



Incremental Validity of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire Above Self-Report Psychopathy Measures in Community Samples

Guillaume Durand <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5418-4429>

To cite this article: Guillaume Durand <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5418-4429> (2019) Incremental Validity of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire Above Self-Report Psychopathy Measures in Community Samples, Journal of Personality Assessment, 101:5, 493-502, DOI: [10.1080/00223891.2018.1464456](https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1464456)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1464456>



© 2019 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis© Guillaume Durand



Published online: 03 May 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1150



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

Incremental Validity of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire Above Self-Report Psychopathy Measures in Community Samples

Guillaume Durand 

Department of Psychiatry and Neuropsychology, Faculty of Health, Medicine, and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Although highly debated, the notion of the existence of an adaptive side to psychopathy is supported by some researchers. Currently, 2 instruments assessing psychopathic traits include an adaptive component, which might not cover the full spectrum of adaptive psychopathic traits. The Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ; Durand, 2017) is a 41-item self-reported instrument assessing adaptive traits known to correlate with the psychopathic personality. In this study, I investigated in 2 samples ($N = 263$ and $N = 262$) the incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Short Form (PPI–SF) and the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM) using multiple criterion measures. Results showed that the DAPTQ significantly increased the predictive validity over the PPI–SF on 5 factors of the HEXACO. Additionally, the DAPTQ provided incremental validity over both the PPI–SF and the TriPM on measures of communication adaptability, perceived stress, and trait anxiety. Overall, these results support the validity of the DAPTQ in community samples. Directions for future studies to further validate the DAPTQ are discussed.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 22 September 2017
Revised 3 March 2018

Modern theories of psychopathy stem primarily from the early work of Cleckley (1941), who defined psychopathy as a multifacet disorder, including interpersonal, affective, and behavioral components, such as an absence of anxiety and fear, a proneness to lying, a lack of sincerity and remorse, having little to no empathy, and being emotionally detached. Through time, one of the most prominent definitions of psychopathy came from the work of Hare (1991), who developed the Psychopathy Checklist (PCL) and Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL–R; Hare, 1991, 2003). Originally, the authors of the PCL conceptualized psychopathy as a two-factor disorder, consisting of interpersonal and affective deficits, and antisocial behaviors (Harpur, Hare, & Hakstian, 1989). Later, a three-factor solution was proposed, consisting of interpersonal, emotional, and lifestyle facets (Cooke & Michie, 2001). The most current model of the PCL–R has included a fourth facet, assessing impulsivity and aggression (Hare, 2003). While the PCL–R is vastly recognized as the gold standard in psychopathy assessment, there are a lot of controversies regarding core features of psychopathy. Although all psychopathy models include lack of empathy and remorse as key components, there are several debates regarding the inclusion of criminal tendencies or aggression as central components in psychopathy, which is considered by some as a consequence of the disorder rather than a criterion (Berg et al., 2013; Cooke & Michie, 2001; Gao & Raine, 2010).

Despite the majority of early research in the field of psychopathy focusing on forensic populations, it has been

argued early on that psychopaths might not always be maladaptive (Cleckley, 1941). Cleckley (1988) proposed a set of 16 characteristics representing psychopaths, namely superficial charm, absence of delusion and irrational thinking, absence of nervousness, unreliability, untruthfulness, lack of remorse or shame, inadequately motivated antisocial behavior, poor judgment, pathologic egocentricity, poverty in major affective reactions, specific loss of insights, unresponsiveness in general interpersonal relations, fantastic and uninviting behavior with or without drinks, low suicide rate, impersonal and imbalanced sexual life, and a lack of life plan (pp. 338–339). Although many of these characteristics are fully maladaptive, many traits, such as anxiety resilience and social charm, can arguably be considered adaptive. Additionally, there is no inclusion of criminal behaviors or criminal tendencies in the original list of common traits in psychopaths proposed by Cleckley. More recently, several literature reviews examining characteristics associated with “successful” psychopathy have emerged. Gao and Raine (2010) developed a theoretical model of successful psychopathy using findings from five types of samples (community, employment agencies, college students, industrial, and serial killers). The authors proposed that, although all psychopathic individuals share similarities in lack of emotional empathy, arousal, and sensation seeking, successful psychopaths display better decision making, enhanced executive functioning, and superior cognitive empathy, and will favor relational aggression over physical aggression.

Whereas the aforementioned authors moderated the benefits of successful psychopaths, other authors reviewed a wider range of benefits associated with traits central to successful psychopathy. Lilienfeld, Watts, and Smith (2015) reviewed findings pertaining to three models of successful psychopathy, namely the differential-severity model, the moderated-expression model, and the differential-configuration model. The differential-severity model assumes that psychopathy is a unitary construct, and that successful psychopathy is a milder form of psychopathy. In the moderated-expression model, successful psychopathy is conceptualized as an atypical manifestation of psychopathy due to the emergence of protective factors, which temper the effect of maladaptive outcomes in the disorder of psychopathy. As opposed to the first two models, the differential-configuration model presumes that psychopathy is not a unitary construct, but rather multidimensional, and that successful and unsuccessful psychopathy, although sharing key features, also possess uniquely distinctive features from one another. Across a wide range of research, multiple authors found distinctive personality traits in successful psychopathy, such as higher extraversion, higher conscientiousness, and lower agreeableness, but also found other adaptive traits, such as leadership abilities, communication abilities, willingness to take risks, and immunity to stress and anxiety (Lilienfeld et al., 2012; Mullins-Sweatt, Glover, Derefinko, Miller, & Widiger, 2010; Smith, Watts, & Lilienfeld, 2014).

Although the PCL-R does not assess adaptive traits, two well-validated measures of psychopathic traits include an adaptive component in their definition of psychopathy. For instance, the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI) divides eight psychopathic traits into two major factors, namely PPI-I (fearless dominance) and PPI-II (impulsive antisociality; Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005). Whereas PPI-II assesses negative personality traits, as enumerated previously, PPI-I focuses on adaptive characteristics, such as social charm, stress and anxiety immunity, and fearlessness. Although the relationship between PPI-I and the concept of psychopathy is highly debated (Berg et al., 2013; Blonigen, 2013; Lilienfeld et al., 2012; Lynam & Miller, 2012), a vast amount of research support the benefits of high PPI-I traits due to its relation with adaptive personality traits, such as superior attentional control (Baskin-Sommers, Zeier, & Newman, 2009); lower provoked violence (Camp, Skeem, Barchard, Lilienfeld, & Poythress, 2013); higher levels of self-esteem and stable happiness (Durand, 2016, 2018); stress, fear, and anxiety resilience (Dindo & Fowles, 2011; Durand & Plata, 2017); and emotional stability (Uzieblo, Verschuere, Van den Bussche, & Crombez, 2010). However, as noted previously, many experts have associated the construct of successful psychopathy with conscientiousness. Considering that fearless dominance is largely unrelated to conscientiousness, the factor might not be able to fully explain successful psychopathy (Lilienfeld et al., 2015).

An alternative measure to the PPI developed by Patrick (2010), the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM), defines psychopathy on a three-factor model: disinhibition, meanness, and boldness (Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger, 2009). Disinhibition and meanness assess the maladaptive side of psychopathy, whereas boldness refers to adaptive characteristics, such as social charm, fearlessness, and stress resilience. Validation of

the scales revealed correlations between PPI-I and boldness ($r = .82$) and PPI-II and both disinhibition ($r = .66$) and meanness ($r = .54$; Hall et al., 2014). Similar to the PPI, the TriPM adaptive component, boldness, was found unrelated to conscientiousness, which might not be able to explain successful psychopathy better than the PPI (Blagov, Patrick, Oost, Goodman, & Pugh, 2016).

In addition to the lack of association between PPI-I and boldness with conscientiousness, the spectrum of adaptive traits measured by those two instruments is limited. Some characteristics proposed by Cleckley as common traits observed in psychopaths, which could be considered adaptive, are not assessed by PPI-I or boldness (i.e., absence of delusions and absence of irrational thinking). Although detailed under the section regarding absence of delusions, Cleckley (1988) further expanded on common related traits seen in psychopaths, such as an absence of depression, mood swings, or worries (p. 339). Due to the limited number of adaptive traits assessed with the PPI and the TriPM, it is possible that the predictive value of these instruments, to identify successful psychopathic individuals, might not be optimal and could benefit from an extension assessing a wider range of adaptive psychopathic traits.

Although the PPI and the TriPM focus on both adaptive and maladaptive traits, these instruments solely assess core traits of the psychopathic personality. The Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ; Durand, 2017) is a self-report instrument assessing nine adaptive personality traits that have shown previous associations with the psychopathic personality. During the development of the DAPTQ, the author identified all the constructs considered adaptive, defined as “a trait maximizing an individual’s survival probability within a set environment,” which have shown a significant association with a measure of psychopathy or psychopathic traits in healthy adults. Subsequently, a pool of 19 distinct constructs emerged, described through 190 items. Following two elimination rounds of items through examination of internal consistency reliability, and an exploratory factor analysis using a parallel analysis, an 11-factor solution emerged. Additional validation studies excluded two factors due to a lack of association with the total score, leaving a final solution of 41 items distributed into nine factors (leadership, logical thinking, composure, creativity, fearlessness, money smart, focus, extraversion, and management). The DAPTQ is not used to diagnose psychopathy, nor does it identify highly psychopathic individuals. Instead, the DAPTQ focuses on a wide range of adaptive traits theorized to be centrally, or peripherally, related to the “successful” psychopath, and should be seen as a detailed extension to PPI-I and boldness.

During its development phase, the DAPTQ was compared to the Five-Factor Model (FFM), as assessed by the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). The Big Five refers to the five major components of personality: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness. The results supported a positive correlation with all factors ($r = .29-.51$), with the exception of a negative correlation with Neuroticism ($r = -.67$). Although the FFM is one of the most commonly used models to validate new instruments to personality traits, a recent model of personality, the HEXACO, has been investigated thoroughly in the field of

psychopathy due to its addition of a sixth factor, assessing honesty and humility (Jonason & McCain, 2012; Lee & Ashton, 2004; Witt, Donnellan, Blonigen, Krueger, & Conger, 2009). Multiple studies confirmed a strong negative correlation between the presence of psychopathic traits and the honesty-humility factor of the HEXACO model (Jonason & McCain, 2012; Lee & Ashton, 2005). Dishonesty and a lack of humility can arguably be considered maladaptive personality traits. Considering this factor's strong association with psychopathy, and considering that the DAPTQ was developed by investigating traits known to correlate with psychopathic traits, it is important to validate the DAPTQ using the HEXACO to examine if a negative relationship exists between the DAPTQ and the honesty-humility factor, which could demonstrate an overlap between the DAPTQ and maladaptive psychopathic traits, hence decreasing the validity of the instrument. Additionally, a significant association with conscientiousness and other measures of psychopathy would further increase the validity of the DAPTQ as an extension of fearless dominance or boldness in predicting adaptive features in the field of psychopathy.

The first study investigated the relationship between the DAPTQ, the HEXACO, and the PPI-Short Form (PPI-SF). Based on previous investigations between the DAPTQ and the FFM, I expected a positive correlation between all factors of the HEXACO model and the DAPTQ, with the exception of an expected negative association with the emotionality factor, which corresponds to the neuroticism factor of the FFM, and with the exception of a lack of correlation with honesty-humility. The purpose was to replicate the relationship between the DAPTQ and the FFM, as well as to extend the findings to the unique component of the HEXACO (honesty-humility). Additionally, I expected the DAPTQ to provide incremental validity over the PPI-SF on the HEXACO on all factors, with the exception of honesty-humility. A second study investigated the incremental validity of the DAPTQ over both the PPI-SF and the TriPM on various measures associated with successful psychopathy (anxiety and stress resilience, and communication skills). In the DAPTQ development article, the DAPTQ was compared to measures of analytical thinking, risk taking, and anxiety and stress resilience (Durand, 2017). By comparing the DAPTQ to a measure of communication skills, it will be possible to broaden the range of adaptive psychopathic characteristics associated with the DAPTQ. Furthermore, although the DAPTQ has previously been compared to measures of anxiety and stress, it is unknown to what extent the DAPTQ provides incremental validity over the PPI-SF or the TriPM on the aforementioned variables.

Study 1

Methods

Participants

Two hundred seventy-five ($N = 275$) participants were recruited on social media and Web sites dedicated to research in psychology (e.g., callforparticipants.com, onlinepsychresearch.co.uk, facebook.com). There were no missing data for any of the responses. Inclusion criteria for the study were to be over 18 years old and be fluent in English. Using the stem-and-leaf plot analysis from SPSS v.23, 12 participants were classified

as outliers and removed from the study. To identify additional outliers, I examined the Variable Response Inconsistency (VRIN) of the PPI-SF. This statistical procedure examines the inconsistencies within 10 pairs of highly correlated items from the PPI-SF (Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005). For each pair, a score is obtained by subtracting the two items, and the difference of the 10 pairs is summed. A higher score signifies greater variability within questions expecting similar answers. A cutoff of 7, which corresponds to 3 SDs of the VRIN score above the mean ($M = 2.37$, $SD = 1.55$), was used to identify additional outliers. Of the remaining 263 participants, the highest VRIN score was 6, so no further participants were removed. The sample consisted of 127 males and 136 females. Most participants reported being located in North America (46%), followed by Europe (37%), Asia (11%), Oceania (3%), South America (2%), or Africa (1%). In terms of ethnicity, the majority of participants reported being White (74%) or Asian (16%). A third of the participants were currently enrolled as full-time university students (36%). Regarding their current marital status, most participants reported being single (42%), followed by married (27%), in a relationship (13%), with a common law partner (13%), or other (5%). Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 65 years old, with a mean age of 32.7 ($SD = 12.37$).

Measures

Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire. The DAPTQ (Durand, 2017) is a 41-item self-reported questionnaire assessing adaptive traits known to correlate with psychopathic personality traits. The DAPTQ uses a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). In this study, the internal consistency reliability ranged from $\alpha = .74$ to $.90$.

HEXACO-PI-R-60. The 60-item version of the HEXACO (HEXACO-PI-60-R; Ashton & Lee, 2009) is a self-reported questionnaire using a 5-point Likert scale, evaluating six domains of personality: honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. The HEXACO-60 has been shown to be a reliable alternative to the HEXACO-100, and possesses similar construct validity and reliability as the full version (Ashton & Lee, 2009). In this study, Cronbach's alpha of the six scales ranged from $\alpha = .74$ to $.84$.

Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Short Form. The PPI-SF (Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005) is a 56-item self-report questionnaire assessing psychopathic traits on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*false*) to 4 (*true*). The subscales are divided among two factors. PPI-I is composed of the Stress Immunity, Social Potency, and Fearlessness subscales. PPI-II consists of the Blame Externalization, Machiavellian Egocentricity, Carefree Nonplanfulness, and Impulsive Nonconformity subscales. The Coldheartedness subscale does not load on either of the two factors (Benning, Patrick, Hicks, Blonigen, & Krueger, 2003). In its development phase, the DAPTQ total score correlated positively with PPI-I ($r = .66$) and PPI-SF total ($r = .46$), but was not significantly associated with PPI-II ($r = -.04$; Durand, 2017). In this study, Cronbach's alpha for the total score and two scales was $\alpha = .79$.

Results

Correlations between the DAPTQ, the HEXACO, and the PPI-SF.

Descriptive data from both samples on all questionnaires can be found in the Appendix. Scores on the DAPTQ were not correlated with honesty-humility, were negatively correlated with emotionality, and were positively correlated with all four other factors (Table 1). Although PPI-I scores were also not significantly correlated with honesty-humility, scores on both PPI-II ($r = -.41$) and PPI-SF total ($r = -.27$) were significantly negatively correlated with the aforementioned factor. Additionally, scores on PPI-I did not show any significant correlation with conscientiousness. Examination of scores on the DAPTQ subscales shows moderate to strong positive correlations between the DAPTQ total score and scores on its subscales ($r = .32-.77$). There were several strong correlations between scores on the DAPTQ subscales and the HEXACO. Leadership was associated with extraversion. Logical thinking was associated with conscientiousness. Composure was negatively associated with emotionality and positively with agreeableness. Creativity was associated with openness. Fearlessness was negatively associated with emotionality. Extraversion was associated with extraversion. Finally, management was associated with extraversion and conscientiousness.

Incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the PPI-SF in predicting HEXACO factors.

In addition to examining correlations of the DAPTQ and the PPI-SF with the HEXACO, I also examined the incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the PPI-SF in predicting HEXACO factors. All analyses were computed twice, once with PPI-SF in Block 1 and DAPTQ in Block 2, and a second time with DAPTQ in Block 1 and PPI-SF in Block 2. Table 2 reports the value in Block 1 and its related p value

Table 1. Correlations between the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ) the HEXACO, and the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Short Form (PPI-SF).

| Scales | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| DAPTQ | | | | | | | | | | |
| DAPTQ total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Leadership | .62 | -.17 | -.20 | .63 | -.07 | .04 | .00 | .56 | .11 | .41 |
| Logical thinking | .37 | .04 | -.39 | .02 | .08 | .55 | .06 | .04 | -.35 | -.12 |
| Composure | .77 | .08 | -.63 | .58 | .37 | .01 | .05 | .54 | -.21 | .27 |
| Creativity | .36 | .20 | -.13 | .21 | .27 | .13 | .66 | .19 | -.05 | .07 |
| Fearlessness | .55 | -.02 | -.57 | .24 | .17 | -.25 | -.02 | .66 | .23 | .61 |
| Money smart | .32 | .14 | -.18 | .01 | .11 | .42 | .08 | -.08 | -.33 | -.21 |
| Focus | .59 | .12 | -.26 | .30 | .14 | .43 | .00 | .23 | -.20 | .06 |
| Extraversion | .68 | -.08 | -.25 | .77 | .13 | -.07 | .19 | .64 | .05 | .42 |
| Management | .66 | .13 | -.23 | .50 | .15 | .52 | .01 | .30 | -.39 | -.05 |
| HEXACO | | | | | | | | | | |
| Honesty Humility | .07 | | | | | | | | | |
| Emotionality | -.60 | -.04 | | | | | | | | |
| Extraversion | .70 | -.01 | -.19 | | | | | | | |
| Agreeableness | .30 | .31 | -.28 | .26 | | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | .24 | .21 | -.04 | .06 | .03 | | | | | |
| Openness | .21 | .22 | -.03 | .19 | .26 | .21 | | | | |
| PPI-SF | | | | | | | | | | |
| PPI-I | .69 | -.02 | -.55 | .59 | .20 | -.09 | .17 | | | |
| PPI-II | -.17 | -.41 | .06 | -.15 | -.33 | -.45 | -.14 | .11 | | |
| PPI-SF total | .38 | -.27 | -.44 | .24 | -.09 | -.33 | -.03 | .73 | .70 | |

Note. $N = 263$. For values shown in bold, $p < .001$, two-tailed. 1 = DAPTQ Total; 2 = Honesty Humility; 3 = Emotionality; 4 = Extraversion; 5 = Agreeableness; 6 = Conscientiousness; 7 = Openness; 8 = PPI-I; 9 = PPI-II; 10 = PPI-SF Total.

when PPI-SF was in Block 1, when DAPTQ was in Block 1, the outcome of the second variable in Block 2, and the adjusted R^2 change and its significance from PPI-SF to DAPTQ and from DAPTQ to PPI-SF. When the DAPTQ was added in Block 2, with the exception of honesty-humility, the DAPTQ added incrementally to the prediction of every measure, increasing the amount of explained variance from .09 (agreeableness) to .38 (openness). When PPI-SF was added in Block 2, it provided significant incremental validity to honesty-humility (.36), but provided smaller R^2 change on all other variables, with the exception of agreeableness, where the PPI-SF R^2 change is .03 superior to the DAPTQ.

To determine if all of the DAPTQ subscales provide incremental validity, I examined the significance of all DAPTQ subscales for each correlate ($p < .05$). For honesty-humility, no DAPTQ subscale was significant. For emotionality, logical thinking, composure, creativity, fearlessness, and management were significant. For extraversion, leadership, composure, fearlessness, extraversion, and management were significant. For agreeableness, leadership, composure, and creativity were significant. For conscientiousness, logical thinking, composure, creativity, fearlessness, focus, and management were significant. For openness, creativity, fearlessness, and management were significant. Overall, all of the DAPTQ subscales, with the exception of money smart, increased the predictive value of the PPI-SF in one of the five significant components of the HEXACO.

Study 2

Methods

Participants. Two hundred eighty-seven ($N = 287$) participants were once again recruited on social media and Web sites dedicated to research in psychology. There were no missing data for any of the responses. Inclusion criteria for the study were to be over 18 years old and be fluent in English. Using the stem-and-leaf plot analysis, 15 participants were classified as outliers and removed from the study. Similar to Study 1, a VRIN cutoff of 7 to the PPI-SF was applied, identifying 10 additional outliers. Of the remaining 262 participants, 141 were males and 121 were females. Most participants reported being located in North America (62%), followed by Europe (24%), Oceania (6%), Asia (5%), or other (3%). In terms of ethnicity, the majority of participants reported being White (82%) or Asian (9%). Half of the participants were currently enrolled as full-time university students (50%). Regarding their current marital status, most participants reported being single (46%), followed by in a relationship (23%), in a common law partnership (15%), married (14%), or other (2%). Participants age ranged from 18 to 63 years old, with a mean age of 26.1 ($SD = 6.79$).

Measures. In addition to the DAPTQ and the PPI-SF from Study 1, the following instruments were also used in Study 2. Internal consistency for the DAPTQ ranged from $\alpha = .76$ to .89, and ranged from $\alpha = .77$ to .78 for the PPI-SF.

Triarchic Psychopathy Measure. The TriPM (Patrick, 2010) is a self-report questionnaire containing 58 items assessing

Table 2. Incremental validity of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ) over the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Short Form (PPI–SF).

| Criterion | Block 1: PPI–SF R^2 | p value in | Block 1: DAPTQ R^2 | p value in | PPI–SF /DAPTQ Block 2 | R^2 change PPI–SF to DAPTQ | P | R^2 change DAPTQ to PPI–SF | p |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Honesty-humility | .45 | < .001 | .09 | < .001 | .45 | .00 | .521 | .36 | < .001 |
| Emotionality | .57 | < .001 | .62 | < .001 | .71 | .14 | < .001 | .09 | < .001 |
| Extraversion | .63 | < .001 | .74 | < .001 | .79 | .16 | < .001 | .05 | < .001 |
| Agreeableness | .25 | < .001 | .22 | < .001 | .34 | .09 | < .001 | .12 | < .001 |
| Conscientiousness | .48 | < .001 | .56 | < .001 | .65 | .17 | < .001 | .09 | < .001 |
| Openness | .16 | < .001 | .45 | < .001 | .54 | .38 | < .001 | .09 | < .001 |

Note. All analyses were run twice, once with PPI–SF subscales in the first block and DAPTQ subscales in the second block, and once with the DAPTQ subscales in the first block and the PPI–SF subscales in the second block. PPI–SF/DAPTQ Block 2 refers to the value of Block 2 when the other scale was in Block 1. R^2 change PPI–SF to DAPTQ refers to the adjusted R^2 difference when PPI–SF was analyzed as Block 1 and DAPTQ was analyzed as Block 2. R^2 change DAPTQ to PPI–SF refers to the opposite, when DAPTQ is Block 1 and PPI–SF is Block 2.

psychopathic traits. Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*true*) to 4 (*false*). The scale is divided into three subscales, namely boldness, meanness, and disinhibition. Boldness refers to the adaptive component seen in psychopathic individuals, and encompasses characteristics such as charisma, fearlessness, anxiety, and stress immunity. Meanness refers to the aggressive aspect of psychopathic individuals, including characteristics such as violent behavior, lack of empathy, and enjoyment through destruction. Disinhibition refers to the behavioral deficits seen in psychopathic individuals, and contains characteristics such as impulsive behaviors, lack of planning, and overall behavioral restraint deficiency (Patrick et al., 2009). In this study, Cronbach's alpha for the total score and the two scales ranged from $\alpha = .83$ to $.88$.

Communicative Adaptability Scale. The Communication Adaptability Scale (CAS; Duran, 1983) is a 30-item instrument measuring six dimensions of communicative adaptability, which Duran (1983) defined as “The ability to perceive socio-interpersonal relationships and adapt one's interaction goals and behaviors accordingly” (p. 320). The six dimensions of the scale are social experience, social confirmation, social composure, appropriateness, articulation, and wit. Social experience refers to the experience of the communicator who adapts to various social situations. Social confirmation refers to the combination of empathy and rewarding impression. Social composure refers to a calm and composed communicator who shows little to no communication anxiety in social situations. Appropriateness refers to the skill of the communicator to recognize what the appropriate disclosure is. Articulation consists of correct pronunciation, fluent speech, adequate word choice, and proper sentence construction. Finally, wit refers to the ability to use humor to reduce or diffuse anxiety and tension during a conversation. The items are answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never true of me*) to 5 (*always true of me*). A high score on the CAS or its subscales indicates a high level of adaptability. Because the participants in this study were recruited across the world, and the language requirement was fluency in English rather than English as mother tongue, I excluded the five items related to the articulation subscale. In this study, Cronbach's alpha of the five scales ranged from $\alpha = .65$ to $.85$.

Perceived Stress Scale–10-Item version. The Perceived Stress Scale–10 Item version (PSS–10; Cohen & Williamson, 1988) is a revised version of the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen,

Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). The PSS–10 is a 10-item self-reported instrument assessing perceived stress in everyday situations. The questionnaire is rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*very often*), where a higher score indicates higher levels of perceived stress. Previous studies support its validity when compared to other measurements of stress (Cohen et al., 1983; Lee, 2012). In this study, Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .60$.

STAI–Y2–Trait Anxiety subscale. The State–Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970) is a self-reported questionnaire with 40 items divided into two equivalent subscales, assessing state anxiety and trait anxiety. The STAI–Y2 subscale measures trait anxiety (e.g., how a participant feels in everyday life). Previous findings support the validity and internal consistency of the STAI (Vigneau & Cormier, 2008). In this study, Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .93$.

Results

Correlations between the DAPTQ, the PPI–SF, the TriPM, the CAS, the PSS, and the STAI–Y2

Table 3 provides the correlations between scores on the DAPTQ, the PPI–SF, the TriPM, the CAS, the PSS, and the STAI–Y2, and Table 4 provides the correlations between scores on the DAPTQ subscales and the aforementioned variables. Scores on the DAPTQ were strongly correlated with PPI–I ($r = .71$) and boldness ($r = .84$), while being moderately correlated with PPI–SF total ($r = .45$) and TriPM total ($r = .42$). Scores on the DAPTQ showed moderate correlations with the CAS ($r = .47$), as well as strong negative correlations with the PSS ($r = -.58$) and the STAI–Y2 ($r = -.69$). Although the TriPM provided a stronger correlation than the DAPTQ with the CAS, the association between scores on the DAPTQ and the PSS or the STAI–Y2 was stronger than the PPI–SF or the TriPM.

Examination of the DAPTQ subscales shows that similar to Study 1, scores on all subscales correlated moderately to strongly with the DAPTQ total score. Additionally, scores on all of the DAPTQ subscales, with the exception of money smart, correlated positively with either PPI–I or boldness. Although money smart was not positively correlated, it was moderately negatively correlated with PPI–II, and strongly negatively correlated with disinhibition. In terms of significantly strong correlations, composure scores were negatively associated with PSS and STAI–Y2 scores, extraversion was positively

Table 3. Correlations between the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ), the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Short Form (PPI–SF), the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM), the Communication Adaptability Scale (CAS), the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), and the State–Trait Anxiety Inventory - Trait Anxiety subscale (STAI–Y2).

| Scales | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------|------|------------|
| DAPTQ total | | | | | | | | | | |
| PPI–SF | | | | | | | | | | |
| PPI–I | | .71 | | | | | | | | |
| PPI–II | –.06 | .14 | | | | | | | | |
| PPI–SF total | .45 | .73 | .73 | | | | | | | |
| TriPM | | | | | | | | | | |
| Boldness | .84 | .75 | –.01 | .49 | | | | | | |
| Meanness | .25 | .31 | .50 | .62 | .26 | | | | | |
| Disinhibition | –.31 | –.04 | .60 | .33 | –.11 | .34 | | | | |
| TriPM total | .42 | .53 | .53 | .72 | .61 | .80 | .58 | | | |
| CAS | | | | | | | | | | |
| CAS total | .47 | .45 | –.12 | .15 | .55 | –.13 | –.05 | .20 | | |
| PSS | | | | | | | | | | |
| PSS total | –.58 | –.34 | .26 | –.10 | –.50 | –.11 | .35 | –.15 | –.25 | |
| STAI–Y2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| STAI–Y2 total | –.69 | –.43 | .36 | –.10 | –.61 | .00 | .43 | –.12 | –.42 | .79 |

Note. $N = 262$. For values shown in bold, $p < .001$. 1 = DAPTQ Total; 2 = PPI–I; 3 = PPI–II; 4 = PPI–SF Total; 5 = Boldness; 6 = Meanness; 7 = Disinhibition; 8 = TriPM Total; 9 = CAS Total; 10 = PSS Total.

associated with CAS total, and management scores were negatively associated with PSS and STAI–Y2.

Incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the PPI–SF in predicting the CAS, the PSS, and the STAI–Y2

Similar to Study 1, the incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the PPI–SF in predicting various adaptive traits was performed through a series of hierarchical linear regressions. Once again, all analyses were computed twice, once with PPI–SF in Block 1 and DAPTQ in Block 2, and a second time with DAPTQ in Block 1 and PPI–SF in Block 2. As shown in Table 5, when the DAPTQ was added in Block 2, the DAPTQ provided an increase over the PPI–SF in terms of predictive validity on all scales of the CAS, with the exception of social confirmation. The greatest

Table 4. Correlations between the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ) subscales, the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Short Form (PPI–SF), the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM), the Communication Adaptability Scale (CAS), the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), and the State–Trait Anxiety Inventory - Trait Anxiety subscale (STAI–Y2).

| DAPTQ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| DAPTQ Total | .68 | .45 | .75 | .32 | .45 | .38 | .54 | .62 | .65 |
| PPI–SF | | | | | | | | | |
| PPI–I | .53 | .18 | .54 | .19 | .65 | .06 | .23 | .52 | .26 |
| PPI–II | –.04 | –.21 | –.07 | .07 | .35 | –.32 | –.17 | .03 | –.30 |
| PPI–SF total | .30 | .04 | .36 | .14 | .65 | –.13 | .08 | .34 | .01 |
| TriPM | | | | | | | | | |
| Boldness | .72 | .26 | .64 | .26 | .48 | .11 | .28 | .62 | .50 |
| Meanness | .13 | .13 | .28 | –.09 | .45 | –.07 | .03 | .07 | .09 |
| Disinhibition | –.09 | –.46 | –.24 | .04 | .19 | –.53 | –.42 | .05 | –.50 |
| TriPM Total | .40 | –.01 | .37 | .11 | .57 | –.23 | –.04 | .39 | .07 |
| CAS | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | .55 | .00 | .31 | .17 | .09 | –.06 | .04 | .69 | .26 |
| PSS | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | –.31 | –.37 | –.67 | –.03 | –.08 | –.25 | –.33 | –.28 | –.55 |
| STAI–Y2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | –.43 | –.38 | –.72 | –.10 | –.11 | –.34 | –.31 | –.44 | –.58 |

Note. $N = 262$. 1 = leadership; 2 = logical thinking; 3 = composure; 4 = creativity; 5 = fearlessness; 6 = money smart; 7 = focus; 8 = extraversion; 9 = management. For values shown in bold, $p < .001$.

improvements in incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the PPI–SF were on measures of perceived stress (.22) and trait anxiety (.23). When PPI–SF was added in Block 2, it only provided greater adjusted R^2 change than the DAPTQ on the CAS social confirmation scale.

Similar to Study 1, scale-by-scale significance of the DAPTQ was verified to determine if all its subscales helped increase the predictive validity of the PPI–SF in one or multiple correlates. Only four of the DAPTQ subscales, namely composure, money smart, focus, and extraversion, were significant predictors on one or multiple of the CAS subscales. For the PSS total, composure and management were the only significant predictors. Finally, composure, creativity, focus, extraversion, and management were the only significant predictors of STAI–Y2. Overall, all DAPTQ subscales but three, namely leadership, logical thinking, and fearlessness, provided incremental validity over the PPI–SF over one or multiple subscales of the CAS, the PSS, or the STAI–Y2.

Incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the TriPM in predicting the CAS, the PSS, and the STAI–Y2

To confirm the results presented earlier, I examined the incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the TriPM, using the same technique as previously mentioned. As shown in Table 6, when the DAPTQ was added in Block 2, it provided a notable increase in incremental validity on social experience, social composure, and overall communicative adaptability. A modest increase was also observed on the wit subscale. Finally, the DAPTQ provided a significant increase in incremental validity over the TriPM for perceived stress (.18) and trait anxiety (.18). Alternatively, when the TriPM was added to Block 2, it provided a significant greater adjusted R^2 than the DAPTQ only on the social confirmation scale of the CAS.

Scale-by-scale examination of the DAPTQ was once again used to determine if all subscales helped increase the predictive validity of the TriPM. Three of the DAPTQ subscales—leadership, composure, and extraversion—were significant predictors in one or multiple of the CAS subscales. For the PSS total, composure and management were the only significant predictors. Finally, composure, focus, extraversion, and management were the only significant predictors of the STAI–Y2. Overall, all DAPTQ subscales but four, namely fearlessness, logical thinking, creativity, and money smart, provided incremental validity over the TriPM over one or multiple subscales of the aforementioned constructs.

Discussion

The purpose of these studies was to further validate the DAPTQ and establish its incremental validity over the PPI–SF and the TriPM over adaptive personality characteristics related to the psychopathic personality in community samples. As reported in its development phase, DAPTQ was negatively correlated with emotionality, and positively correlated with other personality traits of the Big Five, and not associated with honesty-humility. The incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the PPI–SF when predicting the Big Five was supported, with an additional 9% to 38% of the variance explained when adding the DAPTQ to the PPI–SF. In addition, with the exception of

Table 5. Incremental validity of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ) over the Psychopathic Personality Inventory–Short Form (PPI–SF) and vice versa.

| Criterion | Block 1: PPI–SF R^2 | p value in | Block 1: DAPTQ R^2 | p value in | PPI–SF /DAPTQ Block 2 | R^2 change PPI–SF to DAPTQ | p | R^2 change DAPTQ to PPI–SF | p |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------|------------------------------|--------|
| CAS | | | | | | | | | |
| Social experience | .42 | < .001 | .54 | < .001 | .56 | .14 | < .001 | .02 | = .010 |
| Social composure | .48 | < .001 | .60 | < .001 | .62 | .12 | < .001 | .02 | = .004 |
| Appropriateness | .05 | = .010 | .07 | = .001 | .10 | .05 | = .008 | .03 | = .062 |
| Wit | .12 | < .001 | .17 | < .001 | .17 | .05 | = .003 | .00 | = .642 |
| Social confirmation | .30 | < .001 | .07 | = .001 | .30 | .00 | = .402 | .23 | < .001 |
| Total | .47 | < .001 | .50 | < .001 | .57 | .10 | < .001 | .07 | < .001 |
| PSS | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | .30 | < .001 | .52 | < .001 | .52 | .22 | < .001 | .00 | = .172 |
| STAI–Y2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | .47 | < .001 | .64 | < .001 | .70 | .23 | < .001 | .06 | < .001 |

Note. CAS = Communication Adaptability Scale; PSS = Perceived Stress Scale; STAI–Y2 = State–Trait Anxiety Inventory - Trait Anxiety subscale. All analyses were run twice, once with PPI–SF subscales in the first block and DAPTQ subscales in the second block, and once with the DAPTQ subscales in the first block and the PPI–SF subscales in the second block. PPI–SF/DAPTQ Block 2 refers to the value of Block 2 when the other scale was in Block 1. R^2 change PPI–SF to DAPTQ refers to the adjusted R^2 difference when PPI–SF was analyzed as Block 1 and DAPTQ was analyzed as Block 2. R^2 Change DAPTQ to PPI–SF refers to the opposite, when DAPTQ is Block 1 and PPI–SF is Block 2.

honesty-humility and agreeableness, the PPI–SF did not provide more variance to the DAPTQ than the DAPTQ to the PPI–SF, further supporting the predictive abilities of the DAPTQ to measure facets related to the Big Five. Correlations and regression analyses in Study 2 further support the convergent and incremental validity of scores on the DAPTQ over the two most commonly used assessments of psychopathic personality including an adaptive component.

Examination of the association between the DAPTQ and the HEXACO scores from Study 1 reveals compelling results. First, despite multiple studies supporting a strong negative correlation between psychopathy and honesty-humility, the DAPTQ total score did not show a correlation with the aforementioned construct (Jonason & McCain, 2012; Lee & Ashton, 2005; Visser, Ashton, & Pozzebon, 2012). This absence of correlation might be due to the discriminant validity between the DAPTQ and psychopathy. Despite the correlation observed between the DAPTQ and the PPI total score ($r = .38$), as well as the correlation previously observed between the honesty-humility and PPI total score ($r = -.35$), the DAPTQ and the honesty-humility scale do not share any significant variance with one another (Visser et al., 2012). The five other factors assessed in the HEXACO gave similar results to the correlations observed between

the DAPTQ and the BFI during its development phase (Durand, 2017).

As previously mentioned, conscientiousness appears to be central to the concept of successful psychopathy (Lilienfeld et al., 2015). However, the findings reported here support that PPI–I is unrelated to conscientiousness, and the DAPTQ shows a weak association with the construct. The logical thinking, money smart, focus, and management subscales of the DAPTQ appear to be particularly related to conscientiousness. From a subjective perspective, these subscales encompass rational thinking. Although Cleckley (1988) was referring to the lack of irrational thinking as a common characteristic of psychopathic individuals, the findings suggest that it is the presence of rational thinking that could be related to successful psychopathic individuals.

Examination of the adjusted R^2 difference between the PPI–SF and the DAPTQ on the HEXACO support the incremental validity of the DAPTQ in predicting various personality traits. Among all traits, the largest predictive variance increase was seen on openness. Openness refers to the enjoyment of beauty in art and in nature, the tendency to seek information, a preference for innovation, and a tendency to accept the unusual (Lee & Ashton, 2004). Considering previous studies found nonsignificant to weak correlations between the presence of

Table 6. Incremental validity of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ) over the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM) and vice versa.

| Criterion | Block 1: TriPM R^2 | p value in | Block 1: DAPTQ R^2 | p value in | TriPM /DAPTQ Block 2 | R^2 change TriPM to DAPTQ | p | R^2 change DAPTQ to TriPM | p |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|
| CAS | | | | | | | | | |
| Social experience | .33 | < .001 | .54 | < .001 | .57 | .24 | < .001 | .03 | = .001 |
| Social composure | .37 | < .001 | .60 | < .001 | .61 | .24 | < .001 | .01 | = .025 |
| Appropriateness | .05 | = .001 | .07 | = .001 | .07 | .02 | = .079 | .00 | = .316 |
| Wit | .12 | < .001 | .18 | < .001 | .19 | .07 | < .001 | .01 | = .057 |
| Social confirmation | .31 | < .001 | .07 | = .002 | .33 | .02 | = .134 | .26 | < .001 |
| Total | .40 | < .001 | .50 | < .001 | .56 | .16 | < .001 | .06 | < .001 |
| PSS | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | .34 | < .001 | .52 | < .001 | .52 | .18 | < .001 | .00 | = .142 |
| STAI–Y2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | .50 | < .001 | .64 | < .001 | .68 | .18 | < .001 | .04 | < .001 |

Note. CAS = Communication Adaptability Scale; PSS = Perceived Stress Scale; STAI–Y2 = State–Trait Anxiety Inventory - Trait Anxiety subscale. All analyses were run twice, once with TriPM subscales in the first block and DAPTQ subscales in the second block, and once with the DAPTQ subscales in the first block and the TriPM subscales in the second block. TriPM/DAPTQ Block 2 refers to the value of Block 2 when the other scale was in Block 1. R^2 change TriPM to DAPTQ refers to the adjusted R^2 difference when TriPM was analyzed as Block 1 and DAPTQ was analyzed as Block 2. R^2 change DAPTQ to TriPM refers to the opposite, when DAPTQ is Block 1 and TriPM is Block 2.

psychopathic traits and openness, and considering openness can be classified as an adaptive trait, it is unsurprising that the DAPTQ predicts the aforementioned construct over two times better than the PPI-SF (Maples et al., 2014; Ross, Benning, Patrick, Thompson, & Thurston, 2009).

Although all DAPTQ subscales were based on previous findings associating adaptive constructs with psychopathy, money smart was not positively associated with the PPI-SF or the TriPM in Study 2, despite its association with the coldheartedness ($r = .22$) and stress immunity ($r = .17$) factors of the PPI-SF in its development (Durand, 2017). Originally, money management was not part of the selected adaptive construct to develop the DAPTQ. Instead, the three items now included in the subscale were originally part of the cautiousness (low impulsivity) construct. During the development of the DAPTQ, examination of the scale Cronbach's alpha and factor analysis removed the other items of the cautiousness domain (e.g., I plan my future carefully, I am a very spontaneous person, I am always thinking about multiple things at once), leaving only the money-management-related items (e.g., I have a tendency to buy objects I do not need, I have always considered myself to be smart with money). Theoretically, the three items associated with the money smart subscale could be linked with the management subscale. However, statistical analyses show that merging the items of the money smart subscale with the management subscale would lower the internal consistency of the new management subscale, and reduce the strength of its correlation with measures of psychopathic traits. Henceforth, evidence shows that, although money smart emerged from the factor analysis as an adaptive trait, it is not related to the concept of successful psychopathy. However, the strong negative correlations with disinhibition ($r = -.53$) and the weak negative correlation with the TriPM total ($r = -.23$) indicate that highly psychopathic individuals have difficulties managing money. Nevertheless, the results suggest removing the items related to the money smart subscale, as the purpose of the DAPTQ is not only to investigate adaptive traits, but rather to assess adaptive traits in the field of successful psychopathy.

Incremental validity of the DAPTQ over the PPI-SF and the TriPM was also examined in Study 2 on traits related to successful psychopathy. The DAPTQ provided a similar increase in predictive values over both instruments of psychopathic traits. Changes were particularly salient on measures of perceived stress and trait anxiety, with the DAPTQ significantly improving the prediction of both constructs over the PPI-SF and the TriPM. Stress and anxiety immunity, being hallmarks of successful psychopathy, demonstrate the usefulness of the DAPTQ in extending the predictive value of PPI-I (Lilienfeld et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2014). The DAPTQ also appears to provide increased predictive value over the PPI-SF and the TriPM on social experience and composure, appropriateness, and wit. These characteristics are part of the common traits proposed by Cleckley. Indeed, Cleckley (1988) considered psychopaths as often witty (p. 349), appropriate (p. 369), and with excellent social (although considered superficial) abilities (p. 339). Taken together, these characteristics further support the

relationship between the DAPTQ and the clinical profile of successful psychopathic individuals.

Repeating the analyses on the TriPM provided similar results regarding the incremental validity of the DAPTQ. Once again, the DAPTQ provided a stronger R^2 change on social experience and social composure than on the PPI-SF. Once more, the DAPTQ provided a noticeable increase in predictive value on perceived stress and trait anxiety, increasing the R^2 on both constructs by 18%. These results confirm the results obtained previously, supporting that both PPI-I and boldness, although capturing a wide range of adaptive traits in psychopathy, do not capture the full spectrum of adaptive traits in the field. The DAPTQ provides an opportunity to take into account a wider range of adaptive traits, increasing the predictive value of both PPI-I and boldness.

Excluding money smart, the DAPTQ contains a few subscales assessing traits never included in instruments assessing psychopathy, such as creativity. As described in the article on the DAPTQ development, multiple studies found weak correlations between psychopathy and creativity ($r = .13-.22$; Akhtar, Ahmetoglu, & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013; Galang, Castelo, Santos, Perlas, & Angeles, 2016; Jonason, Richardson, & Potter, 2015; Salekin, Neumann, Leistico, & Zalot, 2004). Additionally, highly psychopathic individuals tend to be rated more highly in terms of innovation and creativity by their peers (Babiak, Neumann, & Hare, 2010). Although the association between creativity and psychopathic traits is significantly weaker than other constructs, such as logical thinking, composure, or management abilities, its positive association with boldness in this study suggests that, although minor, creativity is indeed related to the construct of successful psychopathy.

Limitations and conclusion

There are several limitations to consider. First, the participants were excessively heterogeneous. Recruitment was performed online, and no eligibility criteria were set regarding location, education, and current marital status. Although this type of community sample offers a broader view of individuals in general, differences might be observable in specific populations, such as college graduates, children, or forensic populations. Second, although self-reported questionnaires are commonly used in the field of personality, experimental evidence is necessary to support the validity of the DAPTQ to assess adaptive traits. For instance, future work should focus on DAPTQ measurements and stress resilience in an experimental task as measured by physiological factors. Nevertheless, this study gave several insights regarding the validity of the DAPTQ in a community sample, as well as further evidence of its incremental validity over the PPI-SF and the TriPM in assessing adaptive traits known to correlate with psychopathy and psychopathic traits.

Disclosure

Guillaume Durand is the developer of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire and receives royalties for the sales of this measure.

ORCID

Guillaume Durand  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5418-4429>

References

- Akhtar, R., Ahmetoglu, G., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2013). Greed is good? Assessing the relationship between entrepreneurship and sub-clinical psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*(3), 420–425. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.10.013
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*(4), 340–345. doi:10.1080/00223890902935878
- Babiak, P., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2010). Corporate psychology: Talking the walk. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 28*(2), 174–193. doi:10.1002/bsl.925
- Baskin-Sommers, A. R., Zeier, J. D., & Newman, J. P. (2009). Self-reported attentional control differentiates the major factors of psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*(6), 626–630. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.05.027
- 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. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.15.3.340
- Berg, J. M., Smith, S. F., Watts, A. L., Ammirati, R., Green, S. E., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2013). Misconceptions regarding psychopathic personality: Implications for clinical practice and research. *Neuropsychiatry, 3*(1), 63–74. doi:10.2217/np.12.69
- Blagov, P. S., Patrick, C. J., Oost, K. M., Goodman, J. A., & Pugh, A. T. (2016). Triarchic psychopathy measure: Validity in relation to normal-range traits, personality pathology, and psychological adjustment. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 30*(1), 71–81. doi:10.1521/pedi_2105_29_182
- Blonigen, D. M. (2013). Is fearless dominance relevant to the construct of psychopathy? Reconciling the dual roles of theory and clinical utility. *Personality Disorders, 4*(1), 87–88. doi:10.1037/a0027152
- Camp, J. P., Skeem, J. L., Barchard, K., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Poythress, N. G. (2013). Psychopathic predators? Getting specific about the relation between psychopathy and violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 81*(3), 467–480. doi:10.1037/a0031349
- Cleckley, H. (1941). The mask of sanity; an attempt to reinterpret the so-called psychopathic personality. *Jama, 117*(6), 493. doi:10.1001/jama.1941.02820320085028
- Cleckley, H. (1988). *The mask of sanity: An attempt to clarify some issues about the so called psychopathic personality*. (5th ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby. doi:10.1097/00007611-195105000-00028
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*(4), 385–396. doi:10.2307/2136404
- Cohen, S., & Williamson, G. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States. In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *The social psychology of health: Claremont symposium on applied social psychology*. (pp. 31–67). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment, 13*(2), 171–188. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.13.2.171
- Dindo, L., & Fowles, D. (2011). Dual temperamental risk factors for psychopathic personality: Evidence from self-report and skin conductance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(3), 557–566. doi:10.1037/a0021848
- Duran, R. L. (1983). Communicative adaptability: A measure of social communicative competence. *Communication Quarterly, 31*(4), 320–326. doi:10.1080/01463378309369521
- Durand, G. (2016). A Replication of “Using self-esteem to disaggregate psychopathy, narcissism, and aggression (2013)”. *The Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 12*(2), r1–r5. doi:10.20982/tqmp.12.2.r001.
- Durand, G. (2018). Demystification of the relationship between psychopathy and happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 19*(2), 381–395. doi:10.1007/s10902-016-9823-0.
- Durand, G. (2017). The durand adaptive psychopathic traits questionnaire: Development and validation. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 1*–10. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/00223891.2017.1372443
- Durand, G., & Plata, E. M. (2017). The effects of psychopathic traits on fear of pain, anxiety, and stress. *Personality and Individual Differences, 119*, 198–203. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.07.024
- Durand, G., Plata, E. M., & Arbone, I.-S. (2017). Negative attitudes towards psychopaths: The role of one’s own psychopathic traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 109*, 72–76. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.12.047
- Galang, A. J. R., Castelo, V. L. C., Santos, L. C., Perlas, C. M. C., & Angeles, M. A. B. (2016). Investigating the prosocial psychopath model of the creative personality: Evidence from traits and psychophysiology. *Personality and Individual Differences, 100*, 28–36. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.081
- Gao, Y., & Raine, A. (2010). Successful and unsuccessful psychopaths: A neurobiological Model. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 28*(2), 194–210. doi: 10.1002/bsl.924.
- Grieve, R. (2012). The Role of Personality, Psychopathy, and Previous Experience with Assessment in Intentions to Fake in Psychological Testing. *Current Psychology, 31*(4), 414–422. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-012-9158-x>
- Hall, J., 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. doi:10.1037/a0035665
- Hare, R. D. (1991). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL-R)*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Manual for the revised psychopathy checklist*, 2nd ed. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.
- Harpur, T. J., Hare, R. D., & Hakstian, A. R. (1989). Two-factor conceptualization of psychopathy: Construct validity and assessment implications. *Psychological Assessment, 1*(1), 6–17. doi:10.1037//1040-3590.1.1.6
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The big five inventory - versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Jonason, P. K., & McCain, J. (2012). Using the HEXACO model to test the validity of the dirty dozen measure of the dark triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*(7), 935–938. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.07.010
- Jonason, P. K., Richardson, E. N., & Potter, L. (2015). Self-reported creative ability and the dark triad traits: An exploratory study. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 9*(4), 488–494. doi:10.1037/aca0000037
- Lee, E.-H. (2012). Review of the psychometric evidence of the perceived stress scale. *Asian Nursing Research, 6*(4), 121–127. doi:10.1016/j.anr.2012.08.004
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*(2), 329–358. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, machiavellianism, and narcissism in the five-factor model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*(7), 1571–1582. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.016
- Lilienfeld, S. O., Latzman, R. D., Watts, A. L., Smith, S. F., & Dutton, K. (2014). Correlates of psychopathic personality traits in everyday life: Results from a large community survey. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00740>
- 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*(3), 327–340. doi:10.1037/a0026987
- Lilienfeld, S. O., Waldman, I. D., Landfield, K., Watts, A. L., Rubenzer, S., & Faschingbauer, T. R. (2012). Fearless dominance and the U.S. presidency: Implications of psychopathic personality traits for successful and unsuccessful political leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*(3), 489–505. doi:10.1037/a0029392
- Lilienfeld, S. O., Watts, A. L., & Smith, S. F. (2015). Successful psychopathy: A scientific status report. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24*(4), 298–303. doi:10.1177/0963721415580297

- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Widows, M. (2005). Psychopathic personality inventory—revised: Professional manual. Lutz, FL: *Psychological Assessment Resources*.
- Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2012). Fearless dominance and psychopathy: A response to Lilienfeld et al. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3(3), 341–353. doi:10.1037/a0028296
- Maples, J. L., Miller, J. D., Fortune, E., MacKillop, J., Campbell, W. K., Lynam, D. R., ... Goodie, A. S. (2014). An examination of the correlates of fearless dominance and self-centered impulsivity among high-frequency gamblers. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 28(3), 379–393. doi:10.1521/pedi_2013_27_125
- Mullins-Sweatt, S. N., Glover, N. G., Derefinko, K. J., Miller, J. D., & Widiger, T. A. (2010). The search for the successful psychopath. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(4), 554–558. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.05.010
- Patrick, C. (2010). Triarchic psychopathy measure (TriPM). *PhenX Toolkit Online Assessment Catalog*.
- 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. doi:10.1017/S0954579409000492
- 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(1), 71–87. doi:10.1177/1073191108322207
- Salekin, R. T., Neumann, C. S., Leistico, A.-M. R., & Zalot, A. A. (2004). Psychopathy in youth and intelligence: An investigation of cleckley's hypothesis. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 33(4), 731–742. doi:10.1207/s15374424jccp3304_8
- Smith, S. F., Watts, A. L., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2014). On the trail of the elusive successful psychopath. *The Psychologist*, 27(7), 506–511.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, R. E. (1970). Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Uzieblo, K., Verschuere, B., Van den Bussche, E., & Crombez, G. (2010). The validity of the psychopathic personality inventory—revised in a community sample. *Assessment*, 17(3), 334–346. doi:10.1177/1073191109356544
- Vigneau, F., & Cormier, S. (2008). The factor structure of the state-trait anxiety inventory: An alternative view. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90(3), 280–285. doi:10.1080/00223890701885027
- Visser, B. A., Ashton, M. C., & Pozzebon, J. A. (2012). Is low anxiety part of the psychopathy construct? *Journal of Personality*, 80(3), 725–747. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00745.x
- Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Blonigen, D. M., Krueger, R. F., & Conger, R. D. (2009). Assessment of fearless dominance and impulsive antisociality via normal personality measures: Convergent validity, criterion validity, and developmental change. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(3), 265–276. doi:10.1080/00223890902794317

Appendix: Descriptive data

| | Sample 1 | | Sample 2 | | Cohen's <i>d</i> with normative sample |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|--|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | |
| DAPTQ | | | | | |
| Leadership | 13.92 | 4.25 | 14.44 | 4.36 | 0.25/0.12 |
| Logical thinking | 21.73 | 4.12 | 22.00 | 4.05 | 0.03/0.10 |
| Composure | 18.98 | 7.17 | 18.09 | 6.82 | 0.25/0.39 |
| Creativity | 15.18 | 4.87 | 15.20 | 4.86 | 0.04/0.03 |
| Fearlessness | 18.46 | 5.87 | 17.85 | 6.62 | 0.69/0.75 |
| Money smart | 12.59 | 3.15 | 12.11 | 3.75 | 0.22/0.07 |
| Focus | 13.01 | 4.15 | 11.34 | 4.12 | 0.02/0.43 |
| Extraversion | 18.65 | 6.64 | 18.81 | 6.91 | 0.21/0.18 |
| Management | 11.53 | 3.23 | 11.48 | 3.48 | 0.01/0.01 |
| Total | 144.06 | 24.75 | 141.35 | 24.66 | 0.32/0.43 |
| PPI-SF | | | | | |
| PPI-I | 49.97 | 8.95 | 50.75 | 8.83 | 0.37/0.30 |
| PPI-II | 60.60 | 9.57 | 58.14 | 9.13 | 0.30/0.52 |
| Total | 125.40 | 14.59 | 123.27 | 14.53 | 0.47/0.57 |
| HEXACO | | | | | |
| Honesty-humility | 34.07 | 6.57 | — | — | 0.34 |
| Emotionality | 31.23 | 6.87 | — | — | 0.16 |
| Extraversion | 29.60 | 7.44 | — | — | 0.60 |
| Agreeableness | 31.41 | 6.38 | — | — | 0.14 |
| Conscientiousness | 35.87 | 5.81 | — | — | 0.02 |
| Openness | 37.40 | 6.61 | — | — | 0.23 |
| TriPM | | | | | |
| Boldness | — | — | 47.68 | 9.39 | 0.25 |
| Meanness | — | — | 32.81 | 9.00 | 0.13 |
| Disinhibition | — | — | 35.87 | 8.38 | 0.24 |
| Total | — | — | 116.37 | 17.84 | 0.05 |
| CAS | | | | | |
| Social experience | — | — | 15.38 | 3.83 | Unavailable |
| Social composure | — | — | 15.90 | 3.51 | Unavailable |
| Appropriateness | — | — | 18.40 | 2.78 | Unavailable |
| Wit | — | — | 15.75 | 3.53 | Unavailable |
| Social confirmation | — | — | 19.12 | 3.01 | Unavailable |
| Total | — | — | 84.58 | 10.66 | Unavailable |
| PSS | | | | | |
| Total | — | — | 18.87 | 4.80 | 0.09 |
| STAI-Y2 | | | | | |
| Total | — | — | 47.36 | 11.86 | 0.14 |

Note. Values to the left and right of the slash sign indicate Sample 1 and Sample 2, respectively. The normative sample of the DAPTQ was taken from Study 2 of the article on the development of the DAPTQ (Durand, 2017). The normative sample of the PPI-SF was taken from Lilienfeld, Latzman, Watts, Smith, and Dutton (2014), as their sample is one of the largest and most recent community samples using the PPI-SF. The normative sample of the HEXACO was taken from a study investigating a community sample (Grieve, 2012). The normative sample for the TriPM was from a community sample (Durand, Plata, & Arbone, 2017). The normative sample for the PSS and STAI-Y2 were from a community sample (Durand & Plata, 2017).