips, 2013). Among undergraduates, Boldness had moderate negative correlations with five-factor model (FFM) facets of modesty and weak to strong inverse correlations with angry hostility in women and men, respectively (Poy et al., 2014). A related fearless-dominance factor had moderate relationships to narcissism in Miller and Lynam's (2012) meta-analysis. Such patterns are puzzling because effect sizes have been discrepant and because the unempathic, antagonistic, and envy-related features of narcissism (contrary to its grandiosity, attention-seeking, and entitlement facets) conceptually relate to meanness (and, to a lesser extent, disinhibition) rather

than boldness. We aim to throw additional light on the interrelationships among the TriPS scales and such narcissism-related constructs as manipulativeness, entitlement, and exhibitionism.

A second area needing further study are the links of Disinhibition and Meanness to criminality and aggression. An antisociality index correlated weakly with Meanness in female inmates but not in undergraduates, yielding strong associations with Disinhibition in both samples (Sellbom & Phillips, 2013). In Crego and Widiger's (2014) study, both Meanness and Disinhibition correlated strongly with self-reported criminal tendencies. Drislane and colleagues (2014) reported that Disinhibition's moderate correlation with aggressiveness diminished after controlling for Boldness and Meanness, whereas a strong link between Meanness and aggressiveness remained; Disinhibition and Meanness had modest to moderate correlations with criminal tendencies. Their estimates (independent of one another and Boldness) also had moderate correlations with aggressiveness in undergraduates and with antisociality in inmates (Hall et al., 2014). Thus, effect sizes have been similar in valence but discrepant in magnitude.

PROJECT RATIONALE AND PREDICTIONS

We evaluated the TriPM's internal and test-retest reliability and validity in relation to criteria informed by a diverse set of models and test-construction methods. The main validation variables were derived from the FFM (McCrae & John, 1992), a psychodynamic rational-empirical conceptualization of adjustment (Weinberger, 1997), and an empirical classification of clinical dimensions (Clark, 1993), along with other indices of current social-emotional functioning.

With regard to the FFM, we expected to replicate patterns found in prior research; we also expected that, in partial correlation analyses, Boldness would retain its strong associations with extraversion and stability/low neuroticism, whereas Disinhibition would be uniquely linked to conscientiousness and Meanness to antagonism/low agreeableness.

In Weinberger's (1997) model, distress captures negative as well as low positive emotion, hence we predicted a distinct strong link to Boldness. Self-restraint subsumes both basic (impulse control, responsibility) and interpersonal (suppression of aggression, consideration of others) constraint, and its facets should correlate selectively with Disinhibition and Meanness. Repressive defensiveness reflects denial of normative distress and exaggeration of virtuous restraint; it should correlate with Boldness and, negatively, with Disinhibition and Meanness.

As per Clark's (1993, 2005) model, we predicted Boldness to correlate with positive affectivity and (inversely) negative affectivity, Disinhibition to correlate strongly with dimensions capturing disinhibition and aggressiveness, and Meanness to correlate with dimensions that capture manipulativeness, mistrust, aggression, entitlement, and detachment.

We draw attention to the aggression and narcissism-related variables in the study. We expected Boldness to correlate positively only with narcissism-related dimensions reflecting positive self-esteem and "going toward" as opposed to

“against” people (i.e., entitlement and exhibitionism rather than manipulativeness or aggression). We also expected Meanness to explain Disinhibition’s relationship with indices of aggressiveness in partial correlation analyses. In light of the above, because Boldness confers resilience and social closeness, it should correlate with freedom from current symptoms and a self-construal reflecting social connectedness.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Students ($n = 120$) from a small college received \$20 or course credit to participate by means of a secure two-part online survey in 2010. Their mean age was 19.7 years ($SD = 1.32$), with women ($n = 92$) comprising 77% of the sample, akin to college samples in prior TriPM research. The reported racial composition was: White, 75%, Asian, 15%, Black, 5.4%, and Other, 6.0%. Upper-middle (39%) and middle (33%) were the most frequent socioeconomic status answers. No participants were married, and 69% were single. Twenty (17%) indicated a non-heterosexual orientation. All four class years were represented (23, 31, 23, and 23%). In addition, 31 participants responded to a follow-up that included the TriPM as a retest three months later.

MEASURES

Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM). The TriPM (Patrick, 2010) is a 56-item self-report questionnaire that captures Boldness (18 items, e.g., “I am a born leader”), Disinhibition (19 items, e.g., “I jump into things without thinking”), and Meanness (19 items, e.g., “I don’t mind if someone I dislike gets hurt”). Participants choose among “true,” “mostly true,” “mostly false,” or “false.”

NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). The NEO-FFI (Costa & McCrae, 1992) is a factor-analytically derived self-report questionnaire with 60 items selected to measure the largely orthogonal dimensions of the FFM. For each item, participants rated their perceptions of themselves on a 5-point Likert-type scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Sample items include, “I am not a worrier” and “I work hard to accomplish my goals.”

Weinberger Adjustment Inventory – Short Form (WAI-SF). The WAI-SF (Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990) is a 37-item self-report questionnaire designed to capture three adjustment continua. Subjective Distress reflects the presence of negative and the absence of positive feelings (e.g., “I usually think of myself as a happy person,” Reversed) and resembles the low ego resilience construct; Self-restraint reflects impulse control, suppression of aggression, responsibility, and consideration of others (e.g., “People who get me angry better watch out,” Reversed) and resembles ego control; and Repressive Defensiveness reflects claims of absolute restraint and social desirability (e.g., “I am never unkind to people I don’t like”). The 5-point Likert-type scale ranges from “false” or “almost never” to “true” or “almost always.”

Schedule of Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality. The Schedule of Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (Clark, 1993; Clark & Watson, 1999) is a 371-item self-report personality pathology inventory that yields scores on three overarching dimensions (Negative Temperament, Positive Temperament, and Disinhibition; the Big Three) and 13 subscales. Participants rated such statements as, “I’m no good at flirting,” “I rarely get so angry that I lose control,” and “I’m sure I’m being talked about,” on a binary true/false scale.

Additional Measures. To capture psychiatric symptom distress, we used the 30-item Life Status Questionnaire (LSQ; Lambert & Burlingame, 1998), which focuses on general and relational functioning, symptoms of depression, anxiety, alcohol and drug abuse, and suicidality; participants rate the items on a 0 (“never”) to 4 (“almost always”) scale with regard to the previous week. To assess cultural orientation differences, we measured Interdependence and Independence using an abbreviated 16-item form of the Self-Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994). Participants indicated their agreement with such statements as “My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me” on a 7-point Likert-type scale. Finally, the Difficult Vocabulary Scale served a discriminant validity purpose. To capture verbal ability differences in undergraduates, we chose 15 high-difficulty words (e.g., “abjure,” “pyre,” “temerity”) that participants were asked to define as effectively as possible in writing. Independent raters yielded agreements of $r > .90$ when scoring subsets of the protocols on a 0–2 scale using a dictionary-based manual.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The TriPM scales yielded internal consistency estimates of $\alpha = .80$ – $.87$, suggesting that, within each scale, the items likely indexed a coherent underlying dimension or process. Over a 3-month period, each TriPM scale correlated highly ($r = .64$ – $.77$) with itself; Boldness had small correlations with the other scales ($.03$ – $.06$ with Meanness and $.10$ – $.14$ with Disinhibition), which were associated moderately ($.34$ – $.44$). The TriPM’s non-significant associations with the vocabulary and independent self-construal measures yielded discriminant validity evidence.

TRIPM AND THE FFM

The strong correlations that emerged between Boldness and NEO-FFI Extraversion (positive) and Neuroticism (negative), even while controlling for Meanness and Disinhibition (see Table 1), replicate research with the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and Big Five Inventory (BFI; Crego & Widiger, 2014; Poy et al., 2014; Stanley et al., 2013) in undergraduates and offenders. We did not detect the moderate correlations of Boldness with Conscientiousness and Openness reported by Stanley and collaborators. Perhaps among offenders, psychological health features linked to boldness, conscientiousness, and openness coalesce more strongly than they do in student (Poy et al., 2014) or general populations (Crego & Widiger, 2014). It may also

TABLE 1. Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM): Convergent and Discriminant Validity Expressed as Pearson and Partial Correlations (Controlling for the Remaining TriPM Scales) With Validation Variables ($n = 120$)

Scale	Items	Scale	Min.	Max.	M	Md	SD	α	Triarchic Psychopathy Measure					
									Boldness		Disinhibition		Meanness	
TriPM Boldness	18	1–4	1.3	3.7	2.4	2.4	0.41	.80						
TriPM Disinhibition	19	1–4	2.0	3.8	3.2	3.3	0.35	.80						
TriPM Meanness	19	1–4	2.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	0.38	.87	<i>r</i>	<i>r_p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r_p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r_p</i>
NEO-FFI Extraversion	12	1–5	2.0	4.9	3.5	3.5	0.61	.83	.63	.66	-.12	.14	-.23	-.32
NEO-FFI Neuroticism	12	1–5	1.4	4.5	3.0	3.0	0.71	.87	-.66	-.66	.23	.18	.10	.01
NEO-FFI Conscientiousness	12	1–5	2.1	5.0	3.7	3.8	0.58	.83	.12	.09	-.56	-.43	-.39	-.05
NEO-FFI Agreeableness	12	1–5	2.3	5.0	3.8	3.8	0.56	.83	.15	.21	-.43	.02	-.65	-.57
NEO-FFI Openness	12	1–5	2.5	4.8	3.8	3.8	0.55	.79	.15	.17	-.21	.04	-.35	-.30
WAI-SF Distress	12	1–5	1.4	5.0	2.7	2.7	0.71	.88	-.61	-.62	.21	.10	.15	.09
Anxiety	3	1–5	1.3	5.0	3.4	3.7	0.97	.73	-.44	-.43	.09	.12	-.04	-.11
Depression	3	1–5	1.0	5.0	2.7	2.7	0.96	.78	-.54	-.54	.28	.19	.17	.05
Low Self-esteem	3	1–5	1.0	5.0	2.4	2.3	0.95	.76	-.56	-.56	.20	.05	.18	.15
Low Well-being	3	1–5	1.3	5.0	2.4	2.0	0.65	.79	-.43	-.45	.09	-.10	.19	.23
WAI-SF Self-restraint	12	1–5	1.8	5.0	4.1	4.3	0.54	.80	.07	.06	-.68	-.41	-.68	-.44
Suppression of Aggression	3	1–5	2.0	5.0	4.3	4.7	0.80	.72	.10	.13	-.38	-.02	-.56	-.46
Impulse Control	3	1–5	2.0	5.0	3.9	4.0	0.77	.66	-.05	-.09	-.48	-.31	-.43	-.17
Consideration of Others	3	1–5	1.0	5.0	4.1	4.0	0.75	.77	.06	.05	-.51	-.24	-.55	-.33
Responsibility	3	1–5	2.0	5.0	4.2	4.3	0.65	.57	.09	.06	-.65	-.50	-.47	-.09
WAI-SF Repressive Defensiveness	11	1–5	1.2	4.5	2.6	2.5	0.60	.72	.10	.09	-.36	-.16	-.37	-.20
SNAP Negative Temperament	28	0–1	0.0	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.25	.91	-.40	-.40	.23	.12	.16	.06
Mistrust	19	0–1	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.20	.80	-.36	-.39	.48	.29	.40	.19
Manipulativeness	20	0–1	0.0	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.17	.73	.08	.15	.54	.41	.41	.09
Aggression	20	0–1	0.0	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.18	.80	-.13	-.14	.44	.12	.54	.38
Self-harm (SH)	16	0–1	0.0	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.21	.84	-.53	-.53	.26	.19	.14	.01
SH: Low Self-esteem	7	0–1	0.0	1.0	0.1	0.0	0.23	.70	-.48	-.48	.32	.21	.21	.06
SH: Suicidality	9	0–1	0.0	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.24	.79	-.48	-.47	.17	.13	.07	-.02
Eccentric Perceptions	15	0–1	0.0	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.21	.72	-.07	-.06	.24	.17	.16	.02
Dependency	18	0–1	0.0	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.19	.75	-.29	-.28	.06	.15	-.12	-.19
SNAP Positive Temperament	27	0–1	0.2	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.19	.85	.42	.43	-.07	.10	-.16	-.20
Exhibitionism	16	0–1	0.1	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.23	.75	.47	.50	.11	.28	-.05	-.23
Entitlement	16	0–1	0.0	0.9	0.4	0.4	0.23	.77	.37	.39	.08	.18	-.02	-.13
Detachment	18	0–1	0.0	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.24	.81	-.42	-.44	.16	-.07	.26	.27
SNAP Disinhibition	35	0–1	0.1	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.15	.76	.21	.28	.49	.40	.36	.05
Pure Disinhibition	16	0–1	0.0	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.16	.63	.13	.17	.40	.29	.32	.07
Impulsivity	19	0–1	0.0	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.19	.75	.20	.25	.38	.34	.23	-.04
Propriety	20	0–1	0.0	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.21	.79	-.17	-.17	-.06	-.07	-.03	.03
Workaholism	18	0–1	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.20	.75	-.16	-.16	.01	.03	-.04	-.05
Life Status Questionnaire	30	1–3	1.1	3.0	1.9	1.9	0.41	.93	-.51	-.54	.40	.22	.34	.19
Self-construal Scale – Interdependence	8	1–5	2.1	5.0	3.8	3.9	0.56	.74	.37	.44	-.16	.23	-.42	-.48
Self-construal Scale – Independence	8	1–5	2.6	4.9	3.8	3.8	0.46	.67	.15	.16	.11	.09	.09	.01
Difficult Vocabulary Scale	15	0–2	0.1	1.7	0.8	0.8	0.37	.78	-.06	-.07	-.14	-.05	-.18	-.10

NEO-FFI: NEO Five-Factor Inventory; WAI-SF: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory – Short Form; SNAP: Schedule of Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality. For ease of interpretation, descriptives pertain to mean item scores per composite scale rather than to sums of scores. Bolded correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .005$ (one-tailed); italicized coefficients are significant at $p < 0.01$.

be that boldness relates only to isolated facets of the two FFM traits (i.e., openness to ideas, openness to actions, and subjective competence), as prior research suggests.

As predicted, Disinhibition correlated uniquely only with Conscientiousness despite its bivariate correlations with Neuroticism and Agreeableness; the other TriPM variables did not relate to Conscientiousness uniquely. This parallels Poy and colleagues' (2014) results in undergraduates but not BFI data from an offender sample (Stanley et al., 2013). Perhaps a degree of range restriction of meanness among college students limits the strength of its relationship to conscientiousness. It is also possible that low conscientiousness has implications for meanness only among individuals with developmental histories of conduct problems.

As expected, Meanness's negative correlation with Conscientiousness diminished when controlling for the other TriPM dimensions, whereas its strong link to Agreeableness remained, as did moderate negative partial correlations with Extraversion and Openness. This is consistent with prior findings linking Meanness to antagonism/low agreeableness as well as, inversely, to Extraversion's alienation-related facts and Openness's feelings and values facets.

TRIPM AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT

Before and after controlling for Disinhibition and Meanness, Boldness showed the expected negative correlations with all WAI-SF Subjective Distress subscales. Among the TriPM scales, it had the strongest relationship to the LSQ, suggesting that boldness is a strong predictor of freedom from common acute psychopathology symptoms. Boldness also had a moderate positive association with interdependent self-construal, which we interpret as an index of interpersonal and communal connectedness (this finding contrasted with Meanness's strong negative relationship with interdependence). All this corroborates the notion that Boldness reflects not only high Extraversion and low Neuroticism but also their related psychiatric and social-emotional adjustment manifestations or outcomes.

Disinhibition and Meanness had significant negative bivariate correlations with all Self-restraint subscales, but Disinhibition's inverse relationship with Suppression of Aggression was rendered negligible after controlling for Meanness and Boldness, whereas Meanness's correlations with Impulsivity and Responsibility were rendered non-significant after controlling for Disinhibition and Boldness. Examining the TriPM's links to the WAI-SF in light of the NEO-FFI results strongly suggests that Disinhibition and Meanness capture different basic processes.

TRIPM AND PERSONALITY PATHOLOGY DIMENSIONS

TriPM Boldness exhibited moderate to strong relationships with SNAP Positive Temperament and its underlying dimensions, and it had negative associations with Self-harm, Mistrust, and Dependency from the SNAP's Negative Temperament domain, with which it was negatively linked. Boldness's associations

with SNAP Disinhibition and its Impulsivity facet in particular were stronger when controlling for Disinhibition and Meanness, suggesting a degree of statistical suppression. This recalls research linking Boldness to the drive facet of behavioral activation (Sellbom & Phillips, 2013). Together, the NEO-FFI, WAI-SF, and SNAP findings support a conceptualization of boldness as a fearless-dominance dimension with overtones of pleasure-seeking narcissism. Future research may need to establish how boldness differs from mild hypomanic activation less the antagonism.

In bivariate analyses, TriPM Disinhibition was linked to several subscales of SNAP Negative Temperament, and it had moderate to strong correlations with the SNAP's Disinhibition domain and its Pure Disinhibition and Impulsivity facets. After controlling for Meanness and Boldness, TriPM Disinhibition retained positive associations with Mistrust and Manipulativeness, and with the SNAP Disinhibition scales noted above; its associations with Aggression and overall Negative Temperament were rendered non-significant. Thus, considering the SNAP results in the context of the NEO-FFI and WAI-SF findings, TriPM Disinhibition appears to measure low effortful control linked to poor social adjustment and weak conscience.

Meanness had bivariate correlations with Mistrust, Manipulativeness, Aggression, Detachment, Pure Disinhibition, Impulsivity, and overall SNAP Disinhibition. After controlling for the other TriPM variables, only the associations with Aggression and Detachment were prominent. In the context of the NEO-FFI and WAI-SF findings, the SNAP results reveal an added malignant quality to meanness as a blend of lack of interpersonal warmth along with a pernicious disregard for others. This is consistent with research that has linked Disinhibition repeatedly to antagonistic and callous-unemotional traits (Sellbom & Phillips, 2013) and remorselessness (Drislane et al., 2014). However, Meanness has tended to evidence more diverse associations, including with indices of disinhibition, irresponsibility, erratic living, angry hostility, impulsive antisociality, exhibitionistic grandiosity, and sensation seeking (Crego & Widiger, 2014; Sellbom & Phillips, 2013; Stanley et al., 2013). Below, we discuss and briefly try to interpret some of the possible reasons for this lack of coherence.

THE TRIPM, NARCISSISM, AND AGGRESSION

Findings linking overall narcissism scores to each of the TriPM scales (to a different extent in different studies; Crego & Widiger, 2014; Sellbom & Phillips, 2013; Stanley et al., 2013) should be interpreted in the context of the TriPM scales' differential associations with different narcissism-related constructs, sample and method variance, and narcissism's heterogeneity. In our study, Boldness was linked to entitlement, high self-esteem, and exhibitionism; Disinhibition predicted manipulateness; and both Disinhibition and Meanness predicted lack of consideration of others. This parallels Poy's (2014) finding that Boldness correlated with low modesty (but also with warmth) and Meanness and Disinhibition both correlated with low altruism in undergraduates; however, Poy found bivariate correlations between low straightforwardness and all TriPM scales, including Boldness. Our findings agree with the Stanley

and colleagues' finding that Boldness predicted leadership/authority and grandiose exhibitionism, but not with the finding that Meanness was the unique contributor to entitlement/exploitativeness and low empathy. In two ostensibly similar community samples, Crego and Widiger found diverging patterns of association of the TriPM with indices capturing narcissism, manipulativeness, and callousness. The consistent finding between their two samples was that Meanness and Disinhibition contributed to manipulativeness. Sellbom and colleagues' samples (undergraduates and female offenders) also yielded different association patterns, with the consistent result being a link between Machiavellian egocentricity and Meanness.

In sum, it appears that Boldness is a stronger predictor of overall narcissism in community and offender samples than it is in student samples, that Meanness and Disinhibition both enable low empathy/lack of concern for others, and that Disinhibition may facilitate actually engaging in instrumental lying (see also Drislane et al., 2014, linking Disinhibition to lying, manipulativeness, and exploitativeness). Future research attempting to locate narcissism vis-à-vis the triarchic model of psychopathy may take into account the possibility of different prevalence rates of distinct narcissism variants that common self-report questionnaires may not distinguish well. The TriPM may, in fact, be well suited to help distinguish among high-functioning, fragile, and malignant narcissistic personality variants (Russ, Shedler, Bradley, & Westen, 2008).

The aggression-related scales of the WAI-SF and SNAP yielded moderate to strong bivariate correlations with Disinhibition and Meanness; for both aggression scales, only Meanness remained a moderate to strong predictor after partialling out Disinhibition. This closely parallels Drislane and colleagues' (2014) findings in undergraduates in regard to aggressiveness, although a broader measure of impulsive antisociality in that study was linked more strongly to Disinhibition and weakly to Meanness. After comparing these findings to work with community and offender samples (Crego & Widiger, 2014; Stanley et al., 2013), it appears that Disinhibition may enable overall antisocial/criminal behavior but that it may not be sufficient and may require Meanness to result in aggression. Future research may benefit from detailed antisocial conduct assessment, laboratory measures of aggression, or behavioral records or observations.

LIMITATIONS

The key limitations include a modest sample size, reliance primarily on self-report measures that share method variance, and use of a population in which such external validity criteria as an extensive criminal history, repeated relational violence, irresponsible parenting, and so forth, could not be assessed. Also important is that, in an undergraduate sample, potential range restriction and skewness (particularly of psychopathology dimensions) may respectively lower effect sizes and inflate type II error rates, thus limiting generalizability to other populations. The data in Table 1 suggest that scores on all variables had wide ranges, but we did observe positive skew on some SNAP and WAI-SF dimensions. However, prior research on psychopathy has tended to find similar patterns of correlations across student, community, and forensic

samples (see Drislane et al., 2013, for a brief review), and studying the validity of the TriPM in undergraduates may be useful in its own right. For example, research has linked psychopathy to self-reports of sexual coercion (Hersh & Gray-Little, 1998), binge drinking (Sylvers, Lanfield, & Lilienfeld, 2011) and achievement motivation (Ross & Rausch, 2001) in students, so research on the TriPM's validity in this population may benefit from including such criterion variables. We also recommend extending research on the validity of the TriPM to include physiological, neuropsychological, behavioral, and life outcome criteria. Future research on the triarchic psychopathy model's validity would benefit from the inclusion of alternative operationalizations to compare to the TriPM (see, for example, Hall et al., 2014).

CONCLUSION

As a whole, the current results suggest highly distinct contributions of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition to externalizing psychopathology and social deviance. Our findings also suggest that the TriPM evidences validity against constructs that represent diverse theoretical models and varying degrees of personality dysfunction versus health. This underscores the potential utility of TriPM and the triarchic model in two ways. First, this feature of the model may help to clarify, reconcile, and integrate otherwise contrasting or incompatible historical perspectives and contemporary conceptualization of psychopathy. Second, the model may facilitate the building of conceptual and empirical linkages between the study of psychopathy and research in the broader field of personality and personality pathology.

REFERENCES

- 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*(3), 340–350.
- Clark, L. A. (1993). *Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (SNAP)*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Clark, L. A. (2005). Temperament as a unifying basis for personality and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 114*(4), 505–521.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1999). Temperament: A new paradigm for trait psychology. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 399–423). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Cleckley, H. (1982). *The mask of sanity* (rev. ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R. Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment.
- Crego, C., & Widiger, T. A. (2014). Psychopathy, DSM-5, and a caution. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 5*(4), 335–347.
- 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*(2), 350–362.
- Hall, J. R., Drislane, L. E., Patrick, C. J., Morano, M., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Poythress, N. G. (2014). Development and validation of triarchic construct scales from the Psychopathic Personality Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 26*(2), 447–461.
- Hersh, K., & Gray-Little, B. (1998). Psychopathic traits and attitudes associated with self-reported sexual aggression in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*(4), 456–471.
- Kahn, R. E., Frick, P. J., Youngstrom, E. A., Youngstrom, J. K., Feeny, N. C., & Findling, R. L.

- (2013). Distinguishing primary and secondary variants of callous-unemotional traits among adolescents in a clinic-referred sample. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(3), 966–978.
- Lambert, M. L., & Burlingame, G. M. (1998). *Life status questionnaire*. Stevenson, MD: APCS.
- Maples, J. L., Lamkin, J., & Miller, J. D. (2014). A test of two brief measures of the dark triad: The dirty dozen and short dark triad. *Psychological Assessment*, 26(1), 326–331.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 175–215.
- Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2012). An examination of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory's nomological network: A meta-analytic review. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3(3), 305–326.
- Patrick, C. J. (2010). *Operationalizing the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Preliminary description of brief scales for assessment of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Minnesota. Minneapolis, MN.
- Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Developmental Psychopathology*, 21(3), 913–938.
- Poy, R., Segarra, P., Esteller, A., Lopez, R., & Molto, J. (2014). FFM description of the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy in men and women. *Psychological Assessment*, 26(1), 69–76.
- Ross, S. R., & Rausch, M. K. (2001). Psychopathic attributes and achievement dispositions in a college sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(3), 471–480.
- Russ, E., Shedler, J., Bradley, R., & Westen, D. (2008). Refining the construct of narcissistic personality disorder: Diagnostic criteria and subtypes. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 165(11), 1473–1481.
- Sellbom, M., & Phillips, T. R. (2013). An examination of the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy in incarcerated and nonincarcerated samples. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 122(1), 208–214.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 580–591.
- Stanley, J. H., Wygant, D. B., & Sellbom, M. (2013). Elaborating on the construct validity of the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure in a criminal offender sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95(4), 343–350.
- Sylvers, P., Landfield, K. E., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2011). Heavy episodic drinking in college students: Associations with features of psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder. *Journal of American College Health*, 59(5), 367–372.
- 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(1), 88–100.
- Weinberger, D. A. (1997). Distress and self-restraint as measures of adjustment across the life span: Confirmatory factor analyses in clinical and nonclinical samples. *Psychological Assessment*, 9(2), 132–135.
- Weinberger, D. A., & Schwartz, G. E. (1990). Distress and restraint as superordinate dimensions of self-reported adjustment: A typological perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 58(2), 381–417.