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Psychopathic Personality

- Pinel (1962)
- Cleckley (1976): ‘The Mask of Sanity’
- McCord and McCord (1964)
- DSM IV
- PCL-R as a ‘golden standard’
  - Emphasis on antisocial behaviors
  - Not dynamic
Triarchic model of psychopathy

Triarchic Psychopathy Model/Measure (TriPM)
- Cleckley’s (1970) psychopathic personality
- Dysfunctional emotional processing
- Captures the heterogeneity of psychopathy

Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger, (2009)
Boldness

- Genetic predisposition of fearlessness
- Social efficacy and dominance
- ‘Successful’ psychopathic personality
- Neural basis: Weak defensive reactivity in the face of threat; brain’s defensive system, incl. amygdala & affiliated structure
Meanness

- Lack of empathy
- Detached attachment
- Cruel behavior
- Neural basis: weak defensive reactivity; empathy related brain structures
Disinhibition

- Deficient inhibitory control
- High risk taking behavior
- Deficient emotion regulation
- Neural basis: difficulties in behavior or emotional control; PFC and ACC
Aim

To assess the usefulness of new conceptualizations of psychoapathy in relation to conceptually related constructs
Relevance

- With respect to new diagnostic criteria and investigation into new conceptualizations it is important to study these new dimensional trait conceptualizations in terms of their construct validity.
77 participants (23 males, 54 females)
– Mean age 21 (range 17-47).

Measures:
– Dutch Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM; Soe-Agnie, Van Dongen et al., 2012)
– Dutch CAPP-IRF (see for research version full CAPP Hildebrand et al., 2010)
– Dutch Reactive and Proactive Aggression Questionnaire (Cima et al., 2009)
– Dutch Brief Sensation Seeking Scale (Dutch BSSS; Van Dongen et al., 2012)
– Dutch BIS/BAS scales (Franken et al., 2005)
Methods forensic sample

- 82 forensic patients (males)
  - Only 59 with PCL-R scores
- PCL-R (interview based)
- TriPM (self-report)
  - Boldness
  - Meanness
  - Disinhibition
- BSSS (self-report)
- RPQ (self-report)
Results for the community sample
TriPM in relation to other constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RPQtot</th>
<th>RPQre</th>
<th>RPQpro</th>
<th>BSSS</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>BAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TriPM total</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boldness</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanness</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>63**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinhibition</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>43**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P < .01
CAPP in relation to other constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RPQtot</th>
<th>RPQre</th>
<th>RPQpro</th>
<th>BSSS</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>BAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPPtot</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>32**</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPPself</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPPemo</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>44**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPPattach</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPPdom</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPPcogn</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>35**</td>
<td>30**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPPbeh</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>41**</td>
<td>43**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05
** P < .01
Results for the forensic sample
## TriPM relation to PCL-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TriPMtotal</th>
<th>Boldness</th>
<th>Meanness</th>
<th>Disinhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCL-Rtotal</td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td><strong>.29</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td><strong>.41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td><strong>.51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sign at .05  
** Sign at .001
## External correlates/construct validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RPQtotal</th>
<th>Reactive aggression</th>
<th>Proactive aggression</th>
<th>BSSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TriPMtotal</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boldness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanness</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinhibition</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCL-Rtotal</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sign at .05
** Sign at .001
Discussion

• Inconsistent/consistent findings
  – Community sample
  – Forensic sample
• Method variance
• Usefulness of self-report
  – Self-report and informant seem to converge very well (Ray et al., 2013)
• Dutch TriPM (Soe-Agnie, Van Dongen et al., 2011)
The CAPP and TriPM are promising new models of psychopathic personality
General discussion

1. Do we need to revise the ‘golden standard’ model(s) of psychopathic personality?

2. Are self-reports useful? Useful for research?

3. Can we measure psychopathy with ‘measures’ that are not designed to be assessment tools/measures?