

**Using the HEXACO to Capture Psychopathy:
Development and Initial Validation of the Power Proxies of Psychopathic Traits**

By

Jordan P. Power

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Social Sciences, Brock University
St. Catharines, Ontario

© Power 2022

Abstract

Psychopathy, though often considered an abnormal personality construct, has been repeatedly found to be related to “normal” personality traits, and the HEXACO model of personality is particularly capable of capturing the “dark” personality variance integral to the construct. Additionally, while previous research indicates that psychopathy can be applied to both sexes, it has been suggested that psychopathic traits are expressed somewhat differently between men and women. In Study 1, we examined the relations between the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP) and the HEXACO-60 in a student sample ($n = 1,346$) in order to create proxy measures for Hare’s two-factor/four-facet model of psychopathy and to investigate sex differences in the associations between the SRP and the HEXACO. We created “general” proxies for use with samples of men and women in addition to male- and female-specific proxies for potential use with samples of exclusively men or women, respectively. The proxies had good psychometric properties and had stronger correlations with several psychopathy-relevant variables than did a previous attempt to measure the SRP facets using HEXACO items. In Study 2, we investigated how the proxies would function in a youth community sample ($n = 396$). The proxies related to many external variables in a similar manner as that of a previously validated measure of psychopathic traits in youth, suggesting that the proxy scales can be used with younger populations. In Study 3, we used a MTurk sample ($n = 471$) to update the proxy scales with HEXACO-100 items and to investigate sex differences in the relations between the SRP and the new HEXACO items. Several items were added to each version of the proxy scales and, compared to the original proxies, the updated proxies displayed better psychometric properties and stronger correlations with

psychopathy-relevant variables. Overall, this program of research demonstrates considerable overlap between Hare's model of psychopathy and the HEXACO model of personality. Honesty-Humility and altruism seem to underlie all of the psychopathy scales, whereas aspects of the other HEXACO domains tend to differentiate the psychopathy scales from one another. Further, several sex differences in how psychopathic traits relate to basic personality were identified.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Angela Book for her supervision and encouragement throughout this project. This program of research was made possible because of her. I am eternally grateful that she welcomed me into her lab seven years ago. I would also like to thank my supervisory committee, Dr. Mike Ashton and Dr. Drew Dane, for their consultation and feedback and for providing me with novel ideas throughout the different stages of this program of research. I would like to thank Dr. Joshua Miller and Dr. Michael Savage for agreeing to be on my examination committee, as well as Dr. Beth Visser for her valued support and her excitement about this project. I would also like to thank the members of the Brock Forensic Lab, past and present. Not only have they provided their unique thoughts and perspectives on my research over the years, but the friendships that were formed within the lab (often through shared stressful experiences) have been an invaluable part of my graduate school experience. Finally, I need to thank my family. I would not be where I am today without their love and support.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	x
CHAPTER ONE: General Introduction	1
Psychopathy	2
Sex Differences	4
Psychopathy and Normal Personality	11
The Big Five	11
The HEXACO	14
The Present Research	18
Study 1	19
Study 2	20
Study 3	20
References	21
CHAPTER TWO: Using the HEXACO-60 to Capture Psychopathic	
Traits: Similarities and Differences Between Men and Women	28
Sex Differences in Psychopathy	28
Psychopathy and Normal Personality	31
The Present Study	33
Method	35
Participants	35

Measures	35
Key Variables	35
Additional Dataset 1 Variables	36
Additional Dataset 2 Variables	38
Data Analysis and Results	40
Establishing Overlap Between the SRP and HEXACO-60	40
Proxy Measures	41
Item Selection	41
Addressing Overlapping Items	42
Evaluating Construct Validity	45
General Proxies	47
Male-Specific Proxies	47
Female-Specific Proxies	48
Proxies vs. SRP	49
Sex Differences in Correlations	50
Discussion	52
Objective 1: Creating HEXACO Proxies for the SRP	52
Objective 2a: Creating Sex-Specific Proxies	55
A Note on Antisocial Behaviour	58
Objective 2b: Practical Sex Differences	59
Stronger Relationships in Men	59
Stronger Relationships in Women	60
Limitations and Future Research	63

Conclusion	64
References	78
CHAPTER THREE: Extending the Power Proxies of Psychopathic Traits to an Adolescent Sample	89
Psychopathy and Normal Personality	89
Psychopathy and Youth	93
The Present Study	94
Method	95
Participants	95
Measures	95
Key Variables	95
Additional Variables	96
Data Analysis and Results	102
General Proxies	104
Male-Specific Proxies	105
Female-Specific Proxies	106
Proxies vs. APSD	107
Discussion	108
Objective 1: Examining Relationships Between Proxies and External Variables	108
Objective 2: Investigating the Utility of the Sex-Specific Proxies	110
Limitations	112
Conclusion	113

References	127
CHAPTER FOUR: Incorporating HEXACO-100 Items Into the Power	
Proxies of Psychopathic Traits	136
Using the HEXACO to Measure Psychopathy	136
The Power Proxies	138
The Present Study	139
Method	141
Participants	141
Measures	141
Key Variables	141
Additional Variables	143
Data Analysis and Results	145
Updating Proxy Scales	145
Selecting New Items	145
Evaluating Construct Validity	145
General Proxies	147
Male-Specific Proxies	147
Female-Specific Proxies	148
Proxies vs. SRP	149
Sex Differences in Correlations	149
Discussion	151
Objective 1: Updating the Power Proxies with HEXACO-100 Items	151
Objective 2: Practical Sex Differences	155

Stronger Relationships in Men	156
Stronger Relationships in Women	157
Limitations and Future Research	161
Conclusion	163
References	180
CHAPTER FIVE: General Discussion	187
Measuring Psychopathy Using the HEXACO	188
The Role of Antisocial Behaviour	191
Using the Power Proxies with Different Age Groups	193
Addressing Concerns About Applying Psychopathy to Youth Populations	196
Overall Sex Difference Findings	199
Limitations	201
Conclusion	203
References	205
Appendix A: Supplemental Tables	213
Appendix B: Measures	317

List of Tables

Table 2-1	<i>HEXACO-60 Items in General Proxy Scales</i>	65
Table 2-2	<i>General Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample</i>	66
Table 2-3	<i>HEXACO-60 Items in Male-Specific Proxy Scales</i>	67
Table 2-4	<i>Male-Specific Proxies' and General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men</i>	68
Table 2-5	<i>Male-Specific Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men</i>	69
Table 2-6	<i>HEXACO-60 Items in Female-Specific Proxy Scales</i>	70
Table 2-7	<i>Female-Specific Proxies' and General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women</i>	71
Table 2-8	<i>Female-Specific Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women</i>	72
Table 2-9	<i>General Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample</i>	73
Table 2-10	<i>Male-Specific Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men</i>	74
Table 2-11	<i>Female-Specific Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women</i>	75
Table 2-12	<i>Relative and Absolute Profile Similarities Between Proxy Scales and Corresponding SRP Scales</i>	76

Table 2-13	<i>Magnitudes of Sex Differences in Correlations Between Proxy Items and SRP Scales</i>	77
Table 3-1	<i>Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alphas for the Power Proxies in an Adolescent Sample</i>	115
Table 3-2	<i>Canonical Loadings for Relevant Variables in Total Sample</i>	116
Table 3-3	<i>Male-Specific Proxies' and General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys</i>	117
Table 3-4	<i>Canonical Loadings for Relevant Variables in Boys</i>	118
Table 3-5	<i>Female-Specific Proxies' and General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls</i>	119
Table 3-6	<i>Canonical Loadings for Relevant Variables in Girls</i>	120
Table 3-7	<i>General Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample</i>	121
Table 3-8	<i>Male-Specific Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys</i>	122
Table 3-9	<i>Female-Specific Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls</i>	123
Table 3-10	<i>General Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Discriminant Variables in Total Sample</i>	124
Table 3-11	<i>Male-Specific Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Discriminant Variables in Boys</i>	125
Table 3-12	<i>Female-Specific Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Discriminant Variables in Girls</i>	126

Table 4-1	<i>Proportion of HEXACO-60 Items Meeting Cutoff for Inclusion on Proxy Scales in the Present Study</i>	164
Table 4-2	<i>New HEXACO-100 Items Added to General Proxy Scales</i>	165
Table 4-3	<i>Updated General Proxies' and Original General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample</i>	166
Table 4-4	<i>Updated General Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample</i>	167
Table 4-5	<i>New HEXACO-100 Items Added to Male-Specific Proxy Scales</i>	168
Table 4-6	<i>Updated Male-Specific Proxies' and Original Male-Specific Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men</i>	169
Table 4-7	<i>Updated Male-Specific Proxies' and Updated General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men</i>	170
Table 4-8	<i>Updated Male-Specific Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men</i>	171
Table 4-9	<i>New HEXACO-100 Items Added to Female-Specific Proxy Scales</i>	172
Table 4-10	<i>Updated Female-Specific Proxies' and Original Female-Specific Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women</i>	173
Table 4-11	<i>Updated Female-Specific Proxies' and Updated General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women</i>	174
Table 4-12	<i>Updated Female-Specific Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women</i>	175
Table 4-13	<i>Updated General Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample</i>	176

Table 4-14	<i>Updated Male-Specific Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men</i>	177
Table 4-15	<i>Updated Female-Specific Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women</i>	178
Table 4-16	<i>Magnitudes of Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100 Proxy Items and SRP Scales</i>	179

CHAPTER ONE

General Introduction

Psychopathy is generally described as a personality construct that encompasses traits such as manipulativeness, callousness, and impulsivity (Hare, 2003). While the construct has been applied to both men and women for research and forensic purposes, it is often considered a male-typical strategy (Blanchard & Lyons, 2016) and it has been argued that measures of psychopathy tend to be better validated for use in male populations (Vidal et al., 2010). As a result, there is a growing body of research investigating the applicability of the construct to women, and while it certainly seems that psychopathy can be applied to both sexes, it has been suggested that psychopathic women might differ in some ways from psychopathic men.

Further, psychopathy is sometimes referred to as a personality disorder, implying the construct is abnormal in nature. However, there is evidence to suggest that psychopathy is strongly related to basic or “normal” personality traits, including the Big Five and HEXACO models of personality. The HEXACO’s Honesty-Humility domain seems to be particularly capable of capturing much of the so-called “dark” personality variance integral to psychopathy (e.g., Hodson et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2013).

This program of research aims to examine the relations between psychopathy and the HEXACO in order to create proxy measures for psychopathy and identify sex differences in how the construct may be expressed through normal personality traits. Before the studies are described in more detail, relevant background information is first discussed, including a brief history and description of psychopathy, evidence supporting

the existence of sex differences in psychopathy, and past research pertaining to the relations between psychopathy and models of normal personality.

Psychopathy

In the early 1800s, Pinel coined the term *manie sans délire* to describe a condition believed to consist of mania without delusional thinking, or more generally, psychological disturbance without disordered thoughts (Horley, 2014). This construct is often considered to have been the catalyst in the development of our current conceptualizations of psychopathy. Following the appearance of Pinel's construct, other individuals began outlining characteristics that are included in, or relevant to, the modern view of psychopathy. Hervey Cleckley was one of such individuals, and his work throughout the 1900s was particularly influential to our current understanding of psychopathy. Cleckley used case studies to describe individuals whom he considered to have psychopathic personalities. Men were described in his earliest case studies, but cases describing women were later included. Cleckley originally identified 21 characteristics of psychopathy (Cleckley, 1941), though after several revisions, he ultimately selected 16 and collectively referred to them as his clinical profile: 1) superficial charm and good intelligence, 2) absence of delusions and other signs of irrational thinking, 3) absence of nervousness or psychoneurotic manifestations, 4) unreliability, 5) untruthfulness and insincerity, 6) lack of remorse or shame, 7) inadequately motivated antisocial behaviour (i.e., engaging in antisocial acts for very minor rewards/benefits or for no discernable reason at all), 8) poor judgment and failure to learn by experience, 9) pathologic egocentricity and incapacity for love, 10) general poverty in major affective reactions, 11) specific loss of insight, 12) unresponsiveness in

general interpersonal relations, 13) fantastic and uninviting behaviour with drink and sometimes without (i.e., rude, vulgar, or inexplicably strange behaviour that often occurs with only small amounts of alcohol and sometimes when sober), 14) suicide threats rarely carried out, 15) sex life impersonal, trivial, and poorly integrated, and 16) failure to follow any life plan (Cleckley, 1976). Cleckley's clinical profile is often cited as having been extremely influential in the development of the construct of psychopathy.

There is more than one contemporary conceptualization of psychopathy. The Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996), for instance, measures psychopathy on eight dimensions: Machiavellian egocentricity, social potency (i.e., the tendency to be charming, manipulative), fearlessness, coldheartedness, impulsive nonconformity, carefree nonplanfulness, blame externalization, and stress immunity. Contrastingly, the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM; Patrick, 2010) is based on the theory that psychopathy comprises three constructs: disinhibition, boldness (e.g., remaining calm under pressure, having high self-assurance, possessing a tolerance for unfamiliarity and danger), and meanness (e.g., lacking empathy, lacking close interpersonal attachments, feeling empowered through cruelty) (Patrick et al., 2009). However, Hare's model of psychopathy, largely inspired by Cleckley's work (Hare & Neumann, 2008), is the best known and, to date, the most widely used. According to Hare's model, psychopathy is made up of two related factors. Factor 1 (Interpersonal/Affective) includes traits such as manipulateness and callousness, and Factor 2 (Lifestyle/Antisocial) includes traits such as impulsiveness and criminal versatility. These factors can be further broken down into four facets: interpersonal manipulation, callous affect, erratic lifestyle, and antisocial behaviour.

The only diagnostic tool for psychopathy is the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003), which was designed to be used as a risk assessment tool in forensic settings. The PCL-R mirrors Hare's model of psychopathy. It is a 20-item symptom rating scale that is completed by a clinician using information gathered through an interview alongside a review of the individual's case file. Individuals with total scores of 30 or higher (out of a possible 40) can be clinically identified as psychopaths. However, lower cutoff scores, such as 25, are commonly used for research purposes. Although the PCL-R's two-factor/four-facet structure is well established, it should be noted that some researchers have suggested alternative structures. For example, Cooke and Michie (2001) have proposed a slightly different structure that removes items assessing criminal behaviour, resulting in three factors (i.e., Arrogant and deceitful interpersonal style, Deficient affective experience, and Impulsive and irresponsible behaviour style) using 13 of the 20 PCL-R items.

The Self-Report Psychopathy Scale, now on its fourth edition (SRP:4; Paulhus et al., 2016), is a measure of psychopathy developed for use in community and student samples. It has the same two-factor/four-facet structure as the PCL-R as both are modelled after Hare's conceptualization of psychopathy. However, because the SRP is not a diagnostic tool, psychopathy scores are measured on a continuum and there are no set cutoff scores for classifying psychopaths.

Sex Differences

The notion of sex differences in psychopathy has long been a relatively under-investigated area of research. That said, the topic has received more attention in recent years, and there are now several studies that support the existence of sex differences in

the construct. One of the more established findings is that, on average, women tend to have lower psychopathy scores than men. More specifically, total PCL-R scores tend to be four to six points lower in women than in men, and this difference has been found in forensic samples (e.g., Hare, 1991; Salekin et al., 1997) as well as student samples (e.g., Forth et al., 1996). Of course, due to the generally lower scores found in women, the number of women who meet Hare's recommended cutoff score of 30 tends to be lower as well (Jackson et al., 2002). As a result, women are less likely than men to be classified as psychopaths. For instance, Vitale et al. (2002) stated that base rates of psychopathy typically range from 9-23% in incarcerated women and 15-30% in incarcerated men. Though much of the research on sex differences in psychopathy scores focuses on the PCL-R, women are often found to score lower on self-report psychopathy measures as well (e.g., Verona & Vitale, 2006; Zágón & Jackson, 1994). In a meta-analysis of psychopathy rates in the general population, Sans-Garcia et al. (2021) found the prevalence of psychopathy as measured by the PCL-R to be approximately 1.2%. However, when also considering various self-report psychopathy measures, the estimated prevalence was increased to 4.5% and was significantly lower in women compared to men (2.9% and 7.9%, respectively).

While commonalities are often found in the comorbidities of psychopathy in men and women, there is also some evidence to suggest the existence of sex differences in this area. For example, while antisocial personality disorder has strong comorbidity with psychopathy in both men and women, the remaining cluster B personality disorders (i.e., borderline personality disorder, narcissistic personality disorder, and histrionic personality disorder) also have strong comorbidity with psychopathy in women (Wynn et

al., 2012). Further, Blonigen et al. (2005) found in a behaviour genetic study that, compared to men, women had stronger positive associations between Factor 2 psychopathy and internalizing psychopathology (i.e., mood and anxiety symptoms).

There have also been potential differences suggested in terms of the actual manifestation of prototypical psychopathic traits. Nicholls and Petrila (2005) commented that women likely display psychopathic traits in the home more often than men. Consequently, they would be more likely to victimize people they know and be more likely to engage in relational aggression (Nicholls & Petrila, 2005). The authors point out that as a result of the potential types and targets of women's antisocial behaviours, it is also possible that these behaviours would be less likely to be recorded in official records (Nicholls & Petrila, 2005). This could, in turn, result in lower psychopathy scores in women, as PCL-R scores are strongly influenced by the information found in an individual's case file.

The types of conduct problems in childhood that are often associated with the development of psychopathy in adulthood (e.g., criminal tendencies, rule violations, physical aggression, violence) tend to be better predictors of psychopathic development in boys than they are in girls (Wynn et al., 2012). Psychopathic development in girls seems to be marked by a more non-physical form of aggression consisting of jealousy, self-harm, manipulation, and verbal aggression (Wynn et al., 2012). Additionally, girls who go on to have high psychopathy scores when they are older tend to have a later onset of behavioural problems than what is typically seen in boys, with these problems often arising in adolescence rather than early childhood (Wynn et al., 2012).

Forouzan and Cooke (2005) summarized what they consider to be four key areas in how sex differences in psychopathy manifest. The first area is behavioural expression. They suggest that women are more likely to use flirtation as a manipulation tactic, while manipulative men are more likely to con others by running scams and committing fraud. Further, impulsiveness and conduct disorder in women are often associated with behaviours such as running away and engaging in self-harm, but are more likely to be associated with violent behaviours in men. Forouzan and Cooke's second area is interpersonal symptoms. It has been suggested that women with high psychopathy scores, on average, tend to present as less superficially charming and glib than men with high psychopathy scores. They also do not exhibit the same sense of grandiosity that men who score high on psychopathy often do. That said, some women can present with these characteristics, but usually only at very high levels of psychopathy. Forouzan and Cooke's third area is the psychological meaning of indicators. It has been suggested that typical psychopathic behaviours may have different underlying motivational factors in men and women. For example, while promiscuity in psychopathic men might be mostly associated with high levels of sensation-seeking, promiscuity in psychopathic women might be more motivated by some kind of financial or social gain. Thus, promiscuity in women could potentially be more manipulative in nature. The fourth and final area Forouzan and Cooke identify is societal norms. They suggest that different societal norms for men and women could impact whether or not certain behaviours are evaluated as indicators of psychopathy. For example, in many societies, it is generally socially acceptable for a woman to be financially dependent on her partner. Conversely, a man in

a similar situation may be more likely to be seen as having a parasitic disposition (Forouzan & Cooke, 2005).

Some researchers argue that in order to truly advance our knowledge of psychopathy as it manifests in women, more qualitative and case study methodologies should be applied to the investigation of female psychopathy. By doing this, it would be possible to focus on mapping out the key aspects of the construct in women without being too influenced by the established conceptualizations of the construct in men. Kreis and Cooke (2012) reported that many of the characteristics of female psychopathy found in Cleckley's early case studies are also found in more recent biographical accounts of women who exhibit psychopathic traits. Similar to psychopathic men, the women in these real-life accounts tend to display a level of callousness and cruelty while lacking the capacity to deeply experience empathy or remorse (Kreis & Cooke, 2012). They also tend to be manipulative and deceitful (Kreis & Cooke, 2012). They engage in a variety of behaviours to gain control over others, including sexual seduction, feigned vulnerability and victimization, emotional blackmail, and relational aggression (Kreis & Cooke, 2012). While some of these women exhibit strong behavioural control and shallow affect, as often seen in psychopathic men, others are quite behaviourally impulsive and emotionally unstable (Kreis & Cooke, 2012). Further, they may be involved in seemingly strong interpersonal relationships, but in actuality these women are emotionally detached and their relationships are often treated as a means to an end, as they see no issue with selfishly using their romantic partners and children in a manner that serves only their own interests (Kreis & Cooke, 2012). Kreis and Cooke sum up their review of the qualitative and case study data on psychopathic women by suggesting that they may share several

characteristics with psychopathic men, such as a lack of empathy and remorse, low anxiety, and shallow affect. However, some psychopathic women may be less emotionally stable than what characterizes the prototypical psychopathic man, and psychopathic women may tend to use their sexuality more as a tool for manipulation (Kreis & Cooke, 2012). Further, in line with findings based on quantitative data, psychopathic women do not seem to be as grandiose or superficially charming as psychopathic men (Kreis & Cooke, 2012).

Some researchers have investigated sex differences specific to the PCL-R. It is worth noting that the PCL-R was incredibly influential in the development of several self-report measures of psychopathy. Therefore, findings from these studies have implications for not only the application of the PCL-R to women, but also for the application of the measures based on the PCL-R, such as the SRP, to women. Grann (2000) found through a matched-pair design, where male violent offenders were matched on several variables to female violent offenders, that men more often scored a “clearly present” on six PCL-R items: shallow affect, callous/lack of empathy, impulsivity, failure to accept responsibility, juvenile delinquency, and criminal versatility. In contrast, women more often scored a “clearly present” on two items: promiscuous sexual behaviour and irresponsibility. They also found through stepwise discriminant analysis that the callous/lack of empathy and juvenile delinquency items best discriminated the men from the women, whereas the promiscuous sexual behaviour item best discriminated the women from the men. Strand and Belfrage (2005) found in a forensic sample using the screening version of the PCL-R (PCL:SV; Hart et al., 1995) that men scored higher on seven items: superficial, grandiose, lacks remorse, lacks empathy, lacks goals,

adolescent antisocial behaviour, and adult antisocial behaviour. Women scored higher on impulsive and poor behavioural control. However, the authors also examined only the offenders who scored high enough on the PCL:SV to be classified as psychopaths. They found that psychopathic men scored higher on adolescent antisocial behaviour and adult antisocial behaviour and that psychopathic women scored higher on deceitful and poor behavioural control.

While some studies have looked at sex differences in PCL-R item expression, others have assessed the overall factor structure of the PCL-R. For example, in a sample of female offenders, Jackson et al. (2002) compared Hare's original two-factor model and Cooke and Michie's (2001) three-factor model that removes the assessment of criminal behaviour. They found through a series of confirmatory factor analyses that Cooke and Michie's model provided the best fit to the data. Further, Salekin et al. (1997) conducted an exploratory factor analysis on a female inmate sample and found a two-factor model, outwardly similar to Hare's. However, while Salekin et al. (1997) found the same number of factors as recommended by Hare, the structure of the factors differed in some ways from Hare's. For instance, while poor behavioural control, lack of realistic goals, and impulsivity load on one factor in men, these items loaded highly on both factors in women. They also found that some items were indicative of a different factor in women compared to men. The authors stated that the primary difference in their sample of female inmates, compared to a reference sample of male inmates (Hare et al., 1990), was a higher degree of overlap between the two factors in women.

In sum, although the notion of sex differences has not received as much attention as some of the other lines of research pertaining to psychopathy, several researchers have found evidence in support of the existence of such differences.

Psychopathy and Normal Personality

The Big Five

Some researchers have investigated how psychopathy relates to basic or “normal” personality. The majority of research addressing the relations between psychopathy and normal personality traits has used the Big Five model. This model was conceived when Tupes and Christal (1961/1992) factor analyzed personality-related adjectives identified by Cattell (1947), which were based on earlier work by Allport and Odbert (1936). They consistently found that the adjectives could be grouped into five factors, a finding that was replicated by other researchers. The Big Five model has since gained immense popularity and consists of the following domains: Neuroticism (e.g., moody, anxious), Extraversion (e.g., talkative, lively), Openness to Experience (e.g., unconventional, intellectual), Agreeableness (e.g., kind, cooperative), and Conscientiousness (e.g., organized, thorough).

A number of meta-analyses have been conducted to look at the associations between the Big Five and the components of the Dark Triad (i.e., psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism; Paulhus & Williams, 2002), though only the findings specific to psychopathy will be discussed here. Across four separate meta-analyses, psychopathy was found to be consistently negatively associated with Agreeableness with weighted mean correlations ranging from $-.42$ to $-.55$ (Decuyper et al., 2009; Muris et al., 2017; O’Boyle et al., 2015; Vize et al., 2018). This is not surprising, as individuals with

high psychopathy scores are known to lack compassion and to be very antagonistic towards others, both hallmarks of low Agreeableness. Psychopathy was also found to be negatively correlated with Conscientiousness with weighted mean correlations ranging from -.26 to -.34. This also makes sense theoretically as some of the defining characteristics of psychopathy, specifically Factor 2, are lack of planning and failing to pay attention to rules. There were some statistically significant associations between psychopathy and the remaining Big Five domains, but these relationships were notably smaller, the largest being .09.

Decuyper et al. (2009) and O'Boyle et al. (2015) not only examined the associations between psychopathy and the Big Five traits at the domain level, but also at the facet level when this information was available. Across the two studies, psychopathy was unsurprisingly found to be negatively associated with all facets of Agreeableness (ranging from -.19 to -.61) and Conscientiousness (ranging from -.11 to -.38). However, psychopathy was also related to some of the facets of the other domains. Decuyper et al. found that psychopathy was associated with the Extraversion facets excitement-seeking (.31), warmth (-.20), and assertiveness (.16), and the Neuroticism facets angry hostility (.29), impulsiveness (.24), and anxiety (-.15). Similarly, O'Boyle et al. found that psychopathy was associated with the Extraversion facets excitement-seeking (.20), warmth (-.18), and positive emotions (-.13), and the Neuroticism facets angry hostility (.28) and impulsiveness (.28). These results suggest that although Agreeableness and Conscientiousness may be the most relevant Big Five domains when it comes to psychopathy, there are still noteworthy associations between psychopathy and facets of other domains, namely Extraversion and Neuroticism.

Because of the relevance of certain Big Five traits to the construct of psychopathy, several researchers have investigated whether psychopathy can be simply understood as a collection of Big Five traits. Widiger and Lynam (1998) went through the 20 PCL-R items and listed the Big Five facets they believed to be associated with each. According to Widiger and Lynam, PCL-R psychopathy is associated with low scores on one Neuroticism facet (i.e., self-consciousness), two Extraversion facets (i.e., warmth and positive emotions), five Agreeableness facets (i.e., straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, and tender-mindedness), and four Conscientiousness facets (i.e., dutifulness, achievement striving, self-discipline, and deliberation). PCL-R psychopathy is also associated with high scores on two Neuroticism facets (i.e., angry hostility and impulsiveness) and one Extraversion facet (i.e., excitement-seeking).

Miller et al. (2001) asked multiple psychopathy researchers to rate the prototypical psychopath on each of the Big Five facets. According to this expert-generated profile, psychopathy is associated with low scores on four Neuroticism facets (i.e., anxiety, depression, self-consciousness, and vulnerability), one Extraversion facet (i.e., warmth), one Openness facet (i.e., openness to feelings), all six Agreeableness facets (i.e., trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, and tender-mindedness), and three Conscientiousness facets (dutifulness, self-discipline, and deliberation). Prototypical psychopathy, as rated by experts, is also associated with high scores on one Neuroticism facet (i.e., impulsiveness), two Extraversion facets (i.e., assertiveness and excitement-seeking), one Openness facet (i.e., openness to actions), and one Conscientiousness facet (i.e., competence).

Lynam and Miller (2015) compiled data on the empirical relations between the Big Five facets and multiple psychopathy measures. They then provided an empirical profile of psychopathy by averaging the correlations across the different measures. According to this empirical profile, psychopathy is negatively correlated with one Neuroticism facet (i.e., anxiety), one Extraversion facet (i.e., warmth), all six Agreeableness facets (i.e., trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, and tender-mindedness), and five Conscientiousness facets (i.e., (i.e., competence, order, dutifulness, self-discipline, and deliberation). According to Lynam and Miller's empirical profile, psychopathy is also positively correlated with two Neuroticism facets (i.e., angry hostility and impulsiveness) and one Extraversion facet (i.e., excitement-seeking).

Overall, past research has demonstrated substantial overlap between psychopathy and the Big Five model of personality. The exact traits that seem to be relevant to psychopathy may differ somewhat across methodologies, but several facets (most notably from Agreeableness and Conscientiousness) are consistently associated with the construct.

The HEXACO

Although most of the research examining psychopathy and normal personality has focused on the Big Five model of personality, the HEXACO model is also very relevant when it comes to trying to map psychopathy onto normal personality traits. The HEXACO model of personality was introduced more recently than the Big Five, after several studies of personality structure in a variety of languages consistently found six factors, as opposed to five (Ashton, 2018). It is important to note that the studies from which the Big Five model was conceived focused only on English-language adjectives.

Further, advances in technology now allow more words to be factor analyzed at one time than was possible in the earlier English-language studies (Ashton, 2018); more recent English-language studies have found a six-factor personality structure as well (e.g., Ashton et al., 2004). The HEXACO model of personality has gained considerable traction and consists of the following factors: Honesty-Humility (e.g., sincere, honest), Emotionality (e.g., sentimental, fearful), Extraversion, (e.g., outgoing, lively), Agreeableness (e.g., patient, gentle), Conscientiousness (e.g., organized, diligent), and Openness to Experience (e.g., creative, unconventional).

While Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience are very much the same in both models, there are notable differences between Big Five Agreeableness and HEXACO Agreeableness as well as between Big Five Neuroticism and HEXACO Emotionality (Ashton, 2018). Put broadly, some traits associated with Big Five Agreeableness (e.g., sentimental) are associated with HEXACO Emotionality rather than HEXACO Agreeableness, and some traits associated with Big Five Neuroticism (e.g., irritable) are associated with HEXACO Agreeableness rather than HEXACO Emotionality (Ashton, 2018). Thus, although HEXACO Agreeableness and Emotionality function similarly in some ways compared to their Big Five counterparts, they function differently in others. Therefore, one must keep in mind that the relationships between psychopathy and Big Five Agreeableness/Neuroticism do not necessarily correspond to the relationships between psychopathy and HEXACO Agreeableness/Emotionality.

While there are some differences between two of the HEXACO factors and their corresponding Big Five factors, it is the additional sixth personality factor, Honesty-Humility, that seemingly makes the HEXACO model particularly applicable to the

construct of psychopathy. Honesty-Humility captures individual differences in traits such as manipulation and entitlement, which are not captured as well in the Big Five model, yet are very relevant to psychopathy (Lee & Ashton, 2014). Since the HEXACO was published, it has been shown to have an advantage over the Big Five in measuring socially malevolent personality constructs, often referred to in the literature as “dark” personality constructs. This type of research often centers around the Dark Triad. Before the HEXACO was published, researchers who were interested in both “normal” and “dark” personality traits would have to include measures of the Big Five and measures of the Dark Triad in their studies. However, the HEXACO model captures the variance of both the Big Five and the Dark Triad, a component of which is psychopathy (Lee & Ashton, 2014).

Hodson et al. (2018) found that when the Dark Triad components were treated as indicators of a latent Dark Triad factor and when the Honesty-Humility facets were treated as indicators of a latent Honesty-Humility factor, the two latent variables were correlated at -0.95 (i.e., they shared 90% of their variance). Essentially, “dark” personality variance was almost entirely explained by (low) Honesty-Humility. It should be noted that it has also been suggested that “dark” personality variance can be explained by other constructs (e.g., low Big Five Agreeableness; Vize et al., 2020), but within the HEXACO framework, Honesty-Humility is undoubtedly the strongest candidate.

Lee et al. (2013) also investigated how the Dark Triad was related to the HEXACO and found that the shared variance between the Dark Triad components was correlated with Honesty-Humility at -0.94 when using self-report ratings, a finding strikingly similar to that of Hodson et al. (2018). However, there is more to the construct

of psychopathy than just the variance it shares with narcissism and Machiavellianism. Lee et al. (2013) also looked at how the residual variances of the individual Dark Triad components were related to the HEXACO factors. Once the shared variance of the three components was partialled out, they found that the residual psychopathy variance was negatively correlated with Emotionality (-.77 for self-report ratings; -.63 for peer ratings) and Conscientiousness (-.34 for self-report ratings; -.35 for peer ratings). The residual psychopathy variance was also negatively correlated with Agreeableness at -.48 for peer ratings, though the relationship was not significant for self-report ratings. These findings suggest that not only is Honesty-Humility strongly related to the aspects of psychopathy that are common among the Dark Triad components, but that other HEXACO factors (e.g., Emotionality, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness) are related to the aspects of psychopathy that distinguish it from the other components. Thus, although Honesty-Humility would surely be extremely important when trying to map psychopathy onto the HEXACO model of personality, other HEXACO factors would likely come into play as well.

Given that there are clear links between psychopathic traits and the HEXACO model of normal personality, there have been attempts to create proxies for psychopathy using HEXACO items. For example, Ruchensky et al. (2018) created proxies for the Triarchic Model using items from the 100-item version of the HEXACO Personality Inventory (HEXACO-100; Lee & Ashton, 2018). Items that were rated as being most relevant to the constructs of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition were initially selected for each scale. After some modifications (e.g., removing any items that had inadequate

correlations with the TriPM), the final proxies consisted of 11 items for boldness, 11 items for meanness, and 10 items for disinhibition.

More relevant to the present research, Međedović (2017) created proxies for Hare's model of psychopathy, specifically the facets, using items from the HEXACO-100. To create the proxies, items that were correlated with the SRP subscales at a magnitude of at least $\pm .20$ were chosen. The proxies consisted of 18 items for interpersonal manipulation, 18 items for callous affect, and 17 items for erratic lifestyle; a proxy for antisocial behaviour could not be constructed. Importantly, Međedović's proxies did not account for potential sex differences. He did not look at men and women separately, but instead looked at the SRP-HEXACO correlations in his total sample. Consequently, it is possible that some of the items may be relevant for men but not particularly relevant for women, or vice versa. For example, if an item was correlated at .30 with callous affect in women, but only at .10 in men, it would meet the .20 cutoff when looking at the overall correlation using the total sample. This would result in the item being included in the callous affect proxy even though it was not overly relevant to callous affect in men. This example, though hypothetical, illustrates how by not looking at the correlations separately for both sexes, we cannot be certain whether each item actually meets the cutoff for both sexes.

The Present Research

Due to the HEXACO's ability to capture both "normal" and "dark" personality variance, and considering the research pertaining to the relationships between the HEXACO and psychopathy, we decided to create proxy measures for Hare's model of psychopathy using items from the HEXACO Personality Inventory, similar to the work

done by Međedović (2017). However, the aim of the present research was to create proxies while taking potential sex differences into consideration. We decided to attempt to construct proxy measures for each of the four facets of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (i.e., interpersonal manipulation, callous affect, erratic lifestyle, and antisocial behaviour). We also decided to create proxies for Factor 1, Factor 2, and total psychopathy score, as researchers are typically interested in measuring these as well, oftentimes more so than the facets. Before constructing the proxies, it was determined that every item selected for inclusion on a given scale would be required to meet our cutoff criteria for both men and women separately.

It was also of interest to make note of sex differences in terms of which HEXACO items met our chosen cutoff for inclusion on each scale and to create additional sex-specific proxies if the differences were prominent enough to warrant doing so. Relatedly, we decided to identify HEXACO items that function differently for men and women in how strongly they relate to psychopathy and its various subscales. To clarify, in addition to examining sex differences in terms of which items simply met the cutoff for inclusion on the proxies as described above, the magnitudes of the sex differences in correlations would also be examined in order to identify any differences with potentially meaningful significance. By identifying differences between men and women in terms of how strongly psychopathy relates to the HEXACO items (i.e., items that make up a scale that purportedly covers the entire range of personality), new avenues for future investigation could be discovered.

Study 1

In Study 1, the correlations between the individual items of the 60-item HEXACO Personality Inventory (HEXACO-60; Ashton & Lee, 2009) and the various scales of the SRP were examined separately for men and women. Proxy measures for psychopathy using the HEXACO-60 were created and their relations with several additional psychopathy-relevant variables were analyzed. In addition, sex differences in how these items related to psychopathy and its facets/factors were identified.

Study 2

Study 2 was conducted to validate the proxies in a community sample of adolescents by investigating the relationships between the proxies and several additional psychopathy-relevant variables. This was done in order to determine whether the proxies could be used with younger populations.

Study 3

In Study 3, the 40 items from the HEXACO-100 that are not included in the HEXACO-60 were examined in order to construct modified versions of the proxies to be used when the HEXACO-100 is included in researchers' datasets. These proxies were once again validated by examining their relationships with theoretically relevant variables. Further, sex differences in how the new items related to psychopathy were investigated.

References

- Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, *47*, i–171. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093360>
- Ashton, M. C. (2018). *Individual differences and personality* (3rd ed.). Academic Press.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *91*, 340–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878>
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Goldberg, L. R. (2004). A hierarchical analysis of 1,710 English personality-descriptive adjectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 707–721. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.5.707>
- Blanchard, A., & Lyons, M. (2016). Sex differences between primary and secondary psychopathy, parental bonding, and attachment style. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, *10*, 56–63. <http://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000065>
- Blonigen D. M., Hicks, B. M., Krueger, R. F., Patrick, C. J., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Psychopathic personality traits: Heritability and genetic overlap with internalizing and externalizing psychopathology. *Psychological Medicine*, *35*, 637–648. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704004180>
- Cattell, R. B. (1947). Confirmation and clarification of primary personality factors. *Psychometrika*, *12*, 197–220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289253>
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The mask of sanity*. Mosby.
- Cleckley, H. (1976). *The mask of sanity* (5th ed.). Mosby.
- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a

hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment*, *13*, 171–188.

<https://doi.org/10.1037//1040-3590.13.2.171>

Decuyper, M., De Pauw, S., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., & De Clercq, B. J. (2009). A meta-analysis of psychopathy-, antisocial PD- and FFM associations. *European Journal of Personality*, *23*, 531–565. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.729>

Forouzan, E., & Cooke, D. J. (2005). Figuring out la femme fatale: Conceptual and assessment issues concerning psychopathy in females. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *23*, 765–778. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.669>

Forth, A. E., Brown, S. L., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1996). The assessment of psychopathy in male and female noncriminals: Reliability and validity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *20*, 531–543.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(95\)00221-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(95)00221-9)

Grann, M. (2000). The PCL-R and gender. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *16*, 147–149. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.16.3.147>

Hare, R. D. (1991). *Manual for the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R. D. (2003). *Manual for the Revised Psychopathy Checklist* (2nd ed.). Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R. D., Harpur, T. J., Hakstian, A. R., Forth, A. E., Hart, S. D., & Newman, J. P. (1990). The revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and factor structure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *2*, 338–341.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.2.3.338>

Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2008). Psychopathy as a clinical and empirical construct.

Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 4, 217–246.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091452>

Hart, S. D., Cox, D., & Hare, R. D. (1995). *Manual for the screening version of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL:SV)*. Multi-Health Systems.

Hodson, G., Book, A., Visser, B. A., Volk, A. A., Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2018). Is the Dark Triad common factor distinct from low Honesty-Humility? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 73, 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.012>

Horley, J. (2014). The emergence and development of psychopathy. *History of the Human Sciences*, 27, 91–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695114541864>

Jackson, R. L., Rogers, R., Neumann, C. S., & Lambert, P. L. (2002). Psychopathy in female offenders: An investigation of its underlying dimensions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 692–704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009385402237922>

Kreis, M. K. F., & Cooke, D. J. (2012). The manifestation of psychopathic traits in women: An exploration using case examples. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 11, 267–279. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2012.746755>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 2–5.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.048>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100.

Assessment, 25, 543–556. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116659134>

Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., Visser, B. A., & Gallucci, A.

- (2013). Sex, power, and money: Prediction from the Dark Triad and Honesty-Humility. *European Journal of Personality*, *27*, 169–184.
<http://doi.org/10.1002/per.1860>
- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *66*, 488–524.
http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6603_3
- Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2015). Psychopathy from a basic trait perspective: The utility of a Five-Factor Model approach. *Journal of Personality*, *83*, 611–626.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12132>
- Međedović, J. (2017). Can HEXACO-PI-R adequately represent the four-factor model of psychopathy? *Psihologijske Teme*, *26*, 557–576. <http://doi.org/10.31820/pt.26.3.4>.
- Miller, J., Lynam, D., Widiger, T., & Leukefeld, C. (2001). Personality disorders as extreme variants of common personality dimensions: Can the Five-Factor Model adequately represent psychopathy? *Journal of Personality*, *69*, 253–276.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00144>
- Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the Dark Triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 183–204. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616666070>
- Nicholls, T. L., & Petrila, J. (2005). Gender and psychopathy: An overview of important issues and introduction to the special issue. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *23*, 729–741. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.677>

- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the Dark Triad and Five-Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Personality, 83*, 644–664. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12126>
- Patrick, C. (2010). Operationalizing the Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Preliminary description of brief scales for assessment of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition [Unpublished manual]. Florida State University.
- Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Development and Psychopathology, 21*, 913–938. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579409000492>
- Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2016). *Manual for the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Fourth Edition*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556–563. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
- Ruchensky, J. R., Donnellan, M. B., & Edens, J. F. (2018). Development and initial validation of the HEXACO-Triarchic scales. *Psychological Assessment, 30*, 1560–1566. <http://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000609>
- Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., & Sewell, K. W. (1997). Construct validity of psychopathy in a female offender sample: A multitrait-multimethod evaluation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 106*, 576–585. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.106.4.576>

- Sanz-García, A., Gesteira, C., Sanz, J., & García-Vera, M. P. (2021). Prevalence of psychopathy in the general adult population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 1–14.
<http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.661044>
- Strand, S., & Belfrage, H. (2005). Gender differences in psychopathy in a Swedish offender sample. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 23*, 837–850.
<http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.674>
- Tupes, E. C., & Christal, R. E. (1992). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 225–251. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00973.x> (Original work published 1961)
- Verona, E., & Vitale, J. (2006). Psychopathy in women: Assessment, manifestations, and etiology. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 415–436). Guilford Press.
- Vidal, S., Skeem, J., & Camp, J. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Painting different paths for low-anxious and high-anxious psychopathic variants. *Law and Human Behavior, 34*, 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-009-9175-y>
- Vitale, J. E., Smith, S. S., Brinkley, C. A., & Newman, J. P. (2002). The reliability and validity of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised in a sample of female offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29*, 202–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854802029002005>
- Vize, C. E., Collison, K. L., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2020). The “core” of the Dark Triad: A test of competing hypotheses. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 11*, 91–99. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000386>

- Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., Collison, K. L., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Differences among Dark Triad components: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 9*, 101–111.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/per0000222>
- Widiger, T. A., & Lynam, D. R. (1998). Psychopathy and the Five-Factor Model of personality. In T. Millon, E. Simonsen, M. Birket-Smith, & R. D. Davis (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal, and violent behavior* (pp. 171–187). Guilford Press.
- Wynn, R., Høiseth, M. H., & Pettersen, G. (2012). Psychopathy in women: Theoretical and clinical perspectives. *International Journal of Women's Health, 4*, 257–263.
<http://doi.org/10.2147/IJWH.S25518>
- Zágon, I. K., & Jackson, H. J. (1994). Construct validity of a psychopathy measure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 17*, 125–135. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)90269-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90269-0)

CHAPTER TWO

Using the HEXACO-60 to Capture Psychopathic Traits: Similarities and Differences Between Men and Women

Hare's model of psychopathy posits that the construct is made up of two factors: Factor 1 (Interpersonal/Affective) includes traits such as manipulateness and callousness, and Factor 2 (Lifestyle/Antisocial) includes traits such as impulsiveness and criminal versatility. These factors can be further broken down into four facets: interpersonal manipulation, callous affect, erratic lifestyle, and antisocial behaviour. While not the only conceptualization of psychopathy, Hare's two-factor/four-facet model is the most heavily researched and widely used. In fact, the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003), which follows this model, is the only tool used to determine an individual's psychopathy level for forensic purposes (e.g., sentencing).

Psychopathy is sometimes referred to as a male-typical strategy (Blanchard & Lyons, 2016), and it has been argued that psychopathy measures tend to be better validated for use with men (Vidal et al., 2010). Further, it is often considered an abnormal personality construct, sometimes referred to as a personality *disorder*, yet research suggests that psychopathy overlaps with models of "normal" personality, including the HEXACO (Lee & Ashton, 2014; Lee et al., 2013). Thus, the general goal of the present study was to examine the relationships between Hare's model of psychopathy and the HEXACO model of personality and to determine how these relationships may differ between men and women.

Sex Differences in Psychopathy

The construct of psychopathy, and the tools used to measure it, are used with both male and female populations. However, researchers have found evidence of sex differences in the construct. For example, women tend to have lower psychopathy scores than men (e.g., Forth et al., 1996; Hare, 1991; Salekin et al., 1997; Sanz-García et al., 2021; Verona & Vitale, 2006; Zágón & Jackson, 1994). Subsequently, fewer women meet the threshold to be classified as psychopaths (Jackson et al., 2002).

Psychopathic development in males is typically marked by criminal tendencies, rule violations, physical aggression, and violence, with behavioural problems first appearing in childhood (Wynn et al., 2012). However, intense jealousy, self-harm, manipulation, and verbal aggression may be more indicative of psychopathic development in females, with behavioural problems often not appearing until adolescence (Wynn et al., 2012). Psychopathy in women has also been found to be more strongly associated with certain personality disorders (e.g., borderline personality disorder, histrionic personality disorder) than is often the case with men (Wynn et al., 2012), and Factor 2 may be more strongly related to mood and anxiety disorders in women as well (Blonigen et al., 2005). Kreis and Cooke (2012) examined real-life biographical accounts of psychopathic women and reported that while these women tended to share many characteristics with psychopathic men, they often demonstrated greater impulsivity and emotional instability. Further, psychopathic women may present as less grandiose/superficially charming and may make greater use of their sexuality as a manipulation tactic (Forouzan & Cooke, 2005; Kreis & Cooke, 2012). Forouzan and Cooke (2005) suggested that there may be sex differences in the underlying factors behind prototypical psychopathic behaviours. For example, a psychopathic woman might

act promiscuously in order to manipulate others, whereas a psychopathic man may act promiscuously due to high levels of sensation-seeking (Forouzan & Cooke, 2005).

Forouzan and Cooke (2005) also pointed out that societal gender norms could affect the evaluation of certain traits or behaviours as indicators of psychopathy.

Some researchers have examined sex differences in PCL-R item expression and factor structure. Grann (2000) found that male violent offenders were more likely to score a “clearly present” on certain items (e.g., shallow affect, criminal versatility), and female violent offenders were more likely to score a “clearly present” on others (e.g., promiscuous sexual behaviour, irresponsibility). Strand and Belfrage (2005) reported that among offenders who scored high enough on the Psychopathy Checklist-Screening Version (PCL:SV; Hart et al., 1995) to be classified as psychopaths, men scored higher on adolescent antisocial behaviour and adult antisocial behaviour whereas women scored higher on deceitful and poor behavioural control. Salekin et al. (1997) conducted an exploratory factor analysis of the PCL-R on a female inmate sample and found a two-factor structure; however, the structure of the factors did not directly correspond to Hare’s. Compared to a reference sample of male inmates (Hare et al., 1990), the main difference was that items were more likely to load on both factors in women. Through a series of confirmatory factor analyses, Jackson et al. (2002) found that a three-factor PCL-R structure proposed by Cooke and Michie (2001) provided a better fit to the data in female offenders than did Hare’s original two factors. Of note, Cooke and Michie’s structure only used 13 of the 20 PCL-R items and removed any assessment of criminal behaviour.

In sum, while it can certainly be argued that psychopathic men and psychopathic women are more similar than not, there is evidence that sex differences exist in the manifestation of psychopathy.

Psychopathy and Normal Personality

Although psychopathy is often considered an abnormal personality construct, several researchers have attempted to determine how psychopathy relates to basic or “normal” personality traits. Researchers often use the Big Five model of personality (i.e., Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness) to investigate the associations between psychopathy and normal personality traits. In multiple meta-analyses of the relationships between the Big Five domains and the components of the Dark Triad (i.e., narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy; Paulhus & Williams, 2002), psychopathy has been found to be particularly (negatively) related to Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Decuyper et al., 2009; Muris et al., 2017; O’Boyle et al., 2015; Vize et al., 2018). However, when examining the Big Five traits at the facet level, significant associations with psychopathy also emerge within Extraversion (e.g., excitement-seeking, warmth) and Neuroticism (e.g., angry hostility, impulsiveness) (Decuyper et al., 2009; O’Boyle et al., 2015). Thus while (low) Agreeableness and (low) Conscientiousness seem to be particularly important to psychopathy at the domain level, certain facets of the other domains might also be relevant.

Though it has been suggested that psychopathy can be largely understood as a collection of Big Five traits (e.g., Lynam & Miller, 2015; Miller et al., 2001; Widiger & Lynam, 1998), the HEXACO model of personality (i.e., Honesty-Humility, Emotionality,

Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness) may be better able to capture individual differences in certain psychopathy-relevant traits, such as manipulation and entitlement, through its Honesty-Humility domain (Lee & Ashton, 2014; Visser et al., 2012). This domain has been found to account for much, and sometimes nearly all, of the shared variance between the components of the Dark Triad (Book et al., 2015; Hodson et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2013). Essentially, (low) Honesty-Humility has been suggested to be at the core of “dark” personality¹, making it extremely relevant to the construct of psychopathy. Moreover, Lee et al. (2013) found that after removing the shared Dark Triad variance from psychopathy, the remaining psychopathy variance demonstrated significant associations with Emotionality ($r = -.77$ for self-report ratings; $r = -.63$ for peer ratings), Conscientiousness ($r = -.34$ for self-report ratings; $r = -.35$ for peer ratings), and Agreeableness ($r = -.48$ for peer ratings).

Given the theoretical and empirical associations between psychopathy and the HEXACO model of personality, some researchers have attempted to create proxy measures of psychopathy using HEXACO items. For instance, Ruchensky et al. (2018) created proxies for the Triarchic Model of psychopathy by initially selecting items from the HEXACO-100 (Lee & Ashton, 2018) based on their theoretical relevance to the model’s three components (i.e., boldness, meanness, and disinhibition). They subsequently tested the associations between these items and the corresponding scales of the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM; Patrick, 2010) before finalizing their proxies. Also using items from the HEXACO-100, Međedović (2017) attempted to create proxies for Hare’s four-facet model of psychopathy by examining the items’ correlations

¹ Other candidates for the construct that best explains the core of “dark” personality have been suggested, most notably (low) Big Five Agreeableness (e.g., Vize et al., 2020).

with the facets of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP; Paulhus et al., 2016) and selecting those that met a correlation cutoff of $\pm.20$. Proxies were created for three of the SRP facets, but a proxy for antisocial behaviour could not be constructed. Ruchensky et al.'s and Međedović's findings provide solid evidence that it is possible to use HEXACO items to capture psychopathic traits. However, when considering previous research supporting the existence of sex differences in psychopathy, one might expect there to be at least some differences between men and women in how psychopathy relates to models of normal personality, including the HEXACO. That said, sex differences were not investigated in these studies.

The Present Study

The goal of the present study was to examine the associations between psychopathy and the HEXACO model of personality in order to create proxy measures of SRP psychopathy and its facets/factors. While this is not the first attempt to measure psychopathy using HEXACO items, it is the first to do so by examining the relationships between psychopathy and the HEXACO in men and women separately. Analyzing the relationships in this manner ensures that all selected items are relevant to psychopathy in both sexes. Further, it allows for the identification of sex differences in which items meet the inclusion criteria for the proxy scales and to construct additional male- and/or female-specific proxies if there are enough differences to deem the creation of these versions worthwhile. In addition to identifying sex differences in which items simply meet the inclusion criteria, we can also examine the magnitudes of the differences in order to determine which ones may hold some practical significance. That is, we can determine

whether there are potentially meaningful sex differences in the presentation of psychopathy from a normal trait perspective.

Method

Participants

Four previously-collected datasets, each containing the key variables described below, were combined into one large dataset. Dataset 1 came from Book et al. (2016), Dataset 2 from Visser and Schueler (2016), and Dataset 3 from Book et al. (2020); Dataset 4 has not been used in previous publications. The final sample consisted of 1,346 participants (813 women, 508 men, 25 undisclosed) and ranged from 17 to 59 years of age ($M = 20.69$, $SD = 5.07$). Of the participants for whom information on race was available ($n = 132$), 65.9% were White, 22.0% were Asian, and 8.3% were Black.

Measures

Note that the means and standard deviations of the study variables can be found in Appendix A (Table A2-1).

Key Variables

Psychopathy. Psychopathy was measured using the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Fourth Edition (SRP:4; Paulhus et al., 2016), which consists of 64 statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). The scale measures four related facets of psychopathy: interpersonal manipulation (IPM; e.g., “I purposely flatter people to get them on my side,” $\alpha = .86$), callous affect (CA; e.g., “I’m more tough-minded than other people,” $\alpha = .80$), erratic lifestyle (ELS; e.g., “I’m a rebellious person,” $\alpha = .81$), and antisocial behaviour (ASB; e.g., “I was convicted of a serious crime,” $\alpha = .81$). The interpersonal manipulation and callous affect facets can be combined to capture Hare’s Factor 1 (F1; $\alpha = .90$), and the

erratic lifestyle and antisocial behaviour facets can be combined to capture Hare's Factor 2 (F2; $\alpha = .87$). Total psychopathy score can also be calculated ($\alpha = .93$).

HEXACO Personality Traits. The HEXACO model of personality was measured using the 60-item version of the HEXACO Personality Inventory-Revised (HEXACO-60; Ashton & Lee, 2009), which consists of statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale measures six domains of normal personality: Honesty-Humility (e.g., "I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed"), Emotionality (e.g., "I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions"), Extraversion (e.g., "I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone"), Agreeableness (e.g., "I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me"), Conscientiousness (e.g., "I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute"), and Openness to Experience (e.g., "I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries"). Only the individual HEXACO items, not the scale scores, were used in the present study.

Additional Dataset 1 Variables

Exploitativeness and Entitlement. Exploitativeness and entitlement were measured using the exploitativeness and entitlement subscales of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979, 1981). Each subscale consists of pairs of statements and participants choose the one they feel best describes them. Exploitativeness is measured through five pairs (e.g., "I can read people like a book" vs. "People are sometimes hard to understand") and entitlement is measured through six

pairs (e.g., “I expect a great deal from other people” vs. “I like to do things for other people”).

Vengeance. Vengeance was measured using the Vengeance Scale (Stuckless & Goranson, 1992), which consists of 20 statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 7-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) (e.g., “I try to even the score with anyone who hurts me,” $\alpha = .93$).

Status-Driven Risk Taking. Status-driven risk taking was measured using the Status-Driven Risk Taking scale (SDRT; Ashton et al., 2010), which consists of 14 statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) (e.g., “I would risk my life for a good chance of finding a huge amount of buried treasure,” $\alpha = .92$).

Mating Orientation. Mating orientation was measured using the Expanded Multidimensional Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (EM-SOI; Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007), which consists of statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale measures short-term mating orientation through 10 items (e.g., “Sex without love is OK,” $\alpha = .94$) and long-term mating orientation through seven items (e.g., “I can see myself settling down romantically with one special person,” $\alpha = .93$).

Aggression. Aggression was measured using the Reactive-Proactive Aggression Questionnaire (RPQ; Raine et al., 2006), which consists of items that describe various aggressive behaviours. Participants indicate how often they engage in each behaviour on a 3-point scale from 0 (*never*) to 2 (*often*). The scale measures reactive aggression through 11 items (e.g., “How often have you yelled at others when they have annoyed

you?” $\alpha = .84$) and proactive aggression through 12 items (e.g., “How often have you had fights with others to show who was on top?” $\alpha = .85$).

Dark Triad. The Dark Triad components were measured using the Short Dark Triad (SD3; Jones & Paulhus, 2014), which consists of 27 statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale measures subclinical levels of narcissism (e.g., “I have been compared to famous people,” $\alpha = .70$), psychopathy (e.g., “People who mess with me always regret it,” $\alpha = .79$), and Machiavellianism (e.g., “Most people can be manipulated,” $\alpha = .85$).

Sadism. Sadism was measured using the Varieties of Sadistic Tendencies scale (VAST; Paulhus & Jones, 2015), which consists of 16 statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) (e.g., “I enjoy physically hurting people,” $\alpha = .85$).

Additional Dataset 2 Variables

Self-Estimated Lying Ability. Self-estimated lying ability was measured using Giammarco et al.’s (2013) version of the Perceived Ability to Deceive scale (PATD; Schneider & Goffin, 2012). The original scale focuses on workplace behaviours, but Giammarco et al.’s version includes a greater variety of social situations (e.g., “Please rate how good you would be at lying to a friend without getting caught,” $\alpha = .90$). The scale consists of eight items and participants responded on a 10-point scale with anchors provided (1–3 = *worse than the average person*, 4–6 = *average*, 7–10 = *better than the average person*).

Lying Habits. Several items were developed by the authors of the original study (Visser & Schueler, 2016) to measure lying habits and emotions experienced when lying. Participants were asked how frequently they lie, the ease of which they are able to tell lies, the severity of their typical lies, and how successful their lies typically are. Participants also rated the extent to which they feel anxiety, guilt, fear, enjoyment, and pride when they tell lies on a 5-point scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*).

Data Analysis and Results

Establishing Overlap Between the SRP and HEXACO-60

To help validate the claim that the HEXACO-60 would be a viable option from which to create proxy measures of SRP psychopathy, a series of canonical correlation analyses (CCAs) were conducted. CCAs can determine the proportion of variance that is shared between two sets of variables. They also provide loadings for each variable and these loadings can be used to identify which particular variables overlap the most (or least) between the two sets. Thus, by conducting CCAs with the SRP facets on one side of the equation and the HEXACO domains on the other, we can determine the extent to which the two measures overlap, and we can also gain insight into which HEXACO domains may or may not be important to capturing the SRP scales.

A CCA was conducted on the total sample with SRP facets on one side of the equation and HEXACO domains on the other. The first canonical correlation was significant ($R = .79$, Wilks' Lambda = .257, $F(24, 4480.55) = 88.80$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 74.3% of the variance. Canonical loadings indicated that all of the SRP facets loaded positively on the canonical variate (.89, .92, .77, and .56 for IPM, CA, ELS, and ASB, respectively) while Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness loaded negatively (-.75, -.65, -.48, and -.48, respectively). Extraversion and Openness to Experience did not meet the cutoff of .25 for loading on the canonical variate (-.12 and .09, respectively), suggesting that these HEXACO domains do not share much of the variance captured by the SRP facets.

In addition to conducting a CCA on the total sample, CCAs were also conducted separately for men and women. When using only the men in the sample, the first

canonical correlation was again significant ($R = .76$, Wilks' Lambda = .293, $F(24, 1689.68) = 29.66$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 70.7% of the variance. Similar to the findings of the total sample, canonical loadings indicated that all of the SRP facets loaded positively on the canonical variate (.91, .83, .73, and .43 for IPM, CA, ELS, and ASB, respectively) while Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness loaded negatively (-.86, -.42, -.56, and -.35, respectively). Extraversion and Openness to Experience did not meet the cutoff of .25 for loading on the canonical variate (-.03 and -.05, respectively).

When using only the women in the sample, the first canonical correlation was once again significant ($R = .76$, Wilks' Lambda = .276, $F(24, 2739.75) = 50.92$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 72.4% of the variance. As with the previous CCAs, canonical loadings indicated that all of the SRP facets loaded positively on the canonical variate (.87, .91, .77, and .63 for IPM, CA, ELS, and ASB, respectively) while Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness loaded negatively (-.72, -.61, -.55, and -.50, respectively). Extraversion and Openness to Experience did not meet the cutoff of .25 for loading on the canonical variate (-.21 and .07, respectively).

Overall, the CCAs established that a large proportion of variance was shared between the HEXACO-60 domains and the SRP scales. The results also suggested that while Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness items may be important to capturing SRP psychopathy, Extraversion and Openness items may be less relevant.

Proxy Measures

Item Selection

Pearson correlations were conducted with the SRP and HEXACO-60 to identify individual HEXACO items that were correlated at a magnitude of least $\pm.25$ with any of the SRP scales (i.e., facets, factors, and total score). This cutoff was chosen as it is often used in factor analyses/canonical correlations and was slightly stricter than the one Međedović (2017) used. Importantly, the correlations were completed separately for men and women as we did not want items to be selected for the “general” (i.e., not sex-specific) proxies based on simply meeting the cutoff when analyzing the full dataset; this could have allowed items that were not strongly related to the SRP in both sexes to be selected. Examining the correlations separately also made the creation of male- and female-specific item pools possible.

In the general and both sex-specific item pools, there were items that met the cutoff for only one facet/factor as well as items that met the cutoff for multiple facets/both factors. However, there were differences between the item pools in which items met the cutoff for which SRP scales and in the total number of items. Notably, there were several more combinations in terms of how certain items met the cutoff for multiple scales, and there were more items overall, in the female-specific item pool compared to the others. Due to the differences found between men and women, we decided to go ahead with the creation of additional male- and female-specific proxies for potential use with male- and female-only samples, respectively.

Addressing Overlapping Items. As described above, there were several HEXACO items that met the cutoff for more than one facet and/or both factors of the SRP, and this was the case in the general, male-specific, and female-specific item pools. When determining how to address these items, the trade-off between sensitivity and

specificity was considered. To maximize the sensitivity of each subscale, one could allow items to be included on all scales for which they meet the cutoff (i.e., allow proxies to have overlapping items). In contrast, to maximize the specificity of each subscale, one could assign each item that meets the cutoff for more than one scale to only one of said scales (e.g., the scale with which it has the strongest correlation). In other words, one could strive for the proxies to capture the SRP scales as closely as possible, even if this results in overlapping items between scales, or one could strive for the proxies to be relatively distinct from one another, even if this results in the proxies being less closely related to the scales they are meant to capture.

The main goal for these proxies is to be able to use them in lieu of the SRP to relate to external variables. Thus, because we wanted to find combinations of HEXACO items that are strongly related to each of the SRP scales, we decided that including HEXACO items on multiple proxy scales would be acceptable. However, we are aware that allowing overlapping items will inevitably inflate the correlations between the individual proxies. Therefore, they might be most useful when one is interested in how the SRP scales relate to other variables, but not how they relate to each other.

To elaborate on why allowing overlapping items might be favourable for these proxies, the SRP facets/factors are naturally strongly correlated with each other. The scales share a significant proportion of variance and were not designed to be orthogonal, as they can be combined to yield a total psychopathy score (Paulhus et al., 2016). Other researchers have allowed items to be included on multiple scales within a single measure when the underlying constructs are known to be strongly associated. For example, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI-2; Butcher et al., 1989) assesses a

wide variety of personality traits and psychopathologies, many of which are theoretically and empirically related to each other. As a result, MMPI items are often included in the calculation of multiple scales. Further, the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-IV (MCMI-IV; Millon et al., 2015) assesses personality disorder symptomology as outlined in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.; DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). The authors decided that it was acceptable for there to be a degree of item overlap between the MCMI scales as there are notable commonalities between various personality disorders (Reminger, 2017). Thus, although allowing overlapping items between scales is not the typical approach to test construction, it does not seem absolutely necessary to ensure that the current proxy scales do not share any content with each other.

Importantly, most of the Honesty-Humility items included in the item pools met the cutoff for multiple SRP facets/factors. Considering Honesty-Humility accounts for nearly all of the shared Dark Triad variance (i.e., the essential “dark” part of psychopathy), it could be assumed that Honesty-Humility also accounts for some of the variance in each of the psychopathy scales due to these scales being strongly correlated with each other. If we were to remove the variance accounted for by Honesty-Humility, we would be extracting much of the “dark” quality of psychopathy and only be left with the residual variance of the subscales once the common “dark” variance is partialled out. That is, we would be removing a great deal of the variance that makes psychopathy what it is. Thus, if our goal is to be able to use these proxies as viable substitutes for the SRP scales, we would not want to lose any of the crucial variance accounted for by Honesty-Humility. Assigning each item that meets the cutoff for more than one subscale to the

scale with which it has the highest correlation would allow us to avoid losing this variance altogether, but doing so poses the risk of allowing certain subscales to more or less monopolize the variance of the items that meet multiple cutoffs. Still, assigning these items to one subscale would likely be preferred over removing them altogether.

With these considerations in mind, it was decided to create both overlapping and non-overlapping versions of the general and sex-specific proxies. The overlapping versions, which will likely capture the SRP scales more closely, might be favoured when researchers are interested in how the psychopathy scales relate to other variables. The non-overlapping versions, though hypothesized to have inferior psychometric properties, might be preferred in cases where researchers are interested in making comparisons between SRP scales. Further, we recognize that some researchers might opt to use the non-overlapping proxies simply due to the somewhat unconventional nature of allowing items to be included on multiple subscales of a single measure. Note that the information in the upcoming sections pertains to the proxies that allow overlapping items between scales. Information about the proxies that do not allow overlapping items can be found in Appendix A (Tables A2-2–A2-7).

Evaluating Construct Validity

Proxy measures need to be strongly related to the scales they purportedly capture, but it is also necessary that they correlate with variables that the original measures correlate with. Otherwise, they would not be valid substitutes for the measures and would therefore not serve the purpose for which they were intended.

Although the four datasets utilized in this study were originally collected to address their own research questions, these datasets included several variables that are

theoretically and empirically related to psychopathy. As a result, we were able to select a variety of relevant variables from two of these datasets (i.e., the two datasets with the largest samples) and examine their associations with the proxy scales. As opposed to simply assessing the significance of each proxy's correlations with these variables, we conducted multiple batches of correlation comparisons. We compared the correlations between the sex-specific proxies and the variables to the corresponding correlations between the general proxies and the variables, which was completed separately for men and women. These comparisons were conducted in order to determine whether the male- and/or female-specific proxies had any incremental ability over the general proxies to be related to other variables when using samples of only men or women, respectively. In addition, we compared the correlations between our proxies and the variables with the correlations between Međedović's proxies and the variables. These comparisons were completed with the general proxies using all participants in the dataset, the male-specific proxies using only the men in the dataset, and the female-specific proxies using only the women in the dataset. However, it should be kept in mind that Međedović's proxies were created using the HEXACO-100, whereas the present proxies were created using the HEXACO-60. Thus, our proxies were not compared to Međedović's full-length proxies, but instead shortened versions that included only the items in the HEXACO-60. Further, while Međedović created proxies for the SRP facets (excluding antisocial behaviour), he did not create proxies for Factor 1, Factor 2, or total score.

To test whether the difference between each pair of correlations was statistically significant, Lee and Preacher's (2013) calculator was used. This calculator was created to test the difference between two dependent correlations with one variable in common.

Thus, when comparing the correlation between one scale and a variable with the correlation between a different scale and the same variable, the correlation between the scales being compared is taken into account. This results in more power to detect a significant difference, especially when the correlation between the scales is large. In addition to assessing the statistical significance of the differences between pairs of correlations, the raw differences between these correlations were also considered as a way to account for the different sample sizes and correlations between compared scales, both of which affect power level and statistical significance. For all correlation comparisons, we operationalized a meaningful difference as any that a) was statistically significant at $p < .05$, and/or b) had a raw difference of at least .05 (i.e., half a small effect size; Cohen, 1988).

General Proxies

Table 2-1 shows the items in the general proxy scales along with the scales' psychometric properties. We were unable to create a general ASB proxy as there was only one HEXACO item that met the inclusion criteria. Convergent correlations between proxies and their corresponding SRP scales ranged from .60 to .75 and Cronbach's alphas ranged from .68 to .77.

Our general IPM and ELS proxies demonstrated modest improvements over Međedović's IPM and ELS proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables. The improvement of our general CA proxy over Međedović's CA proxy, however, was considerable (Table 2-2). Note that the raw differences, z -scores, and exact p -values for all correlation comparisons can be found in Appendix A (Tables A2-8–A2-28).

Male-Specific Proxies

Table 2-3 shows the items in the male-specific proxy scales along with the scales' psychometric properties. As was the case with the general proxies, we were unable to create a male-specific ASB proxy as there was only one HEXACO item that met the inclusion criteria. Convergent correlations between proxies and their corresponding SRP scales ranged from .61 to .74 and Cronbach's alphas ranged from .67 to .80.

Each of the male-specific proxies demonstrated some degree of improvement over the respective general proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables, though the improvements of certain proxies were very minor (e.g., IPM and F1). Of note, the male-specific F2 proxy demonstrated a noticeably greater improvement over its general counterpart than that seen with the other male-specific proxies (Table 2-4).

While our male-specific IPM proxy demonstrated a minor improvement over Međedović's IPM proxy in terms of its correlations with relevant variables, the improvements of our male-specific CA and ELS proxies over Međedović's CA and ELS proxies were substantial (Table 2-5).

Female-Specific Proxies

Table 2-6 shows the items in the female-specific proxy scales along with the scales' psychometric properties. Note that the ASB proxy had notably inferior psychometric properties and is not strongly recommended for practical use. Excluding the ASB proxy, convergent correlations between proxies and their corresponding SRP scales ranged from .66 to .76 and Cronbach's alphas ranged from .72 to .79.

Each of the female-specific proxies demonstrated improvements over the respective general proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables, with the greatest improvements being for ELS, F2, and total psychopathy score (Table 2-7).

Each of our female-specific proxies demonstrated marked improvements over Međedović's respective proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables, with the improvement of the female-specific CA proxy being especially prominent (Table 2-8).

Proxies vs. SRP

It is rarely the case that proxy measures capture all of the variance, and only the variance, captured by the measures from which they were based. Thus, it was not deemed necessary to statistically evaluate how the correlations between the proxy scales and the variables compared to the correlations between the original SRP scales and the variables using the correlation comparison procedure described above. Instead, we decided to examine and comment on these correlations more broadly. Overall, the patterns were comparable in that the magnitudes of corresponding correlations tended to be similar and the variables that were among the most/least strongly correlated with a given SRP scale also tended to be among the most/least strongly correlated with the proxy for that scale (Tables 2-9–2-11).

Further, we quantified the degree of relative similarity between the nomological networks of the proxy scales and their corresponding SRP scales by calculating Pearson's r coefficients between the correlations in Tables 2-9–2-11. We also quantified the degree of absolute similarity between the nomological networks of the proxy scales and their corresponding SRP scales by calculating double-entry intraclass correlations between the correlations in Tables 2-9–2-11. The results of the profile similarity analyses are reported in Table 2-12. Overall, the nomological networks of the proxy scales were nearly

identical to that of the SRP scales in terms of both relative and absolute similarity (r 's ranged from .94 to .99; r_{ICC} 's ranged from .93 to .99).

Sex Differences in Correlations

With regard to identifying potential sex differences in psychopathy, it should be noted that our focus was on determining whether there were differences between men and women in the presentation of psychopathy from a normal trait perspective. That is, we did not aim to determine whether the SRP scales differentially related to the relevant variables, but rather, whether they differentially related to the HEXACO items. Regardless of whether there are differences between men and women in how psychopathic traits relate to external criteria or outcomes, psychopathy could still be expressed somewhat differently through HEXACO personality traits.

The magnitudes of the correlations between the individual HEXACO items and the SRP scales were compared between men and women in order to identify sex differences in how the HEXACO items relate to psychopathy. Note that for any given psychopathy scale, we only compared items that were included on a proxy (i.e., male- and/or female-specific) for that scale. Table 2-13 provides a summary of these sex differences. Though the table shows the correlations that differed by at least .05 between men and women, our focus is on the correlations that differed by at least .10 (i.e., a small effect; Cohen, 1988). The actual correlations for these items can be found in Appendix A (Tables A2-29–A2-35).

Overall, there were three Honesty-Humility items and two Agreeableness items that were more strongly correlated (with a difference of .10 or greater) with at least one SRP scale in men compared to women. By contrast, there were three Honesty-Humility

items, six Emotionality items, one Extraversion item, two Agreeableness items, and two Conscientiousness items that were more strongly correlated (with a difference of .10 or greater) with at least one SRP scale in women compared to men.

While the remaining items in Table 2-13 (i.e., the items with sex differences of .05 or greater, but less than .10) might not offer much practical significance individually, it may still be enlightening to note where these differences occurred. An additional four Honesty-Humility items and one Conscientiousness item were more strongly correlated (with a difference between .05 and .10) with at least one SRP scale in men compared to women. An additional Honesty-Humility item, two Emotionality items, and one Extraversion item were more strongly correlated (with a difference between .05 and .10) with at least one SRP scale in women compared to men.

In sum, it seems that Honesty-Humility items may be somewhat more relevant to psychopathy in men compared to women. This is not to say that Honesty-Humility is not at all relevant to psychopathy in women, as these items still tended to meet the cutoff for women. However, it was often the case that the correlations between the Honesty-Humility items and the psychopathy scales were stronger for men. On the contrary, Emotionality items seem particularly more relevant for women. It should also be noted that a broader range of items were more strongly related to psychopathy for women, with items coming from all HEXACO domains aside from Openness to Experience.

Discussion

The present study had two main objectives: 1) to create proxy measures of SRP psychopathy using HEXACO items that are relevant to the construct in both men and women, and 2) to investigate sex differences in how the HEXACO items relate to psychopathy. The second objective was comprised of two sub-goals: a) to examine sex differences in which items meet the cutoff for each SRP scale in order to create sex-specific proxies, and b) to identify potential practically significant sex differences by examining the magnitudes of the differences between corresponding correlations. As will be expanded on below, we were successful in meeting these objectives.

Objective 1: Creating HEXACO Proxies for the SRP

Because the HEXACO model of personality is able to capture both “normal” and “dark” personality variance (Lee & Ashton, 2014), we predicted that it would be possible to create HEXACO proxies for the SRP and its subscales. The preliminary CCA findings demonstrated that a large proportion of variance was shared between the SRP and the HEXACO-60, and the amount of variance shared was similar in men and women. However, there were some noticeable differences in how strongly certain variables loaded on the canonical variate. For example, ASB loaded more strongly in women than in men, implying that the HEXACO might do a better job at capturing ASB in women. Emotionality, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion also loaded more strongly in women, implying that these HEXACO domains might be somewhat more relevant to capturing the SRP facets in women than in men. In contrast, Honesty-Humility loaded more strongly in men. Overall, the CCA results support the idea that the HEXACO-60 is a viable option for measuring SRP psychopathy. They also reinforced the decision to

investigate the relationships between the SRP scales and HEXACO items separately for men and women.

With the exception of ASB, general proxies were created for all of the SRP scales (i.e., facets, factors, total) with several items meeting the cutoff for inclusion in both men and women. The ability of the HEXACO items to measure psychopathic traits is consistent with previous research findings that the HEXACO significantly overlaps with the Dark Triad and Tetrad, both of which include psychopathic traits (e.g., Book et al., 2015; Book et al., 2016; Hodson et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2013). As well, the findings are consistent with previous attempts to use the HEXACO to create proxies for measures of psychopathy (Međedović, 2017; Ruchensky et al., 2018).

The general proxies had favourable psychometric properties and correlated strongly with several variables that are related to psychopathy. For example, psychopathy has been previously found to be related to aggression (e.g., Book & Quinsey, 2004; Hare, 1993/1999; Knight et al., 2018), short- and long-term mating orientation (positively and negatively, respectively; e.g., Jonason et al., 2012; Tsoukas & March, 2018), and status-driven risk taking (Visser et al., 2014). Considering its position within the Dark Triad/Tetrad, it is evident that psychopathy is also related to Machiavellianism, narcissism, and sadism (e.g., Buckels et al., 2013; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). The proxies created in the present study were significantly associated with each of these variables, among others.

Our general proxies showed some improvements over Međedović's shortened proxies (i.e., versions that use only the items included in the HEXACO-60) in how strongly they related to external variables, and this was especially evident in the case of

CA. These improvements are likely the result of different decisions that were made when creating the proxies (e.g., using different cutoffs, examining the HEXACO-SRP correlations in men and women separately rather than in the total sample). However, the decision that may have led to the greatest improvement in the correlations with external variables is the allowance of items to be included on multiple facets/factors, as we placed a higher priority on strong associations between the proxy scales and the corresponding SRP scales, whereas Međedović placed a higher priority on scale independence. Thus, regardless of the present findings, researchers could reasonably elect to use either set of proxy scales depending on the relative importance they place on these qualities.

Our decision to allow overlapping items between scales was largely due to the overarching role of Honesty-Humility. Honesty-Humility items were highly important to the measurement of psychopathy in the present study as not only were they included in the proxy for total psychopathy, but also the proxy for every SRP scale that we were able to construct. Because Međedović's proxies did not allow overlapping items between scales, most of the Honesty-Humility items included on his proxies fell on IPM; Međedović's ELS proxy included only one Honesty-Humility item and his CA proxy included none. Seeing as the proxy that had the greatest improvement over Međedović's was for CA, it certainly seems that Honesty-Humility was somewhat of a driving force behind the relationships found with the external correlates.

Although Honesty-Humility was extremely relevant to measuring psychopathy, items from other HEXACO domains were also included in the proxies. In a sense, Honesty-Humility might be considered the core HEXACO domain necessary for adequately capturing SRP psychopathy and each of its subscales, while items from the

other HEXACO domains help to distinguish the subscales from one another. For example, ELS tended to be mostly differentiated from the other facets due to the inclusion of Conscientiousness items, whereas Emotionality items were especially relevant to CA. Relatedly, F2 was comprised of mostly Conscientiousness items, whereas F1 was comprised of several Emotionality and Agreeableness items. Thus, although aspects of Honesty-Humility spanned across all of the proxy scales, each individual scale also included a distinct combination of items derived from the other HEXACO domains.

Overall, we were successful in meeting our first objective. Several HEXACO items correlated with the SRP and all but one of its subscales (i.e., ASB) in both men and women, allowing for the creation of general proxies for total psychopathy, both factors, and three of the four facets. The constructed proxies had good reliability and the relationships they had with several relevant variables demonstrate their validity and potential utility. While we are pleased to have been able to create HEXACO proxies for most of the SRP scales, we do not discount the fact that we were unable to create proxies for all of them; it is imperative to question why ASB could not be adequately captured by the HEXACO in the present study. We will return to this issue once the findings pertaining to the sex-specific proxies have been discussed.

Objective 2a: Creating Sex-Specific Proxies

The second objective was to investigate sex differences in how the HEXACO items relate to SRP psychopathy, starting with differences in the items that met the cutoff for inclusion on the proxy scales. Due to considerable differences found in terms of the particular items that met the cutoffs for men and women, we decided to create male- and female-specific proxies as potential alternatives to the general proxies. We were

successful in creating these sex-specific proxies and the differences that were observed lend further support to the idea that there are sex differences in the expression of psychopathic traits (e.g., Forouzan & Cooke, 2005; Kreis & Cooke, 2012).

Interestingly, it seems that the different psychopathy scales may be less distinct in women in regards to how they are expressed through normal personality traits. Each female-specific proxy scale contained items from a larger number of HEXACO domains than its male-specific counterpart. For example, while the male-specific IPM proxy only included items from Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness, the female-specific IPM proxy included items from every HEXACO domain with the exception of Openness. The female-specific CA and F1 proxies also included items from every HEXACO domain aside from Openness; this differed from the respective male-specific proxies, which did not include Extraversion or Conscientiousness items. Further, there were also more items that met the cutoff for multiple facets/factors as well as more combinations in terms of how the items met the cutoffs for multiple facets/factors in women compared to men. Thus, while the psychopathy subscales may show some distinctions from one another in how they are expressed in women, these distinctions may be more nuanced than they are in men. This is not the first study to suggest that different subscales or subtypes of psychopathy may be less distinct in women; recall that Salekin et al. (1997) found a higher degree of overlap between Hare's two psychopathy factors in a female inmate sample than what is typically found with men. Further, Lee and Salekin (2010) conducted model-based cluster analyses of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Short Form (Lilienfeld 1990; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996) separately for men and women and found two psychopathy groups for each sex. In men, there were notable differences between the

two groups (e.g., the first group was associated with more adaptive attributes, such as social skills, whereas the second group was associated with less adaptive attributes, such as anxiety; the second group was also associated with more problems with the law). However, the authors note that the two psychopathy groups in women were less distinct from each other than was the case in men (e.g., neither group seemed to be particularly associated with adaptive attributes; both groups were associated with similarly negative personality traits and antisocial behaviours, including criminality).

Compared to Međedović's proxies, the sex-specific proxies tended to be more strongly related to several relevant variables when used with the appropriate sample (i.e., men only or women only). While not all individual proxies demonstrated substantial improvements over Međedović's proxies (e.g., male-specific IPM), each set of proxies demonstrated marked improvements as a whole. Further, the sex-specific proxies, compared to the general proxies, also tended to have stronger relationships with the variables when examining the correlations in the appropriate sex, though the improvements of some individual proxies were again very minor (e.g., male-specific IPM, male-specific F1). As a whole, the female-specific proxies seemed to be more of an improvement over the general proxies than were the male-specific proxies, likely because the general proxies were more limited by the relationships between the HEXACO items and SRP scales in men than they were by these relationships in women. As a result, the general proxies more closely resemble the male-specific proxies. Thus, it may be more beneficial to use the female-specific proxies in samples of women than to use the male-specific proxies in samples of men where the general proxies would presumably perform more comparably. Of note, the general proxies can always be used in lieu of the male- or

female-specific proxies, especially if one is interested in using SRP proxy scores to make comparisons between men and women.

A Note on Antisocial Behaviour

While our attempt to create proxies for the SRP and its subscales was largely successful, we were less successful in creating proxies for ASB. General and male-specific ASB proxies could not be constructed due to only one HEXACO item meeting the cutoff in men. Further, while six items met the cutoff for ASB in women, this was still fewer than that of the other SRP scales. Thus, the female-specific ASB proxy had the least favourable psychometric properties. The relative lack of overlap between the HEXACO and ASB is an interesting finding, especially considering Međedović was also unable to create a proxy for this particular facet.

Some researchers view the ASB facet as a central component of the construct (e.g., Hare & Neumann, 2010), while others believe that although ASB is certainly related to psychopathy, it should be treated as a correlate or outcome rather than a feature of it (e.g., Skeem & Cooke, 2010). The argument of the latter camp is often rooted in the notion that psychopathy is a personality construct, and despite there being a clear link between personality and behaviour, they are distinct. Reflecting this view, some of the newer measures of psychopathy focus more on the strict *personality* aspects of the construct and less on antisocial *behaviour* (e.g., TriPM; Patrick, 2010). The finding that ASB, compared to the other SRP facets, was poorly captured by the HEXACO items in the present study seems to uphold the idea that it might be more appropriate to consider antisocial behaviour an outcome of psychopathy rather than a feature of it. While we appreciate that this interpretation hinges on certain assumptions (e.g., psychopathy is

strictly a *personality* construct, the HEXACO adequately captures the full range of personality), it is nonetheless worthy of noting.

Objective 2b: Practical Sex Differences

An important component of the second objective was to consider the content of items that were found to have different correlations with the psychopathy scales between men and women, not by simply comparing which items were included on the proxy scales, but by identifying which correlations had potentially meaningful differences in magnitude (i.e., at least a small effect). By examining the correlations in this manner, it could be possible to detect specific distinctions in how SRP psychopathy is expressed in each sex.

Stronger Relationships in Men

In men, stronger relationships with the SRP scales were observed for Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness items. The specific features of (low) Honesty-Humility that the psychopathy scales were found to be more strongly associated with in men were pretending to like someone's jokes in order to gain something from them (IPM, CA, and F1), willingness to accept bribes (CA, F1, and total), and getting pleasure from owning luxury goods (IPM, ELS, and F1). Considering (low) Honesty-Humility has been suggested to be at the core of "dark" personality (Book et al., 2015; Book et al., 2016; Hodson et al., 2018) and is the HEXACO domain most strongly associated with psychopathy (e.g., Lee & Ashton, 2005; Muris et al., 2017), it is interesting that in the present study there were some Honesty-Humility items that were more strongly related to multiple SRP scales in men. The specific features of (low) Agreeableness that the

psychopathy scales were found to be more strongly associated with in men were holding grudges (total) and not having a “forgive and forget” disposition towards others (CA).

Stronger Relationships in Women

In women, Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness items were more strongly related to the SRP scales. Several Emotionality items, which typically have stronger average ratings in women compared to men (e.g., Lee & Ashton, 2020), were often more strongly related to the psychopathy scales in women in the direction that is expected to correspond to higher levels of psychopathic traits. This direction is also the opposite of what is expected in the average woman compared to the average man. For example, “I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental” had a lower average score but was more strongly positively associated with CA and F2 in women, whereas “I feel like crying when I see other people crying” had a higher average score but was more strongly negatively associated with F2 in women. The psychopathy scales in women were also more strongly negatively associated with panicking in an emergency (ELS), fearing physical danger (CA and F1), and feeling afraid when driving in bad weather conditions (CA, F2, and total). Importantly, these findings reflect the fact that there is a larger discrepancy in Emotionality item ratings between women who score high versus low on the SRP scales compared to this discrepancy in men, not that women with high psychopathy scores are less sentimental and fearful than men with high psychopathy scores. This could be a result of the average woman having higher sentimentality and fearfulness levels than the average man. Essentially, because women tend to score higher

on Emotionality on average, low ratings on these items may be more relevant to the estimation of psychopathy levels in women than in men.

The main feature of (low) Extraversion that was more strongly associated with the psychopathy scales in women was a lack of cheerfulness/optimism (IPM, F1, and total). This finding suggests that psychopathy in women is more strongly associated with negative affect, a finding that has been previously supported. For example, Visser et al. (2010) reported that psychopathy in women was negatively associated with self-esteem, which was not the case for men. Also, as previously noted, psychopathy in women has been found to be more strongly related to mood/anxiety symptoms (e.g., Blonigen et al., 2005).

The specific features of (low) Conscientiousness that were more strongly related to the psychopathy scales in women were doing only the minimum amount of work needed to get by (IPM, ELS, F1, F2, and total) and making mistakes due to not thinking before acting (IPM, CA, F1, F2, and total). Notably, both of these items were more strongly related to most of the SRP scales, including both factors and total score, implying that psychopathy as whole, not just a particular component, is more strongly associated with these traits in women.

The specific features of (low) Agreeableness that were more strongly related to the psychopathy scales in women were being seen as stubborn (CA) and being seen as quick-tempered (IPM, ELS, and F1). While it is certainly possible that psychopathy in women is simply more strongly associated with these traits, an alternative explanation, due to the wording of the items, could be that psychopathy in women is more strongly associated with *perceiving others* as seeing them in these ways. Thus, these findings

might be partially explained by the relationship between psychopathy and negative affect (e.g., Blonigen et al., 2005) and/or self-esteem (Visser et al., 2010) in women. That is, psychopathic women, compared to psychopathic men, might more strongly believe that others see them in a negative light.

Several of the aforementioned items that were more strongly related to the psychopathy scales in women can conceivably be explained by the relationship between psychopathy and the cluster B personality disorders (Wynn et al., 2012), namely borderline personality disorder (BPD). Similarities between the expression of psychopathy and BPD in women are prevalent to the extent that some have questioned whether BPD is essentially a female variant of psychopathy (e.g., Sprague et al., 2012). Thus, it is not necessarily surprising that lacking cheerfulness/optimism, not thinking before acting, and being quick-tempered are more strongly related to the psychopathy scales in women; feelings of emptiness, impulsivity, extreme mood reactivity, and difficulty controlling anger are all core features of BPD according to the DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

There were a few features of (low) Honesty-Humility that were more strongly related to the psychopathy scales in women. These features were wanting to be seen as someone of high status (ASB), pretending to like someone for favours (ASB), and using flattery for personal gain (F2). However, it should be noted that each of these traits were similarly associated with F1 and multiple facets in men and women, and that they were only more strongly associated with ASB or F2 in women. Thus, these traits may not necessarily be female-specific expressions of psychopathy per say. Instead, these findings

may be related to the fact that ASB, and to a lesser extent F2, were not captured as well by the HEXACO-60 in men.

Limitations and Future Research

As with any empirical study, there are some limitations that need to be addressed. Due to the prominence of Honesty-Humility items in each of the proxies, the present study provides further support that the HEXACO model of personality may be particularly well suited to capture psychopathy. However, the HEXACO was not compared to any other models of personality (e.g., the Big Five) in its ability to measure psychopathic traits. Future research should directly compare proxies derived from different models of personality in order to determine whether any model is truly superior at capturing psychopathy.

While our proxies did demonstrate improvements over Međedović's proxies in their relationships with psychopathy-relevant variables, the versions of Međedović's proxies calculated in the present study did not include all of the items identified for inclusion from the HEXACO-100, but only the items available in the HEXACO-60. Thus, further research would be needed to determine how our proxies, which utilize only items from the HEXACO-60, would compare to Međedović's full proxies in datasets that include the HEXACO-100.

The inferences made about the constructed proxies were based on how they performed within the datasets from which they were created. Although we could have split the sample into two groups in order to create the proxy scales with one group and test them in the other, we decided against this approach. Our intention was to create the proxies using a very large sample so that the HEXACO-SRP correlations would be stable

and accurate; the sample was already split by sex and we did not want to split it further. However, creating and testing the proxy scales in the same sample could have resulted in somewhat inflated estimates of how strongly the proxies correlate with the SRP scales and the external variables. Additionally, the present study relied on an undergraduate sample and all of the variables were self-report. Like all newly constructed measures, these proxies need to be tested in multiple samples, and perhaps using additional methodologies (e.g., observer reports), in order to better establish their validity.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we created proxies for SRP psychopathy and most of its subscales using HEXACO items. We created our first set of proxies using only items that met our inclusion criteria in both sexes separately to ensure that the proxies contained items that were relevant to the respective scales in both men and women. We then shifted our focus from the HEXACO-SRP relations that men and women had in common to the relations they did not. We created sex-specific proxies as alternatives to the proxies we had originally constructed in hopes of better capturing the SRP scales in samples of exclusively men or exclusively women. The general, male-specific, and female-specific proxies had good psychometric properties and correlated strongly with several psychopathy-relevant variables. They also demonstrated some improvements over a previous attempt to measure the SRP facets using HEXACO items. Additionally, we identified potentially meaningful differences in how psychopathy is expressed through HEXACO items by examining the magnitudes of the differences in corresponding correlations between men and women.

Table 2-1
HEXACO-60 Items in General Proxy Scales

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2	Total
6r (H: sincerity)	x				x		x
30 (H: sincerity)	x				x		x
54r (H: sincerity)	x				x		x
12 (H: fairness)	x	x	x		x	x	x
36r (H: fairness)	x	x	x		x	x	x
60 (H: fairness)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
24 (H: modesty)	x	x			x		x
48 (H: modesty)	x	x			x		x
29r (E: fearfulness)			x				
41 (E: dependence)		x					
23r (E: sentimentality)		x			x		x
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x		
59 (E: sentimentality)		x			x		x
27r (A: forgiveness)	x				x		
9 (A: gentleness)	x	x			x		x
57 (A: flexibility)	x				x		
21 (A: patience)		x			x	x	x
2r (C: organization)			x			x	
20 (C: prudence)			x			x	x
44 (C: prudence)			x			x	
56 (C: prudence)			x			x	
# of items	11	11	8	-	15	8	13
Cronbach's α	.76	.72	.68	-	.77	.70	.75
Convergent r	.69	.71	.66	-	.75	.60	.72
M	2.71	2.63	2.72	-	2.65	2.65	2.63
SD	0.61	0.58	0.63	-	0.54	0.64	0.56

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table 2-2

General Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	IPM		CA		ELS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
Dataset 1 ^a						
Exploitativeness	.52	.51	.48	.40	.35	.31
Entitlement	.47	.47	.50	.39	.31	.29
Vengeance	.62	.61	.60	.37	.43	.42
SDRT	.56	.52	.68	.51	.63	.57
STMO	.46	.40	.51	.40	.50	.47
LTMO	-.31	-.27	-.40	-.34	-.31	-.32
Proactive aggression	.54	.52	.53	.26	.47	.44
Reactive aggression	.51	.52	.44	.11	.39	.38
Narcissism	.38	.42	.28	.19	.22	.17
Psychopathy	.65	.63	.70	.45	.62	.60
Machiavellianism	.70	.67	.63	.37	.48	.45
Sadism	.56	.51	.65	.53	.57	.57
Dataset 2 ^b						
PATD	.56	.52	.53	.32	.50	.38
Lie frequency	.38	.35	.32	.13	.38	.39
Lie ease	.40	.40	.39	.25	.44	.37
Lie severity	.25	.25	.21	.01	.19	.21
Lie success	.21	.22	.17	.03	.17	.08
Lie anxiety	-.30	-.28	-.37	-.28	-.34	-.30
Lie guilt	-.28	-.24	-.39	-.35	-.37	-.33
Lie fear	-.20	-.17	-.27	-.23	-.28	-.26
Lie enjoyment	.24	.24	.20	.02	.25	.29
Lie pride	.30	.30	.26	.09	.23	.24

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; A = General proxy; B = Međedović's proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

^a $n = 492$. ^b $n = 377$.

Table 2-3
HEXACO-60 Items in Male-Specific Proxy Scales

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2	Total
6r (H: sincerity)	x				x		x
30 (H: sincerity)	x	x			x		x
54r (H: sincerity)	x				x		x
12 (H: fairness)	x	x	x		x	x	x
36r (H: fairness)	x	x	x		x	x	x
60 (H: fairness)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	x		x		x		x
24 (H: modesty)	x	x			x	x	x
48 (H: modesty)	x	x			x		x
29r (E: fearfulness)			x				
41 (E: dependence)		x					
23r (E: sentimentality)		x			x		x
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x		
59 (E: sentimentality)		x			x		x
3r (A: forgiveness)	x	x			x		x
27r (A: forgiveness)	x	x			x		x
9 (A: gentleness)	x	x			x		x
51r (A: gentleness)	x	x			x		
57 (A: flexibility)	x				x		
21 (A: patience)		x			x	x	x
2r (C: organization)			x			x	
20 (C: prudence)			x			x	x
44 (C: prudence)			x			x	
56 (C: prudence)			x			x	x
# of items	14	15	9	-	18	9	17
Cronbach's α	.80	.75	.67	-	.80	.69	.78
Convergent r	.69	.68	.66	-	.74	.61	.71
M	2.89	2.86	2.95	-	2.86	2.74	2.87
SD	0.61	0.53	0.61	-	0.53	0.61	0.54

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table 2-4*Male-Specific Proxies' and General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men*

	IPM		CA		ELS		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Dataset 1 ^a												
Exploitativeness	.48	.50	.43	.37	.27	.25	.46	.48	.29	.25	.48	.46
Entitlement	.53	.52	.52	.48	.35	.32	.53	.52	.36	.31	.54	.51
Vengeance	.65	.61	.69	.57	.38	.37	.68	.65	.43	.39	.66	.59
SDRT	.50	.53	.55	.62	.59	.57	.54	.56	.56	.52	.58	.59
STMO	.41	.40	.38	.35	.40	.38	.39	.38	.35	.33	.43	.38
LTMO	-.29	-.30	-.40	-.39	-.25	-.27	-.37	-.39	-.32	-.29	-.34	-.34
Proactive aggression	.50	.52	.50	.47	.46	.47	.51	.53	.53	.51	.54	.54
Reactive aggression	.53	.51	.47	.38	.36	.35	.51	.49	.44	.44	.51	.48
Narcissism	.48	.47	.29	.26	.28	.22	.40	.38	.29	.23	.42	.39
Psychopathy	.60	.61	.65	.63	.55	.56	.63	.64	.62	.58	.66	.65
Machiavellianism	.67	.68	.65	.62	.40	.36	.69	.70	.44	.39	.66	.66
Sadism	.56	.56	.64	.60	.54	.54	.62	.62	.57	.55	.64	.63
Dataset 2 ^b												
PATD	.55	.57	.51	.50	.44	.42	.54	.56	.45	.42	.55	.57
Lie frequency	.38	.39	.35	.29	.32	.34	.37	.37	.37	.36	.36	.35
Lie ease	.47	.48	.44	.45	.51	.47	.47	.47	.47	.43	.51	.48
Lie severity	.28	.27	.26	.22	.25	.25	.25	.24	.32	.30	.28	.28
Lie success	.33	.33	.34	.33	.31	.28	.35	.35	.26	.26	.36	.33
Lie anxiety	-.39	-.37	-.40	-.40	-.35	-.32	-.40	-.39	-.30	-.29	-.40	-.39
Lie guilt	-.29	-.29	-.36	-.38	-.30	-.29	-.35	-.36	-.25	-.25	-.34	-.33
Lie fear	-.26	-.24	-.31	-.30	-.27	-.26	-.29	-.28	-.21	-.21	-.29	-.26
Lie enjoyment	.22	.20	.17	<i>.13</i>	.21	.19	.19	.17	.27	.24	.21	.20
Lie pride	.25	.23	.21	.17	.19	.17	.24	.21	.25	.22	.26	.22

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Male-specific proxy; B = General proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

^a $n = 192$. ^b $n = 154$.

Table 2-5

Male-Specific Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	IPM		CA		ELS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
Dataset 1 ^a						
Exploitativeness	.48	.48	.43	.31	.27	.14
Entitlement	.53	.51	.52	.27	.35	.23
Vengeance	.65	.60	.69	.36	.38	.30
SDRT	.50	.51	.55	.34	.59	.45
STMO	.41	.36	.38	.21	.40	.29
LTMO	-.29	-.28	-.40	-.29	-.25	-.26
Proactive aggression	.50	.49	.50	.13	.46	.37
Reactive aggression	.53	.51	.47	.03	.36	.30
Narcissism	.48	.52	.29	.05	.28	.10
Psychopathy	.60	.58	.65	.31	.55	.47
Machiavellianism	.67	.64	.65	.37	.40	.25
Sadism	.56	.50	.64	.35	.54	.48
Dataset 2 ^b						
PATD	.55	.52	.51	.27	.44	.29
Lie frequency	.38	.38	.35	.05	.32	.31
Lie ease	.47	.51	.44	.25	.51	.32
Lie severity	.28	.27	.26	-.03	.25	.29
Lie success	.33	.34	.34	.18	.31	.14
Lie anxiety	-.39	-.38	-.40	-.28	-.35	-.17
Lie guilt	-.29	-.27	-.36	-.41	-.30	-.14
Lie fear	-.26	-.23	-.31	-.31	-.27	-.18
Lie enjoyment	.22	.24	.17	-.12	.21	.23
Lie pride	.25	.24	.21	-.06	.19	.22

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; A = Male-specific proxy; B = Međedović's proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

^a $n = 192$. ^b $n = 154$.

Table 2-6
HEXACO-60 Items in Female-Specific Proxy Scales

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2	Total
6r (H: sincerity)	x		x		x	x	x
30 (H: sincerity)	x				x		x
54r (H: sincerity)	x			x	x		x
12 (H: fairness)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
36r (H: fairness)	x	x	x		x	x	x
60 (H: fairness)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
24 (H: modesty)	x	x		x	x		x
48 (H: modesty)	x	x		x	x		x
5r (E: fearfulness)		x	x			x	x
29r (E: fearfulness)		x	x		x	x	x
53 (E: fearfulness)			x				
17r (E: dependence)		x					
41 (E: dependence)		x			x		
23r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	x	x
47r (E: sentimentality)		x		x	x		x
59 (E: sentimentality)	x	x			x	x	x
22r (X: liveliness)	x	x			x		x
46 (X: liveliness)		x					
27r (A: forgiveness)	x				x		
9 (A: gentleness)	x	x			x		x
15 (A: flexibility)	x	x			x		x
57 (A: flexibility)	x				x		
21 (A: patience)	x	x	x		x	x	x
2r (C: organization)			x			x	x
26 (C: organization)			x				
32 (C: diligence)	x	x	x		x	x	x
20 (C: prudence)			x			x	x
44 (C: prudence)	x	x	x		x	x	x
56 (C: prudence)			x			x	
# of items	17	19	14	6	21	14	21
Cronbach's α	.79	.75	.73	.63	.78	.72	.77
Convergent r	.69	.73	.67	.46	.75	.66	.76
M	2.60	2.55	2.56	2.32	2.59	2.55	2.52
SD	0.52	0.45	0.51	0.64	0.46	0.50	0.45

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table 2-7*Female-Specific Proxies' and General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women*

	IPM		CA		ELS		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Dataset 1 ^a												
Exploitativeness	.51	.51	.49	.50	.44	.37	.54	.54	.46	.37	.53	.52
Entitlement	.41	.41	.45	.46	.32	.25	.45	.44	.35	.25	.42	.43
Vengeance	.64	.59	.59	.59	.47	.41	.64	.62	.51	.46	.60	.59
SDRT	.57	.54	.70	.65	.65	.61	.64	.59	.69	.56	.68	.61
STMO	.43	.42	.48	.47	.48	.48	.47	.46	.52	.45	.49	.46
LTMO	-.30	-.27	-.40	-.36	-.31	-.28	-.37	-.34	-.37	-.24	-.38	-.32
Proactive aggression	.57	.53	.52	.53	.48	.43	.56	.55	.50	.48	.55	.56
Reactive aggression	.58	.51	.47	.47	.44	.40	.54	.53	.45	.49	.51	.51
Narcissism	.25	.30	.20	.25	.20	.18	.25	.28	.21	.15	.27	.29
Psychopathy	.72	.65	.74	.70	.66	.61	.75	.70	.70	.63	.75	.71
Machiavellianism	.71	.68	.60	.60	.58	.50	.68	.68	.58	.56	.66	.68
Sadism	.58	.53	.66	.60	.58	.53	.63	.59	.62	.49	.65	.57
Dataset 2 ^b												
PATD	.49	.52	.46	.47	.50	.50	.51	.50	.52	.46	.50	.50
Lie frequency	.35	.31	.31	.24	.38	.35	.34	.30	.37	.37	.37	.33
Lie ease	.33	.28	.30	.26	.37	.34	.34	.29	.36	.34	.34	.29
Lie severity	.23	.20	.14	.16	<i>.12</i>	<i>.10</i>	.19	.20	.14	.15	.17	.20
Lie success	<i>.09</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.02</i>	<i>.05</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.09</i>	<i>.04</i>	<i>.07</i>
Lie anxiety	-.19	-.17	-.23	-.21	-.28	-.26	-.24	-.22	-.28	-.23	-.25	-.20
Lie guilt	-.24	-.20	-.32	-.29	-.39	-.35	-.29	-.27	-.40	-.32	-.34	-.27
Lie fear	-.14	-.12	-.21	-.17	-.25	-.23	-.20	-.17	-.26	-.19	-.23	-.17
Lie enjoyment	.24	.23	.20	.18	.27	.25	.23	.22	.26	.25	.27	.25
Lie pride	.33	.33	.31	.29	.24	.24	.32	.33	.25	.24	.33	.31

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Female-specific proxy; B = General proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

^a $n = 299$. ^b $n = 223$.

Table 2-8

Female-Specific Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	IPM		CA		ELS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
Dataset 1 ^a						
Exploitativeness	.51	.51	.49	.39	.44	.37
Entitlement	.41	.42	.45	.39	.32	.25
Vengeance	.64	.60	.59	.30	.47	.44
SDRT	.57	.50	.70	.49	.65	.57
STMO	.43	.37	.48	.29	.48	.45
LTMO	-.30	-.23	-.40	-.32	-.31	-.31
Proactive aggression	.57	.52	.52	.24	.48	.44
Reactive aggression	.58	.53	.47	.12	.44	.41
Narcissism	.25	.34	.20	.20	.20	.17
Psychopathy	.72	.64	.74	.42	.66	.62
Machiavellianism	.71	.68	.60	.28	.58	.52
Sadism	.58	.50	.66	.44	.58	.54
Dataset 2 ^b						
PATD	.49	.50	.46	.22	.50	.35
Lie frequency	.35	.28	.31	.04	.38	.38
Lie ease	.33	.26	.30	.14	.37	.33
Lie severity	.23	.22	.14	-.03	.12	.12
Lie success	.09	.11	.02	-.08	.07	.04
Lie anxiety	-.19	-.15	-.23	-.11	-.28	-.27
Lie guilt	-.24	-.17	-.32	-.18	-.39	-.38
Lie fear	-.14	-.10	-.21	-.10	-.25	-.24
Lie enjoyment	.24	.21	.20	.01	.27	.28
Lie pride	.33	.33	.31	.12	.24	.22

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; A = Female-specific IPM proxy; B = Međedović's IPM proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

^a $n = 299$. ^b $n = 223$.

Table 2-9*General Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample*

	IPM		CA		ELS		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Dataset 1 ^a												
Exploitativeness	.52	.60	.48	.41	.35	.42	.53	.55	.34	.42	.52	.53
Entitlement	.47	.46	.50	.45	.31	.34	.50	.49	.30	.38	.48	.48
Vengeance	.62	.58	.60	.55	.43	.48	.65	.61	.45	.50	.61	.61
SDRT	.56	.60	.68	.63	.63	.65	.62	.66	.56	.66	.64	.72
STMO	.46	.43	.51	.49	.50	.57	.49	.49	.45	.52	.49	.55
LTMO	-.31	-.36	-.40	-.43	-.31	-.38	-.39	-.42	-.29	-.42	-.36	-.45
Proactive aggression	.54	.54	.53	.47	.47	.51	.56	.55	.51	.60	.57	.62
Reactive aggression	.51	.44	.44	.35	.39	.44	.51	.43	.47	.44	.50	.47
Narcissism	.38	.36	.28	.21	.22	.28	.34	.31	.20	.28	.35	.32
Psychopathy	.65	.72	.70	.70	.62	.74	.70	.77	.63	.78	.71	.84
Machiavellianism	.70	.75	.63	.60	.48	.52	.70	.74	.52	.52	.69	.69
Sadism	.56	.66	.65	.77	.57	.63	.63	.76	.53	.67	.63	.78
Dataset 2 ^b												
PATD	.56	.66	.53	.48	.50	.52	.56	.63	.47	.46	.56	.59
Lie frequency	.38	.44	.32	.30	.38	.38	.37	.40	.39	.35	.38	.41
Lie ease	.40	.52	.39	.36	.44	.43	.41	.48	.41	.39	.41	.47
Lie severity	.25	.25	.21	.21	.19	.20	.23	.25	.23	.24	.25	.26
Lie success	.21	.19	.17	.03	.17	.10	.19	.12	.17	.01	.18	.07
Lie anxiety	-.30	-.42	-.37	-.36	-.34	-.32	-.35	-.43	-.30	-.29	-.35	-.39
Lie guilt	-.28	-.38	-.39	-.43	-.37	-.34	-.36	-.44	-.33	-.34	-.35	-.43
Lie fear	-.20	-.30	-.27	-.26	-.28	-.30	-.25	-.31	-.23	-.25	-.25	-.30
Lie enjoyment	.24	.36	.20	.28	.25	.30	.23	.35	.27	.38	.26	.39
Lie pride	.30	.34	.26	.32	.23	.22	.30	.36	.25	.34	.29	.38

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = General proxy; B = SRP scale; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

^a $n = 497$. ^b $n = 378$.

Table 2-10*Male-Specific Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men*

	IPM		CA		ELS		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Dataset 1 ^a												
Exploitativeness	.48	.56	.43	.28	.27	.30	.46	.47	.29	.28	.48	.43
Entitlement	.53	.48	.52	.42	.35	.37	.53	.50	.36	.39	.54	.50
Vengeance	.65	.51	.69	.55	.38	.47	.68	.58	.43	.47	.66	.59
SDRT	.50	.52	.55	.59	.59	.64	.54	.61	.56	.64	.58	.70
STMO	.41	.25	.38	.33	.40	.42	.39	.31	.35	.32	.43	.35
LTMO	-.29	-.32	-.40	-.45	-.25	-.39	-.37	-.42	-.32	-.42	-.34	-.47
Proactive aggression	.50	.52	.50	.45	.46	.57	.51	.54	.53	.64	.54	.66
Reactive aggression	.53	.38	.47	.33	.36	.46	.51	.39	.44	.45	.51	.47
Narcissism	.48	.40	.29	.12	.28	.31	.40	.30	.29	.31	.42	.34
Psychopathy	.60	.63	.65	.62	.55	.71	.63	.69	.62	.74	.66	.80
Machiavellianism	.67	.67	.65	.56	.40	.40	.69	.68	.44	.39	.66	.61
Sadism	.56	.56	.64	.71	.54	.58	.62	.69	.57	.63	.64	.74
Dataset 2 ^b												
PATD	.55	.70	.51	.38	.44	.48	.54	.62	.45	.41	.55	.57
Lie frequency	.38	.43	.35	.22	.32	.36	.37	.37	.37	.31	.36	.38
Lie ease	.47	.56	.44	.29	.51	.38	.47	.49	.47	.37	.51	.48
Lie severity	.28	.27	.26	.22	.25	.24	.25	.27	.32	.26	.28	.30
Lie success	.33	.30	.34	.19	.31	.20	.35	.28	.26	.11	.36	.21
Lie anxiety	-.39	-.45	-.40	-.22	-.35	-.25	-.40	-.39	-.30	-.23	-.40	-.35
Lie guilt	-.29	-.32	-.36	-.32	-.30	-.20	-.35	-.36	-.25	-.20	-.34	-.32
Lie fear	-.26	-.26	-.31	-.19	-.27	-.19	-.29	-.26	-.21	-.15	-.29	-.22
Lie enjoyment	.22	.31	.17	.18	.21	.25	.19	.28	.27	.30	.21	.33
Lie pride	.25	.30	.21	.25	.19	.17	.24	.31	.25	.25	.26	.32

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Male-specific proxy; B = SRP scale; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

^a $n = 194$. ^b $n = 155$.

Table 2-11*Female-Specific Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women*

	IPM		CA		ELS		ASB		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Dataset 1 ^a														
Exploitativeness	.51	.60	.49	.44	.44	.45	.48	.37	.54	.57	.46	.48	.53	.57
Entitlement	.41	.41	.45	.41	.32	.28	.41	.28	.45	.44	.35	.32	.42	.41
Vengeance	.64	.58	.59	.50	.47	.43	.52	.39	.64	.59	.51	.48	.60	.58
SDRT	.57	.57	.70	.56	.65	.62	.58	.45	.64	.61	.69	.62	.68	.66
STMO	.43	.39	.48	.42	.48	.57	.44	.37	.47	.44	.52	.56	.49	.53
LTMO	-.30	-.33	-.40	-.37	-.31	-.33	-.31	-.31	-.37	-.38	-.37	-.37	-.38	-.40
Proactive aggression	.57	.51	.52	.41	.48	.43	.47	.50	.56	.51	.50	.53	.55	.56
Reactive aggression	.58	.49	.47	.37	.44	.41	.38	.31	.54	.47	.45	.42	.51	.48
Narcissism	.25	.30	.20	.22	.20	.23	.31	.15	.25	.29	.21	.22	.27	.28
Psychopathy	.72	.74	.74	.69	.66	.73	.64	.59	.75	.78	.70	.77	.75	.84
Machiavellianism	.71	.78	.60	.58	.58	.55	.57	.42	.68	.75	.58	.57	.66	.72
Sadism	.58	.64	.66	.74	.58	.62	.53	.52	.63	.74	.62	.66	.65	.76
Dataset 2 ^b														
PATD	.49	.58	.46	.43	.50	.47	.46	.24	.51	.56	.52	.42	.50	.53
Lie frequency	.35	.36	.31	.21	.38	.32	.20	.20	.34	.32	.37	.30	.37	.33
Lie ease	.33	.44	.30	.30	.37	.39	.20	.17	.34	.41	.36	.33	.34	.40
Lie severity	.23	.22	.14	.16	.12	.14	.15	.20	.19	.21	.14	.19	.17	.22
Lie success	.09	.12	.02	-.09	.07	.03	.01	-.15	.07	.03	.08	-.07	.04	-.02
Lie anxiety	-.19	-.28	-.23	-.26	-.28	-.24	-.19	-.14	-.24	-.30	-.28	-.22	-.25	-.28
Lie guilt	-.24	-.32	-.32	-.40	-.39	-.35	-.28	-.28	-.29	-.39	-.40	-.36	-.34	-.41
Lie fear	-.14	-.24	-.21	-.20	-.25	-.29	-.17	-.12	-.20	-.24	-.26	-.25	-.23	-.26
Lie enjoyment	.24	.34	.20	.28	.27	.28	.22	.41	.23	.34	.26	.40	.27	.40
Lie pride	.33	.33	.31	.34	.24	.21	.36	.43	.32	.37	.25	.37	.33	.40

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Female-specific proxy; B = SRP scale; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

^a $n = 302$. ^b $n = 223$.

Table 2-12

Relative and Absolute Profile Similarities Between Proxy Scales and Corresponding SRP Scales

	General		Male-Specific		Female-Specific	
	<i>r</i>	<i>r_{ICC}</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r_{ICC}</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r_{ICC}</i>
IPM	.99	.98	.97	.97	.98	.98
CA	.99	.99	.96	.95	.98	.98
ELS	.99	.99	.97	.96	.99	.99
ASB	-	-	-	-	.94	.93
F1	.99	.99	.98	.98	.99	.99
F2	.98	.97	.97	.97	.98	.98
Total	.99	.98	.97	.97	.99	.99

Note. *r_{ICC}* = Double-entry intraclass correlation; IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2.

Table 2-13*Magnitudes of Sex Differences in Correlations Between Proxy Items and SRP Scales*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2	Total
Men more strongly related							
6r (H: sincerity)	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-
30 (H: sincerity)	.11	.10	-	-	.12	-	.05
36r (H: fairness)	.09	.11	.06	-	.12	-	.10
60 (H: fairness)	.05	-	.08	.05	.05	.07	.08
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	.13	-	.11	-	.12	-	.08
24 (H: modesty)	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-
48 (H: modesty)	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-
3r (A: forgiveness)	-	.09	-	-	.07	-	.10
27r (A: forgiveness)	-	.11	-	-	.07	-	.07
56 (C: prudence)	-	-	.08	-	-	.09	.07
Women more strongly related							
6r (H: sincerity)	-	-	-	-	-	.10	-
54r (H: sincerity)	-	-	-	.11	-	-	-
12 (H: fairness)	-	-	-	.07	-	-	-
48 (H: modesty)	-	-	-	.11	-	-	-
5r (E: fearfulness)	-	.21	.08	-	-	.12	.17
29r (E: fearfulness)	-	.13	-	-	.12	.05	.09
53 (E: fearfulness)	-	-	.16	-	-	-	-
17r (E: dependence)	-	.05	-	-	-	-	-
41 (E: dependence)	-	-	-	-	.05	-	-
23r (E sentimentality)	-	-	-	-	-	.12	.06
47r (E: sentimentality)	-	.08	-	.15	.06	-	.08
59 (E: sentimentality)	-	.10	-	-	.06	.12	.09
22r (X: liveliness)	.17	.08	-	-	.14	-	.12
46 (X: liveliness)	-	.05	-	-	-	-	-
15 (A: flexibility)	.06	.10	-	-	.08	-	-
21 (A: patience)	.14	.08	.10	-	.13	.06	.09
32 (C: diligence)	.16	.08	.10	-	.13	.12	.14
44 (C: prudence)	.13	.12	.08	-	.14	.10	.12

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness. Only raw differences of .05 or greater are shown. Bold items differ by .10 or greater for at least one SRP scale.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878>
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Pozzebon, J. A., Visser, B. A., & Worth, N. C. (2010). Status-driven risk taking and the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*, 734–737. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.09.003>
- Blanchard, A., & Lyons, M. (2016). Sex differences between primary and secondary psychopathy, parental bonding, and attachment style. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences, 10*, 56–63. <http://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000065>
- Blonigen D. M., Hicks, B. M., Krueger, R. F., Patrick, C. J., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Psychopathic personality traits: Heritability and genetic overlap with internalizing and externalizing psychopathology. *Psychological Medicine, 35*, 637–648. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704004180>
- Book, A. S., & Quinsey, V. L. (2004). Psychopaths: Cheaters or warrior-hawks? *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 33–45. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00049-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00049-7)
- Book, A., Stark, S., MacEachern, J., Forth, A., Visser, B., Wattam, T., Young, J., Power, J., & Roters, J. (2020). In the eye of the beholder: Psychopathy and fear enjoyment. *Journal of Personality, 88*, 1286–1301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12571>

- Book, A., Visser, B. A., Blais, J., Hosker-Field, A., Methot-Jones, T., Gauthier, N. Y., Volk, A., Holden, R. R., & D'Agata, M. T. (2016). Unpacking more “evil”: What is at the core of the dark tetrad? *Personality and Individual Differences, 90*, 269–272. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.009>
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., & Volk, A. A. (2015). Unpacking “evil”: Claiming the core of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 73*, 29–38. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.016>
- Buckels, E. E., Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). Behavioral confirmation of everyday sadism. *Psychological Science, 24*, 2201–2209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613490749>
- Butcher, J. N., Dahlstrom, W. G., Graham, J. R., Tellegen, A., & Kaemmer, B. (1989). *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory–2 (MMPI-2): Manual for administration and scoring*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment, 13*, 171–188. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1040-3590.13.2.171>
- Decuyper, M., De Pauw, S., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., & De Clercq, B. J. (2009). A meta-analysis of psychopathy-, antisocial PD- and FFM associations. *European Journal of Personality, 23*, 531–565. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.729>
- Forouzan, E., & Cooke, D. J. (2005). Figuring out la femme fatale: Conceptual and

assessment issues concerning psychopathy in females. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 765–778. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.669>

Forth, A. E., Brown, S. L., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1996). The assessment of psychopathy in male and female noncriminals: Reliability and validity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20, 531–543. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(95\)00221-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(95)00221-9)

Giammarco, E. A., Atkinson, B., Baughman, H. M., Veselka, L., & Vernon, P. A. (2013). The relation between antisocial personality and the perceived ability to deceive. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 246–250. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.09.004>

Grann, M. (2000). The PCL-R and gender. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 16, 147–149. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.16.3.147>

Hare, R. D. (1991). *Manual for the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R. D. (1999). *Without conscience: The disturbing world of the psychopaths among us*. Guilford Press. (Original work published 1993)

Hare, R. D. (2003). *Manual for the Revised Psychopathy Checklist* (2nd ed.). Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R. D., Harpur, T. J., Hakstian, A. R., Forth, A. E., Hart, S. D., & Newman, J. P. (1990). The revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and factor structure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 2, 338–341. <http://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.2.3.338>

Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2010). The role of antisociality in the psychopathy

- construct: Comment on Skeem and Cooke (2010). *Psychological Assessment*, 22, 446–454. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013635>
- Hart, S. D., Cox, D., & Hare, R. D. (1995). *Manual for the screening version of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL:SV)*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Hodson, G., Book, A., Visser, B. A., Volk, A. A., Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2018). Is the Dark Triad common factor distinct from low Honesty-Humility? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 73, 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.012>
- Jackson, J. J., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2007). The structure and measurement of human mating strategies: Toward a multidimensional model of sociosexuality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 382–391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.04.005>
- Jackson, R. L., Rogers, R., Neumann, C. S., & Lambert, P. L. (2002). Psychopathy in female offenders: An investigation of its underlying dimensions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 692–704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009385402237922>
- Jonason, P. K., Luevano, V. X., & Adams, H. M. (2012). How the Dark Triad traits predict relationship choices. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53, 180–184. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.03.007>
- Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Introducing the Short Dark Triad (SD3): A brief measure of dark personality traits. *Assessment*, 21, 28–41. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191113514105>
- Knight, N. M., Dahlen, E. R., Bullock-Yowell, E., & Madson, M. B. (2018). The

HEXACO model of personality and Dark Triad in relational aggression.

Personality and Individual Differences, 122, 109–114.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.10.016>

Kreis, M. K. F., & Cooke, D. J. (2012). The manifestation of psychopathic traits in women: An exploration using case examples. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 11, 267–279. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2012.746755>

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, 1571–1582.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.016>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 2–5.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.048>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment*, 25, 543–556. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116659134>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2020). Sex differences in HEXACO personality characteristics across countries and ethnicities. *Journal of Personality*, 88, 1075–1090.

<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12551>

Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., Visser, B. A., & Gallucci, A. (2013). Sex, power, and money: Prediction from the Dark Triad and Honesty-Humility. *European Journal of Personality*, 27, 169–184.

<http://doi.org/10.1002/per.1860>

Lee, I. A., & Preacher, K. J. (2013). *Calculation for the test of the difference between two*

dependent correlations with one variable in common [Computer software].

<http://quantpsy.org/corrtest/corrtest2.htm>

Lee, Z., & Salekin, R. T. (2010). Psychopathy in a noninstitutional sample: Differences in primary and secondary subtypes. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 1*, 153–169. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0019269>

Lilienfeld, S. O. (1990). *Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Minnesota.

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*, 488–524.

http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6603_3

Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2015). Psychopathy from a basic trait perspective: The utility of a Five-Factor Model approach. *Journal of Personality, 83*, 611–626.

<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12132>

Međedović, J. (2017). Can HEXACO-PI-R adequately represent the four-factor model of psychopathy? *Psihologijske Teme, 26*, 557–576. <http://doi.org/10.31820/pt.26.3.4>.

Miller, J., Lynam, D., Widiger, T., & Leukefeld, C. (2001). Personality disorders as extreme variants of common personality dimensions: Can the Five-Factor Model adequately represent psychopathy? *Journal of Personality, 69*, 253–276.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00144>

Millon, T., Grossman, S., & Millon, C. (2015). *Manual for the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-IV*. Pearson Assessments.

- Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the Dark Triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*, 183–204. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616666070>
- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the Dark Triad and Five-Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Personality, 83*, 644–664. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12126>
- Patrick, C. (2010). *Operationalizing the Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Preliminary description of brief scales for assessment of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition* [Unpublished manual]. Florida State University.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Jones, D. N. (2015). Measuring dark personalities via questionnaire. In G. J. Boyle, D. H. Saklofske, & G. Matthews (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological constructs* (pp. 562–594). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2010-0-68427-6>
- Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2016). *Manual for the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Fourth Edition*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556–563. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
- Raine, A., Dodge, K., Loeber, R., Gatzke-Kopp, L., Lynam, D., Reynolds, C., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Liu, J. (2006). The Reactive–Proactive Aggression Questionnaire: Differential correlates of reactive and proactive aggression in

adolescent boys. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 159–171.

<http://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20115>

Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 45, 590. <http://doi.org/10.2466%2Fpr0.1979.45.2.590>

Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternative form reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 45, 159–162. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4502_10

Reminger, S. (2018). Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory. In J. Kreutzer, J. DeLuca, & B. Caplan (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of clinical neuropsychology*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56782-2_1998-2

Ruchensky, J. R., Donnellan, M. B., & Edens, J. F. (2018). Development and initial validation of the HEXACO-Triarchic scales. *Psychological Assessment*, 30, 1560–1566. <http://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000609>

Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., & Sewell, K. W. (1997). Construct validity of psychopathy in a female offender sample: A multitrait-multimethod evaluation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 576–585. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.106.4.576>

Sanz-García, A., Gesteira, C., Sanz, J., & García-Vera, M. P. (2021). Prevalence of psychopathy in the general adult population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1–14. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.661044>

Schneider, T. J., & Goffin, R. D. (2012). Perceived ability to deceive and incremental

- prediction in pre-employment personality testing. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 806–811. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.015>
- Skeem, J. L., & Cooke, D. J. (2010). Is criminal behavior a central component of psychopathy? Conceptual directions for resolving the debate. *Psychological Assessment*, 22, 433–445. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0008512>
- Sprague, J., Javdani, S., Sadeh, N., Newman, J. P., & Verona, E. (2012). Borderline personality disorder as a female phenotypic expression of psychopathy? *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3, 127–139. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0024134>
- Strand, S., & Belfrage, H. (2005). Gender differences in psychopathy in a Swedish offender sample. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 837–850. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.674>
- Stuckless, N., & Goranson, R. (1992). The Vengeance Scale: Development of a measure of attitudes toward revenge. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 7, 25–42.
- Tsoukas, A., & March, E. (2018). Predicting short- and long-term mating orientations: The role of sex and the Dark Tetrad. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 55, 1206–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1420750>
- Verona, E., & Vitale, J. (2006). Psychopathy in women: Assessment, manifestations, and etiology. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 415–436). Guilford Press.
- Vidal, S., Skeem, J., & Camp, J. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Painting different paths

- for low-anxious and high-anxious psychopathic variants. *Law and Human Behavior*, *34*, 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-009-9175-y>
- Visser, B. A., Ashton, M. C., & Pozzebon, J. A. (2012). Is low anxiety part of the psychopathy construct? *Journal of Personality*, *80*, 725–747. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00745.x>
- Visser, B. A., Pozzebon, J. A., Bogaert, A. F., & Ashton, M. C. (2010). Psychopathy, sexual behavior, and esteem: It's different for girls. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*, 833–838. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.008>
- Visser, B. A., Pozzebon, J. A., & Reina-Tamayo, A. M. (2014). Status-driven risk taking: Another “dark” personality? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *46*, 485–496. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034163>
- Visser, B. A., & Schueler, S. (2016). Savvy liars? HEXACO personality predicts self-report deception ability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *101*, 524. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.05.338>
- Vize, C. E., Collison, K. L., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2020). The “core” of the Dark Triad: A test of competing hypotheses. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *11*, 91–99. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000386>
- Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., Collison, K. L., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Differences among Dark Triad components: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *9*, 101–111. <http://doi.org/10.1037/per0000222>
- Widiger, T. A., & Lynam, D. R. (1998). Psychopathy and the Five-Factor Model of

personality. In T. Millon, E. Simonsen, M. Birket-Smith, & R. D. Davis (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal, and violent behavior* (pp. 171–187). Guilford Press.

Wynn, R., Høiseith, M. H., & Pettersen, G. (2012). Psychopathy in women: Theoretical and clinical perspectives. *International Journal of Women's Health, 4*, 257–263.
<http://doi.org/10.2147/IJWH.S25518>

Zágon, I. K., & Jackson, H. J. (1994). Construct validity of a psychopathy measure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 17*, 125–135. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)90269-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90269-0)

CHAPTER THREE

Extending the Power Proxies of Psychopathic Traits to an Adolescent Sample

Psychopathy is a personality construct that encompasses traits such as manipulativeness, callousness, and impulsivity (Hare, 2003). Hare's two-factor/four-facet model of psychopathy has been, and continues to be, the prevailing model in the field. In fact, the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003), which follows this model, is widely considered the "gold standard" measure of psychopathy and is the only tool used to identify psychopaths in forensic settings. Hare's Factor 1 (Interpersonal/Affective) focuses on the personality aspects of the construct and is made up of the interpersonal manipulation and callous affect facets. Hare's Factor 2 (Lifestyle/Antisocial), on the other hand, focuses more on the behavioural aspects and is made up of the erratic lifestyle and antisocial behaviour facets.

Psychopathy and Normal Personality

Because psychopathy exists on a continuum (Hare & Neumann, 2008) and is widely considered to be a *personality* construct, some researchers have examined the relations between psychopathy and models of "normal" personality, most notably the Big Five. Conceptual similarities can be easily identified between the prototypical traits of psychopathy and certain Big Five traits, particularly low Agreeableness (e.g., unkind, uncooperative) and low Conscientiousness (e.g., unorganized, impulsive), and past research has found that these traits are, indeed, related. Meta-analytic studies repeatedly find negative correlations between psychopathy and both Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, with Agreeableness consistently having the strongest associations with psychopathy (Decuyper et al., 2009; Muris et al., 2017; O'Boyle et al., 2015; Vize et

al., 2018). Further, while the correlations between psychopathy and the other Big Five domains are often quite small, larger associations do emerge between psychopathy and some of the specific facets of these domains (e.g., angry hostility facet of Neuroticism, excitement-seeking facet of Extraversion) (Decuyper et al., 2009; O’Boyle et al., 2015). Thus, meta-analytic findings support the idea that (low) Agreeableness and (low) Conscientiousness are very much related to psychopathic traits, but also that some aspects of the other Big Five domains are relevant as well.

Past research on the relationships between psychopathy and normal personality has tended to use the well-established Big Five model, with some researchers arguing that psychopathy can be largely understood as a combination of certain Big Five traits (e.g., Lynam & Miller, 2015; Miller et al., 2001; Widiger & Lynam, 1998). However, the more recently introduced HEXACO model has become quite prevalent within personality psychology. The HEXACO captures the personality variance accounted for by the Big Five, but also incorporates additional “dark” personality variance through its Honesty-Humility domain (Lee & Ashton, 2014). It has been argued that (low) Honesty-Humility is essentially what is at the core of the Dark Triad (Book et al., 2015; Hodson et al., 2018) and Dark Tetrad (Book et al., 2016), both of which include psychopathy. Thus, although past research has often focused on how psychopathy relates to the Big Five, the HEXACO directly incorporates personality variance essential to the psychopathy construct that the Big Five does not (Lee & Ashton, 2014).

As researchers have recognized the HEXACO’s potential advantage over the Big Five in its ability to capture both “normal” and “dark” personality variance, some have attempted to create proxy measures of psychopathic traits using HEXACO items.

Ruchensky et al. (2018) created proxies for the three dimensions of the Triarchic Model of psychopathy (i.e., boldness, meanness, and disinhibition) using items from the HEXACO-100 (Lee & Ashton, 2018). Items were first selected based on their theoretical relevance to each dimension, and the relationships between these items and the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM; Patrick, 2010) were subsequently examined before the proxy scales were finalized.

Međedović (2017) created proxies for Hare's four-facet model of psychopathy using a data-driven approach. The correlations between the HEXACO-100 items and the facets of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP-IV; Paulhus et al., 2016) were examined, and items that correlated with a given SRP facet at a cutoff of $\pm.20$ were chosen to be included on the proxy for that facet. Notably, while proxies were created for interpersonal manipulation, callous affect, and erratic lifestyle, creating a proxy for antisocial behaviour was not possible. While Međedović provided valuable insights into the relations between the HEXACO items and the SRP facets, he did not examine the SRP factors or total score. Further, although his findings support the notion that certain combinations of HEXACO items can serve as adequate proxies for the SRP scales, the item selection criterion (i.e., correlation cutoff of $\pm.20$) was somewhat lenient, and because he did not attempt to develop sex-specific forms, he selected items based on the correlations in the total sample rather than in men and women separately.

For these reasons, we created our own proxy measures for Hare's model of psychopathy, dubbed the Power Proxies, using a data-driven approach (Power et al., under review). However, our approach differed from Međedović's in several ways. Proxies were created for the SRP facets (excluding antisocial behaviour), SRP factors,

and total SRP score using the HEXACO-60 (Ashton & Lee, 2009) and a correlation cutoff of $\pm.25$. Further, citing previous research on sex differences in the construct of psychopathy (see Power et al., under review), we examined the correlations between the HEXACO items and SRP scales separately for men and women and chose only the items that met the cutoff in both sexes for each scale. In addition to creating these “general” proxies for use with combined samples of men and women, sex-specific proxies were also created for potential use with male- or female-only samples. Finally, items that met the cutoff for multiple SRP scales were allowed to be included on each of those scales (i.e., the proxies were allowed to contain overlapping items). We made this allowance due to the theoretical and statistical overlap between the SRP subscales (they are naturally strongly correlated with each other) as well as the fact that several Honesty-Humility items, which are particularly important to capturing psychopathy, met the cutoff for more than one SRP facet and/or both factors (see Power et al., under review for a more detailed explanation).

The Power Proxies were correlated with several psychopathy-relevant variables in order to assess convergent validity and each version (i.e., general, male-specific, female-specific) showed the expected relationships with these variables (Power et al., under review). However, the findings suggested that the male-specific proxies were not an overly significant improvement over the general proxies as the compositions of the two versions were highly similar. In contrast, the female-specific proxies differed much more from the general proxies and they seemingly offered more practical utility in women, compared to the male-specific proxies in men, in the ability to capture SRP psychopathy.

The initial conclusions that were made about the validity and utility of the Power Proxies were based solely on how they performed within the datasets from which they were originally constructed. Thus, additional research is required to ensure that the proxies are able to capture psychopathic traits in different samples. Further, as the proxies were constructed and validated using an adult sample, it is unknown whether they can be extended to younger populations.

Psychopathy and Youth

Though the study of psychopathy has predominantly focused on adults, there is a growing body of literature investigating psychopathic traits in children and adolescents. This is evident through the development of measures specifically designed to assess psychopathic traits in younger populations. For example, the Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth et al., 2003) is a modified version of the PCL-R. The PCL-YV is similar to the PCL-R as it is designed to be completed by a professional using information gathered through a semi-structured interview as well as the individual's files. The Antisocial Process Screening Device (APSD; Frick & Hare, 2001) was also created to assess psychopathic-like traits in juveniles by having an adult known to the individual in question (e.g., a parent or teacher) rate them on a list of traits; the APSD has been adapted into a self-report version as well (e.g., Caputo et al., 1999). Other self-report scales have also been created to measure psychopathic traits in children and adolescents, such as the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed et al., 2002) and the Inventory of Callous-Unemotional Traits (ICU; Frick, 2004).

Studies on the factor structure of psychopathic traits using the PCL-YV have found similar structures in both adolescent boys (Neumann et al., 2006) and adolescent

girls (Kosson et al., 2013) as is typically found with the PCL-R in adults. Additionally, past research has found that psychopathic traits in young populations tend to be related to many of the same variables as they are in adult populations, including aggression, violence, criminality, and recidivism (e.g., Brandt et al., 1997; Campbell et al., 2004; Edens et al., 2006; Leistico et al., 2008; Murrie et al., 2004). Psychopathic traits in adolescents have also demonstrated similar relations with the Big Five model of personality as is typically found in adults (Lynam et al., 2005). If psychopathic traits in adults and youths are similarly related to the Big Five, it is likely that they will also show similar relations with other models of normal personality, including the HEXACO. Thus, it seems probable that the Power Proxies, though created using an adult sample, will be able to capture psychopathic traits not only in adults, but in younger individuals as well.

The Present Study

It is necessary to test any measure's performance in multiple samples and datasets before making strong inferences about its ability to function as intended in future studies. Thus, the general purpose of the present study was to examine how the Power Proxies would perform in a new sample. More specifically, we wanted to examine whether the proxies would still relate to psychopathy-relevant variables, as well as determine how the sex-specific proxies would compare to the general proxies, in a sample of adolescents. Demonstrating that the proxies have construct validity in youth samples in addition to adult samples would expand the range of situations in which future researchers might elect to use them. Likewise, it would be necessary to discern whether the proxies do not function adequately in youth samples in order to avoid putting them to use in an unsuitable population.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through various community programs (e.g., youth groups and sports teams) in the Niagara Region to take part in the Brock Adolescent Development (BAD) Study (Provenzano et al., 2018). Participants were provided with informed consent/assent forms and were asked to complete the study online using a unique ID. All participants were paid \$15 CAD upon completion of the study and their data was only used after their signed consent/assent forms were returned. Of note, 26 participants were removed from the dataset due to lack of variability in their responses across multiple scales. The final sample consisted of 396 participants (230 girls, 165 boys, 1 undisclosed) and ranged from 12 to 18 years of age ($M = 14.64$, $SD = 1.52$). The sample was predominantly White (81.6%).

Measures

Note that the means and standard deviations of the study variables can be found in Appendix A (Table A3-1).

Key Variables

HEXACO Personality Traits. The HEXACO model of personality was measured using the 60-item version of the HEXACO Personality Inventory-Revised (HEXACO-60; Ashton & Lee, 2009), which consists of statements about the self to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale measures six domains of normal personality: Honesty-Humility (e.g., “I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed”), Emotionality (e.g., “I would feel afraid if I had to travel in

bad weather conditions”), Extraversion (e.g., “I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone”), Agreeableness (e.g., “I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me”), Conscientiousness (e.g., “I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute”), and Openness to Experience (e.g., “I’m interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries”). Note that scores on the HEXACO domains were not calculated in the present study. Rather, the items were only used to calculate scores on the SRP proxies described in Power et al. (under review).

Psychopathic Traits. Narcissism, impulsivity, and callous-unemotional traits were measured using the Antisocial Process Screening Device (APSD; Frick & Hare, 2001). Each subscale consists of multiple statements and participants rate how true each statement is about them on a 3-point scale from 0 (*not at all true*) to 2 (*definitely true*). Narcissism is measured through seven items (e.g., “You think you are better or more important than other people,” $\alpha = .69$), impulsivity through five items (e.g., “You act without thinking of the consequences,” $\alpha = .56$), and callous-unemotional traits through six items (e.g., “You feel bad or guilty when you do something wrong” [reverse-scored], $\alpha = .47$). A total APSD variable was also calculated using all the items from the three subscales plus two additional items ($\alpha = .75$).

Additional Variables

Bullying and Victimization. School bullying perpetration and school victimization were measured using the School Bullying Questionnaire (Volk & Lagzdins, 2009). Each subscale consists of seven items describing bullying behaviours and participants indicate how often they engage in, or are at the receiving end of, each type of

behaviour on a 5-point scale from 1 (*that hasn't happened*) to 5 (*several times a week*) (e.g., bullying: "In school, how often have you hit, slapped, or pushed someone much weaker or less popular last term?" $\alpha = .80$; victimization: "In school, how often has someone much stronger or more popular hit, slapped, or pushed you last term?" $\alpha = .80$).

Aggression. Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber aggression were measured using the Multidimensional, Integrated, Contextualized Measure of Bullying, Aggression, and Victimization (see Lapierre & Dane, 2019). Each subscale consists of several aggressive behaviours and participants indicate how often in the past year they have engaged in each type of behaviour on a 5-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*almost every week*). Physical and verbal aggression are each measured through eight items (e.g., physical: "Physically hurt others," $\alpha = .78$; verbal: "Teased someone in a hurtful way," $\alpha = .81$), while relational and cyber aggression are each measured through nine items (e.g., relational: "Spread negative rumours about someone," $\alpha = .77$; cyber: "Threatened someone using the internet or a cell phone," $\alpha = .80$).

Reactive and proactive aggression were measured using an adapted self-report version of Dodge and Coie's (1987) aggression scale. Each subscale consists of three statements describing aggressive behaviours and participants indicate how often they engage in each behaviour on a 5-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*almost always*) (e.g., reactive: "When I have been teased or threatened I get angry easily and strike back," $\alpha = .65$; proactive: "I threaten or bully others in order to get my way," $\alpha = .89$).

Anger and Hostility. Anger and hostility were measured using Bryant and Smith's (2001) short form of the Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1991). Each subscale consists of three statements and participants rate how characteristic each

statement is of them on a 6-point scale from 1 (*extremely uncharacteristic of me*) to 6 (*extremely characteristic of me*) (e.g., anger: “I have trouble controlling my temper,” $\alpha = .83$; hostility: “Other people always seem to get the breaks,” $\alpha = .78$). A composite anger/hostility variable was also calculated ($\alpha = .85$).

Behavioural Conduct, Social Competence, Athletic Competence, and Romantic Appeal. Self-perceived behavioural conduct, social competence, athletic competence, and romantic appeal were measured using an adapted self-report version of the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents (SPPA; Harter, 1988). Each subscale consists of five statements and participants rate how well each statement describes them on a 4-point scale from 1 (*describes me very poorly*) to 4 (*describes me very well*) (e.g., behavioural control: “I usually do the right thing,” $\alpha = .72$; social competence: “I understand how to get peers to accept me,” $\alpha = .74$; athletic competence: “I do very well at all kinds of sports,” $\alpha = .84$; romantic appeal: “I feel that I am fun and interesting on a date,” $\alpha = .56$).

Conduct Problems, Prosocial Behaviour, and Hyperactivity. Conduct problems, prosocial behaviour, and hyperactivity were measured using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 1997). Each subscale consists of multiple statements and participants rate how true each statement is about them on a 3-point scale from 1 (*not true*) to 3 (*certainly true*). Conduct problems and prosocial behaviour are each measured through five items (e.g., conduct problems: “I am often accused of lying or cheating,” $\alpha = .58$; prosocial behaviour: “I am helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill,” $\alpha = .64$), and hyperactivity is measured through four items (e.g., “I am restless. I cannot stay still for long,” $\alpha = .69$).

Coercive Resource Control Strategies. Coercive resource control strategies were measured using a scale adapted from various sources (Gilbert, 2000; Gilbert et al., 1995; Hawley, 2003; Hawley et al., 2007, 2008; Vaillancourt et al., 2003) to assess social dominance and resource control. The coercive resource control strategies subscale consists of seven statements and participants rate how true each statement is about them on a 3-point scale from 1 (*never true*) to 3 (*almost always true*) (e.g., “I am able to make others do what I want,” $\alpha = .87$).

Delinquency. Theft, vandalism, substance use, and violence were measured using a shortened version of the Self-Report Delinquency Questionnaire (SRDQ; LeBlanc & Fréchette, 1989). Each subscale consists of multiple statements describing delinquent behaviours and participants indicate how often in the past 12 months they have engaged in each behaviour on a 4-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 4 (*often*). Theft is measured through 11 items (e.g., “Taken and kept something from a store without paying,” $\alpha = .89$), vandalism through five items (e.g., “Purposely break or destroy something that didn’t belong to you,” $\alpha = .88$), substance use through three items (e.g., “Used marijuana,” $\alpha = .84$), and violence through seven items (e.g., “Had a fist fight with anyone,” $\alpha = .87$). A total delinquency variable was also calculated ($\alpha = .94$).

Tolerance of Deviance. Attitudinal tolerance of deviance was measured using Jessor’s Attitudinal Intolerance of Deviance Scale (Jessor & Jessor, 1977; Jessor et al., 1995). The scale consists of 11 statements describing deviant behaviours and participants indicate how wrong they believe it is to engage in each behaviour on a 4-point scale from 1 (*very wrong*) to 4 (*not at all wrong*) (e.g., “To cheat on a test,” $\alpha = .88$).

Classroom Incivility. Attitudes toward intentional and unintentional classroom incivility were measured using the Attitudes Toward Classroom In/Civility Questionnaire (Farrell et al., 2015). Each subscale consists of five statements describing classroom behaviours and participants indicate how wrong they believe it is to engage in each behaviour on a 5-point scale from 1 (*definitely wrong*) to 5 (*definitely ok*) (e.g., intentional incivility: “Making fun of a classmate who answered a question wrong,” $\alpha = .87$; unintentional incivility: “Packing books up before a lesson is over,” $\alpha = .78$).

Life History Strategy. Life history strategy was measured using a shortened version of the Mini-K (Figueredo et al., 2006). The scale consists of 14 statements about the self to which participants rate their agreement on a 7-point scale from -3 (*disagree strongly*) to +3 (*agree strongly*) (e.g., I often give emotional support and practical help to my blood relatives,” $\alpha = .81$).

Pleasure Sensitivity, Perceptual Sensitivity, Shyness, and Surgency. Pleasure sensitivity, perceptual sensitivity, shyness, and surgency were measured using Ellis and Rothbart’s (2001) revision of the Early Adolescent Questionnaire (Capaldi & Rothbart, 1992). Each subscale consists of multiple statements and participants rate how true each statement is about them on a 5-point scale from 1 (*almost always untrue*) to 5 (*almost always true*). Pleasure sensitivity is measured through five items (e.g., “I like the crunching sound of autumn leaves,” $\alpha = .73$), perceptual sensitivity and shyness are each measured through four items (e.g., perceptual sensitivity: “I am very aware of noises,” $\alpha = .69$; shyness: “I feel shy about meeting new people,” $\alpha = .83$), and surgency is measured through six items (e.g., “I think it would be exciting to move to a new city,” $\alpha = .58$).

Peer-Valued Characteristics. Possession of peer-valued characteristics was measured using a scale adapted from Knack et al. (2012) and Vaillancourt and Hymel (2006). The scale consists of nine statements and participants rate how true each statement is of them on a 7-point scale from 1 (*very untrue of me*) to 7 (*very true of me*) (e.g., “I am good looking and attractive,” $\alpha = .86$).

Data Analysis and Results

The Brock Adolescent Development (BAD) Study is a large, multi-lab project designed to be able to address a wide variety of research questions. Accordingly, the dataset includes many scales that measure a large number of psychological constructs and behaviours. Importantly, many of these variables are known to be associated with psychopathic traits (e.g., aggression, delinquency). Thus, we were able to examine how the Power Proxies related to various psychopathy-relevant variables in adolescents.

To evaluate how the sex-specific proxies compared to the general proxies in terms of their relationships with relevant variables, the procedure used in Power et al. (under review) was employed. That is, the significance of the differences between corresponding correlations was tested using Lee and Preacher's (2013) calculator, and the raw differences between correlations were also examined. However, a number of the variables in the present study were found to violate the parametric assumption of normality. Therefore, while Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was used in the majority of cases, the correlations involving the non-normal variables used Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ). Lee and Preacher's calculator was developed to test the difference between Pearson correlations using Fisher's r -to- z transformation. However, Fisher's transformation has been used for not only converting Pearson's r coefficients into z -scores, but also for converting Spearman's ρ coefficients (e.g., Myers & Sirois, 2006; Zar, 2005). That said, there is no universal agreement regarding the use of Fisher's transformation on Spearman coefficients. For this reason, the results of the correlation comparisons are separated by correlation type so readers can use their own discretion in

determining how much weight to put on the Spearman correlations in their interpretation of the results.

The dataset used in the present study did not include the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP; Paulhus et al., 2016), so we could not observe how the correlations between the psychopathy-relevant variables and the proxies compared to the correlations between said variables and the actual SRP scales. However, the Antisocial Process Screening Device (APSD; Frick & Hare, 2001) was included in the dataset, and while not an exact counterpart to the SRP, the APSD is another measure designed to assess psychopathic traits. Thus, if the SRP proxies function as intended, they should, in theory, have similar associations with external variables as does the APSD. We therefore ran canonical correlation analyses (CCAs) to determine how much variance was shared between the proxies for the three SRP facets and the set of relevant variables compared to the variance shared between the three APSD subscales and the variables. The CCAs also allowed us to evaluate the manner in which each set of psychopathy scales predicted the combination of variables.

In addition to running CCAs, we simply correlated each psychopathy-relevant variable with all of the individual proxy scales (facets, factors, total) and APSD scales, but because the subscales of the SRP do not directly match the subscales of the APSD, it was not possible to provide one-to-one comparisons. Instead, the variables' correlations with all of the SRP proxies were placed next to their correlations with all of the APSD scales in order to obtain a general idea of how the psychopathy measures compared in terms of their relations with the variables. We also identified variables in the dataset that

showed relatively limited associations with the APSD scales and subsequently correlated these variables with the SRP proxies in order to evaluate discriminant validity.

The means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alphas for each of the proxy scales are provided in Table 3-1. Alphas ranged from .62 to .70 for the general proxies using the total sample, .66 to .69 for the male-specific proxies using the boys in the sample, and .68 to .75 for the female-specific proxies using the girls in the sample.

General Proxies

A CCA was conducted on the total sample of adolescent boys and girls with the general IPM, CA, and ELS proxies on one side of the equation and the external psychopathy-relevant variables on the other. The first canonical correlation was significant ($R = .73$, Wilks' Lambda = .291, $F(66, 854.93) = 6.63$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 70.9% of the variance. Canonical loadings indicated that the proxy scales loaded positively on the canonical variate (.86, .85, and .93, for IPM, CA, and ELS, respectively). Loadings for the variables on the other side of the equation are presented in Table 3-2. A CCA was then conducted on the total sample with the APSD subscales (i.e., narcissism, impulsivity, callous-unemotional) on one side of the equation and the psychopathy-relevant variables on the other. The first canonical correlation was again significant ($R = .76$, Wilks' Lambda = .227, $F(66, 860.91) = 8.38$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 77.3% of the variance. Canonical loadings indicated that the APSD scales loaded positively on the canonical variate (.80, .53, and .80, for narcissism, impulsivity, and callous-unemotional, respectively). Loadings for the variables on the other side of the equation are presented in Table 3-2. The proportion of variance accounted for in the two CCAs was similar. Further, all of the variables in both CCAs met the cutoff of .25 for

loading on the canonical variate. These results indicate that the combination of general SRP proxies and the combination of APSD scales similarly predict the combination of psychopathy-relevant variables, suggesting that the proxies are, in fact, measuring psychopathic traits.

Male-Specific Proxies

The male-specific CA proxy demonstrated some improvements over the general CA proxy in its correlations with relevant variables. However, the remaining male-specific proxies performed similarly to the respective general proxies (Table 3-3). Note that the raw differences, *z*-scores, and exact *p*-values for all correlation comparisons can be found in Appendix A (Tables A3-2–A3-13).

A CCA was conducted on the boys in the sample with the male-specific IPM, CA, and ELS proxies on one side of the equation and the psychopathy-relevant variables on the other. The first canonical correlation was significant ($R = .76$, Wilks' Lambda = .228, $F(66, 323.37) = 3.12$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 77.2% of the variance. Canonical loadings indicated that the proxy scales loaded positively on the canonical variate (.82, .88, and .93, for IPM, CA, and ELS, respectively). Loadings for the variables on the other side of the equation are presented in Table 3-4. A CCA was then conducted on the boys in the sample with the APSD scales on one side of the equation and the psychopathy-relevant variables on the other. The first canonical correlation was again significant ($R = .75$, Wilks' Lambda = .193, $F(66, 329.34) = 3.67$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 80.7% of the variance. Canonical loadings indicated that the APSD scales loaded positively on the canonical variate (.76, .36, and .82, for narcissism, impulsivity, and callous-unemotional, respectively). Loadings for the variables on the other side of the equation are presented in

Table 3-4. The proportion of variance accounted for in the two CCAs was very similar. Further, most of the variables in both CCAs met the cutoff of .25 for loading on the canonical variate, though there were four variables that did not meet the cutoff in the CCA for the proxy scales and one variable that did not meet the cutoff in the CCA for the APSD scales. Three of these variables, however, had loadings just below the cutoff (i.e., .23 or .24). Thus, though slight differences were found in how the variables loaded on the canonical variates, the results indicate that, in adolescent boys, the combination of male-specific proxies and the combination of APSD scales similarly predict the combination of psychopathy-relevant variables.

Female-Specific Proxies

The female-specific IPM, CA, F1, and total psychopathy proxies demonstrated marked improvements over the respective general proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables. However, the female-specific ELS proxy performed similarly to its general counterpart and, unexpectedly, the general F2 proxy performed better than its female-specific counterpart (Table 3-5).

A CCA was conducted on the girls in the sample with the female-specific IPM, CA, and ELS proxies on one side of the equation and the psychopathy-relevant variables on the other. The first canonical correlation was significant ($R = .78$, Wilks' Lambda = .239, $F(66, 451.78) = 4.21$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 76.1% of the variance. Canonical loadings indicated that the proxy scales loaded positively on the canonical variate (.96, .89, and .91, for IPM, CA, and ELS, respectively). Loadings for the variables on the other side of the equation are presented in Table 3-6. A CCA was then conducted on the girls in the sample with the APSD scales on one side of the equation and the psychopathy-

relevant variables on the other. The first canonical correlation was again significant ($R = .81$, Wilks' Lambda = .169, $F(66, 454.77) = 5.61$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 83.1% of the variance. Canonical loadings indicated that the APSD scales loaded positively on the canonical variate (.85, .65, and .75, for narcissism, impulsivity, and callous-unemotional, respectively). Loadings for the variables on the other side of the equation are presented in Table 3-6. Once again, the proportion of variance accounted for in the two CCAs was similar. Further, most of the variables in both CCAs met the .25 cutoff for loading on the canonical variate, with the only exception being one variable in the CCA for the APSD scales. Thus, the results indicate that, in adolescent girls, the combination of female-specific proxies and the combination of APSD scales similarly predict the combination of psychopathy-relevant variables.

Proxies vs. APSD

Tables 3-7–3-9 provide the bivariate correlations between the Power Proxies/APSD scales and each of the psychopathy-relevant variables. Tables 3-10–3-12 provide the bivariate correlations between each set of psychopathy scales and the variables that were pre-identified as having mostly small or negligible associations with the APSD. Overall, the magnitudes of the correlations between the SRP proxy scales and the variables were similar to the magnitudes of the correlations between the APSD scales and the variables.

Discussion

The overarching goal of the present study was to determine whether the findings of Power et al. (under review) could be extended to an adolescent sample. More specifically, we expected that the HEXACO proxies for psychopathic traits would exhibit convergent validity (i.e., be related to psychopathy-relevant variables) in an adolescent sample. Further, we were interested in exploring whether the sex-specific proxies would have any advantage over the general proxies in adolescents. As expected, the utility of the HEXACO proxies in an adolescent sample was supported. The proxies related to relevant variables in ways that were consistent with the relationships observed between those variables and scores on the Antisocial Process Screening Device (Frick & Hare, 2001), which is an established measure of psychopathic traits in youth. Similar to previous findings with an adult sample (Power et al., under review), while the general and male-specific proxies were relatively similar in their relationships with the variables in boys, most of the female-specific proxy scales outperformed the general proxy scales in girls.

Objective 1: Examining Relationships Between Proxies and External Variables

Past research has found psychopathic traits in youths to relate to many of the same types of variables as is typically found in adults (e.g., Brandt et al., 1997; Campbell et al., 2004; Edens et al., 2006; Leistico et al., 2008; Murrie et al., 2004). Therefore, numerous psychopathy-relevant variables (e.g., aggression, delinquency) were selected from the dataset and subsequently correlated with the Power Proxies in order to investigate whether the proxies could relate to these types of variables in a youth sample. The proxies related to the variables in the expected directions and the relations tended to be similar in magnitude to the relations between the same variables and a previously

validated measure of psychopathic traits in youth (i.e., the APSD). Thus, the findings of the present study resemble those of Power et al. (under review), providing additional support of the proxies' convergent validity.

Additionally, the Power Proxies and the APSD showed similarly weak relations with a selection of variables identified as being less relevant to psychopathy (e.g., athletic competence, shyness). These findings provide preliminary evidence of the proxies' discriminant validity. Overall, the relations between the Power Proxies and the selected variables suggest that the proxies can be extended to youth samples. However, it is worth noting that the relations between psychopathy and the victimization variable do not fully align with previous research findings. In girls, we found that the correlations between psychopathy and school bullying victimization were not particularly large, but they were consistently significant and positive. In boys, however, these relations were mostly negligible, resulting in fairly weak relations in the total sample. Consequently, we considered school bullying victimization a discriminant variable for the purpose of this study. However, previous research has found psychopathic traits to be more strongly related to school victimization in combined samples of boys and girls than presently found (e.g., Fanti & Kimonis, 2013). Further, Despoti et al. (2021) reported that gender did not moderate any of the relationships they found between psychopathic traits and school victimization. Note that, in the present study, victimization in boys was not only weakly related to the Power Proxies, but to the APSD as well. Thus, this finding could be plausibly explained by a lack of variability in the victimization variable in our sample; approximately half the boys had the lowest possible victimization score and the others

did not tend to score much higher. Still, how school victimization relates to the Power Proxies, and psychopathic traits in general, should be examined in future studies.

Objective 2: Investigating the Utility of the Sex-Specific Proxies

The male-specific proxies performed similarly to the general proxies, such that the findings are relatively ambiguous in terms of which set had the overall stronger relationships with the psychopathy-relevant variables. The only male-specific proxy scale that had several stronger relations with the variables was the CA proxy. The other proxy scales had few, if any, significant differences. Moreover, the differences that were statistically significant and/or reached .05 in raw magnitude did not consistently support one set over the other. Therefore, the results are unclear as to whether the set of male-specific or general proxies should be favoured in male-only adolescent samples. This finding is not overly surprising, as the results of Power et al. (under review) suggested that the male-specific proxies offered less improvement over the general proxies than did the female-specific proxies, presumably due to the fact that the male-specific proxy scales more closely resemble the general proxy scales. Taken together, the results of both studies suggest that while the male-specific proxies as a whole may not exactly perform worse than the general proxies, they seemingly do not provide much additional predictive utility, especially in adolescents. Thus, considering the principle of parsimony, the general proxies may be the more justifiable option for use with male-only adolescent samples.

Similar to the results of Power et al. (under review), the set of female-specific proxies as a whole had a more clear-cut improvement over the general proxies than did the male-specific proxies. Most of the female-specific proxy scales were more strongly

related to several relevant variables, suggesting that they do indeed provide predictive utility above and beyond the general proxies. However, there was one exception, as the female-specific F2 proxy had only two marginally stronger, but several weaker, relationships with the variables. This contrasts the initial findings, where the female-specific F2 proxy had several stronger, and no weaker, relationships with relevant variables (Power et al., under review). Strictly speaking, the female-specific F2 proxy did not perform poorly in the present study as it still showed significant relationships with the external variables, most of which were not much weaker than what was found with the general F2 proxy. Nevertheless, it is not immediately clear why only the female-specific F2 proxy had overall weaker correlations with the variables while the other female-specific proxies had consistently stronger correlations. Perhaps this finding demonstrates that adolescent girls and adult women express F2 through HEXACO items in slightly different ways, such that some of the “female-specific” F2 items identified in adult women are not as relevant to capturing F2 in adolescent girls. Including these items might therefore add a degree of noise to the female-specific F2 proxy in adolescent girls, resulting in weaker relations with psychopathy-relevant variables than that of the general F2 proxy. Though this explanation has the potential to provide meaning to this finding, we can do little more than speculate at this time.

Because the purpose of the present study was to examine whether the Power Proxies could be extended to youth populations, the sample necessarily differed from the sample used to create the proxies in that it consisted of adolescent boys and girls rather than adult men and women. As a result, we cannot presently determine to what extent, if any, the findings that diverged from Power et al. (under review) were influenced by the

ages of the two samples. For example, it may be an accurate, replicable finding in adolescent girls that, compared to the general F2 proxy, the female-specific F2 proxy had weaker associations with the external variables. If this were the case, it would still be possible for the opposite to be true for adult women, which would explain the inconsistent results. A similar argument could be made for the results pertaining to the male-specific proxies as a whole, which demonstrated less of an improvement over the general proxies in adolescent boys than what was previously found in adult men. However, it is also possible that these inconsistencies are unrelated to age and would have still been found had we examined the proxies using a new adult sample instead of a youth sample. Because the validity of the Power Proxies has only been examined using one adult and one youth sample to date, it is too early to make strong assumptions about the nature of the findings that differed between these samples. Additional research will be necessary to clarify this matter.

Altogether, the results of the present study suggest that while the female-specific proxies (with the possible exception of F2) may provide the overall best performance in female-only adolescent samples, the general and male-specific proxies will likely perform comparably in male-only adolescent samples.

Limitations

Because the present study relied solely on self-reports, the data is subject to shared method bias. Relatedly, participants might have engaged in intentional or unintentional socially desirable responding, especially considering the sensitive nature of many of the questions. As a result, it would be beneficial to incorporate different

methodologies, such as observer reports of relevant traits and/or behaviours, in future studies of the proxy scales.

One could argue that not including the SRP in the present study is a limitation of the research due to the fact that convergent correlations between the proxies and their respective SRP scales could not be calculated, nor could we investigate how the proxies would compare to the actual SRP scales in terms of their relations with the external variables. However, it is important to note that the SRP is intended for adults and some items contain content that may be less applicable to, or appropriate for, younger populations (e.g., driving a vehicle, gambling, sexual activity/violence), so including it in the present study would have been unfitting. The APSD, on the other hand, is a validated measure of psychopathic traits in youths. Thus, although the APSD scales do not directly correspond to the SRP scales, we felt that it was appropriate to use the APSD in lieu of the SRP in order to determine the general manner in which the Power Proxies should (or should not) relate to the external variables.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of the present study largely reflect those of Power et al. (under review). Each version of the proxies (i.e., general, male-specific, female-specific) correlated with a large selection of variables in a similar manner as a previously validated measure of psychopathic traits in youth, providing evidence of both convergent and discriminant validity. However, differing somewhat from what was previously found in adults, the sex-specific proxies, especially the male-specific, did not always demonstrate improvements over the general proxies in terms of their relations with external variables. Though additional research may be needed to determine whether the general or sex-

specific version of certain scales is best suited for male- or female-only adolescent samples, the overall results indicate that the Power Proxies, initially created using an adult sample, can be extended to younger populations.

Table 3-1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alphas for the Power Proxies in an Adolescent Sample

	General			Male-specific			Female-specific		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α
Factor 1	2.59	0.48	.68	2.76	0.43	.69	2.55	0.42	.71
IPM	2.60	0.55	.67	2.75	0.49	.69	2.49	0.50	.75
CA	2.61	0.51	.62	2.76	0.45	.66	2.53	0.42	.68
Factor 2	2.58	0.62	.70	2.67	0.57	.67	2.54	0.47	.68
ELS	2.69	0.60	.65	2.87	0.59	.68	2.51	0.49	.71
Total	2.58	0.51	.66	2.77	0.43	.67	2.48	0.43	.73

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle.

Table 3-2*Canonical Loadings for Relevant Variables in Total Sample*

	CCA 1 ^a	CCA 2 ^b
Physical aggression	.42	.38
Verbal aggression	.38	.39
Relational aggression	.29	.40
Cyber aggression	.42	.52
Anger	.44	.58
Hostility	.28	.40
Reactive aggression	.45	.48
Proactive aggression	.37	.57
Behavioural conduct	-.72	-.69
Conduct problems	.64	.69
Hyperactivity	.47	.36
Prosocial behaviour	-.45	-.57
Coercive resource control	.57	.70
School bullying	.37	.55
Theft	.53	.53
Vandalism	.35	.52
Substance abuse	.46	.30
Violence	.39	.50
Deviance tolerance	.75	.60
Intentional incivility	.58	.57
Unintentional incivility	.63	.42
Life history strategy	-.52	-.59

Note. CCA = Canonical correlation analysis.

^a Canonical loadings when general facet proxies are on the other side of the equation. ^b Canonical loadings when Antisocial Process Screening Device subscales are on the other side of the equation.

Table 3-3*Male-Specific Proxies' and General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys*

	IPM		CA		ELS		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations												
Physical aggression	.29	.28	.32	.31	.33	.34	.34	.33	.37	.39	.34	.33
Verbal aggression	.27	.28	.14	.12	.22	.21	.21	.21	.27	.29	.22	.23
Relational aggression	.23	.22	.08	.01	.07	.05	.14	.12	.13	.13	.14	.12
Anger	.24	.22	.29	.25	.28	.30	.30	.30	.40	.42	.32	.32
Hostility	.20	.21	.13	.07	.15	.17	.17	.16	.24	.25	.20	.20
Anger/hostility	.24	.23	.24	.19	.25	.27	.26	.26	.37	.38	.29	.29
Reactive aggression	.36	.34	.30	.25	.36	.35	.34	.31	.41	.39	.36	.31
Behavioural conduct	-.42	-.42	-.39	-.32	-.45	-.48	-.42	-.42	-.54	-.55	-.44	-.47
Conduct problems	.40	.43	.40	.34	.41	.46	.40	.43	.53	.53	.43	.45
Hyperactivity	.27	.24	.22	.18	.38	.39	.24	.21	.40	.42	.27	.22
Prosocial behaviour	-.22	-.19	-.35	-.30	-.18	-.20	-.32	-.31	-.26	-.25	-.26	-.24
Coercive resource control	.48	.50	.44	.40	.26	.25	.46	.48	.34	.31	.45	.50
Substance abuse	.23	.22	.26	.25	.36	.36	.26	.26	.31	.35	.26	.29
Deviance tolerance	.47	.49	.52	.53	.47	.47	.50	.52	.52	.48	.52	.55
Unintentional incivility	.44	.44	.39	.41	.45	.42	.43	.43	.41	.42	.45	.44
Life history strategy	-.20	-.17	-.27	-.24	-.32	-.34	-.26	-.25	-.33	-.36	-.24	-.21
Spearman correlations												
School bullying	.24	.23	.22	.18	.25	.25	.23	.22	.25	.27	.26	.26
Cyber aggression	.26	.24	.14	.12	.26	.24	.20	.17	.22	.25	.21	.21
Proactive aggression	.33	.31	.30	.29	.31	.31	.32	.31	.36	.33	.35	.37
Theft	.35	.35	.30	.29	.38	.36	.31	.31	.36	.38	.34	.34
Vandalism	.29	.31	.25	.26	.24	.22	.28	.29	.21	.22	.28	.31
Violence	.31	.27	.27	.25	.27	.25	.30	.28	.24	.25	.31	.32
Total delinquency	.37	.35	.34	.31	.41	.40	.35	.33	.37	.40	.36	.36
Intentional incivility	.44	.45	.44	.46	.46	.46	.43	.47	.44	.43	.43	.47

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Male-specific proxy; B = General proxy. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 3-4*Canonical Loadings for Relevant Variables in Boys*

	CCA 1 ^a	CCA 2 ^b
Physical aggression	.41	.32
Verbal aggression	.24	.32
Relational aggression	.11	.33
Cyber aggression	.27	.48
Anger	.41	.50
Hostility	.16	.32
Reactive aggression	.46	.41
Proactive aggression	.29	.62
Behavioural conduct	-.67	-.66
Conduct problems	.57	.71
Hyperactivity	.42	.23
Prosocial behaviour	-.46	-.65
Coercive resource control	.49	.63
School bullying	.31	.62
Theft	.40	.56
Vandalism	.24	.57
Substance abuse	.48	.41
Violence	.31	.56
Deviance tolerance	.72	.55
Intentional incivility	.56	.66
Unintentional incivility	.61	.38
Life history strategy	-.48	-.64

Note. CCA = Canonical correlation analysis.

^a Canonical loadings when male-specific facet proxies are on the other side of the equation. ^b Canonical loadings when Antisocial Process Screening Device subscales are on the other side of the equation.

Table 3-5*Female-Specific Proxies' and General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls*

	IPM		CA		ELS		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations												
Physical aggression	.23	.19	.21	.15	.27	.28	.23	.18	.25	.27	.23	.17
Verbal aggression	.36	.32	.36	.29	.38	.35	.35	.30	.33	.36	.36	.29
Relational aggression	.41	.39	.33	.30	.33	.30	.38	.35	.28	.33	.37	.34
Anger	.50	.37	.35	.28	.36	.34	.43	.36	.32	.45	.43	.39
Hostility	.38	.30	.24	<i>.11</i>	.25	.26	.29	.23	.19	.32	.30	.24
Anger/hostility	.51	.38	.35	.22	.36	.35	.42	.34	.30	.44	.42	.36
Reactive aggression	.40	.31	.30	.24	.32	.28	.36	.31	.30	.37	.36	.30
Behavioural conduct	-.56	-.42	-.52	-.39	-.58	-.55	-.53	-.43	-.54	-.60	-.57	-.47
Conduct problems	.52	.38	.46	.40	.45	.41	.48	.41	.41	.49	.49	.43
Hyperactivity	.37	.27	.27	.19	.42	.38	.33	.27	.38	.44	.35	.29
Prosocial behaviour	-.31	-.27	-.39	-.34	-.25	-.24	-.36	-.36	-.32	-.26	-.35	-.31
Coercive resource control	.47	.45	.42	.47	.34	.32	.45	.45	.29	.36	.43	.47
Substance abuse	.32	.25	.28	.20	.35	.33	.30	.23	.31	.35	.29	.23
Deviance tolerance	.49	.43	.51	.44	.54	.48	.49	.45	.51	.49	.53	.48
Unintentional incivility	.41	.36	.39	.33	.48	.44	.39	.35	.43	.46	.41	.36
Life history strategy	-.36	-.28	-.45	-.31	-.40	-.35	-.39	-.33	-.39	-.34	-.42	-.32
Spearman correlations												
School bullying	.41	.39	.32	.33	.34	.28	.38	.38	.30	.33	.39	.39
Cyber aggression	.40	.39	.32	.29	.36	.37	.37	.34	.30	.37	.37	.35
Proactive aggression	.40	.33	.30	.25	.26	.22	.36	.34	.25	.26	.35	.29
Theft	.33	.30	.34	.30	.41	.38	.34	.33	.38	.37	.37	.31
Vandalism	.30	.25	.31	.27	.29	.29	.29	.27	.28	.30	.32	.28
Violence	.28	.19	.35	.26	.36	.32	.29	.24	.36	.33	.34	.27
Total delinquency	.36	.29	.37	.27	.44	.42	.37	.30	.42	.41	.39	.29
Intentional incivility	.36	.33	.36	.41	.31	.31	.35	.37	.28	.34	.35	.37

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Female-specific proxy; B = General proxy. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 3-6*Canonical Loadings for Relevant Variables in Girls*

	CCA 1 ^a	CCA 2 ^b
Physical aggression	.30	.31
Verbal aggression	.46	.41
Relational aggression	.50	.52
Cyber aggression	.51	.57
Anger	.55	.61
Hostility	.43	.47
Reactive aggression	.45	.46
Proactive aggression	.44	.49
Behavioural conduct	-.75	-.68
Conduct problems	.67	.64
Hyperactivity	.52	.41
Prosocial behaviour	-.39	-.43
Coercive resource control	.55	.72
School bullying	.41	.48
Theft	.58	.45
Vandalism	.43	.42
Substance abuse	.44	.20
Violence	.39	.34
Deviance tolerance	.74	.60
Intentional incivility	.47	.39
Unintentional incivility	.64	.45
Life history strategy	-.56	-.48

Note. CCA = Canonical correlation analysis.

^a Canonical loadings when female-specific facet proxies (excluding antisocial behaviour) are on the other side of the equation. ^b Canonical loadings when Antisocial Process Screening Device subscales are on the other side of the equation.

Table 3-7*General Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample*

	Power Proxies						APSD			
	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2	Total	Narc	Imp	CU	Total
Pearson correlations										
Physical aggression	.26	.28	.35	.29	.36	.29	.22	.30	.17	.34
Verbal aggression	.32	.24	.30	.28	.33	.29	.32	.25	.16	.35
Relational aggression	.31	.16	.17	.24	.23	.24	.36	.25	.13	.34
Anger	.31	.27	.33	.33	.44	.36	.41	.33	.26	.46
Hostility	.25	.08	.22	.19	.30	.21	.31	.22	.20	.34
Anger/hostility	.31	.20	.31	.30	.42	.32	.41	.32	.26	.46
Reactive aggression	.33	.27	.33	.33	.39	.32	.39	.33	.22	.45
Behavioural conduct	-.42	-.38	-.54	-.44	-.59	-.48	-.32	-.44	-.47	-.57
Conduct problems	.41	.39	.45	.43	.52	.45	.40	.34	.49	.57
Hyperactivity	.27	.21	.41	.27	.45	.28	.18	.44	.19	.38
Prosocial behaviour	-.26	-.37	-.26	-.37	-.29	-.32	-.25	-.15	-.45	-.38
Coercive resource control	.48	.45	.30	.47	.34	.49	.53	.23	.40	.55
Substance abuse	.24	.23	.35	.24	.36	.26	.19	.32	.11	.34
Deviance tolerance	.47	.49	.49	.49	.49	.52	.37	.32	.37	.52
Unintentional incivility	.38	.35	.42	.37	.44	.38	.28	.30	.23	.40
Life history strategy	-.24	-.30	-.37	-.32	-.37	-.29	-.25	-.21	-.49	-.42
Spearman correlations										
School bullying	.34	.29	.28	.33	.31	.36	.41	.22	.20	.39
Cyber aggression	.33	.23	.32	.28	.32	.30	.36	.24	.14	.37
Proactive aggression	.35	.31	.29	.36	.32	.36	.37	.26	.36	.47
Theft	.34	.32	.40	.34	.40	.35	.33	.34	.26	.46
Vandalism	.29	.29	.28	.31	.28	.32	.29	.18	.30	.37
Violence	.27	.31	.33	.31	.33	.34	.26	.19	.31	.37
Total delinquency	.34	.33	.45	.35	.44	.35	.32	.37	.28	.48
Intentional incivility	.41	.47	.42	.45	.42	.45	.38	.18	.39	.46

Note. APSD = Antisocial Process Screening Device; IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; Narc = Narcissism; Imp = Impulsivity; CU = Callous-unemotional traits. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

Table 3-8*Male-Specific Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys*

	Power Proxies						APSD			
	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2	Total	Narc	Imp	CU	Total
Pearson correlations										
Physical aggression	.29	.32	.33	.34	.37	.34	.25	.27	.07	.33
Verbal aggression	.27	.14	.22	.21	.27	.22	.37	.18	.10	.33
Relational aggression	.23	.08	.07	.14	.13	.14	.33	.13	.07	.26
Anger	.24	.29	.28	.30	.40	.32	.38	.30	.22	.44
Hostility	.20	.13	.15	.17	.24	.20	.30	.22	.13	.31
Anger/hostility	.24	.24	.25	.26	.37	.29	.39	.30	.20	.43
Reactive aggression	.36	.30	.36	.34	.41	.36	.41	.34	.12	.43
Behavioural conduct	-.42	-.39	-.45	-.42	-.54	-.44	-.29	-.33	-.46	-.53
Conduct problems	.40	.40	.41	.40	.53	.43	.40	.24	.50	.56
Hyperactivity	.27	.22	.38	.24	.40	.27	.14	.39	.13	.33
Prosocial behaviour	-.22	-.35	-.18	-.32	-.26	-.26	-.25	-.02	-.45	-.35
Coercive resource control	.48	.44	.26	.46	.34	.45	.43	.18	.32	.48
Substance abuse	.23	.26	.36	.26	.31	.26	.32	.30	.13	.42
Deviance tolerance	.47	.52	.47	.50	.52	.52	.35	.24	.30	.48
Unintentional incivility	.44	.39	.45	.43	.41	.45	.28	.27	.13	.35
Life history strategy	-.20	-.27	-.32	-.26	-.33	-.24	-.21	-.12	-.48	-.38
Spearman correlations										
School bullying	.24	.22	.25	.23	.25	.26	.40	.16	.20	.41
Cyber aggression	.26	.14	.26	.20	.22	.21	.41	.15	.08	.35
Proactive aggression	.33	.30	.31	.32	.36	.35	.36	.18	.38	.48
Theft	.35	.30	.38	.31	.36	.34	.42	.36	.25	.54
Vandalism	.29	.25	.24	.28	.21	.28	.35	.16	.33	.44
Violence	.31	.27	.27	.30	.24	.31	.37	.21	.22	.41
Total delinquency	.37	.34	.41	.35	.37	.36	.48	.37	.27	.58
Intentional incivility	.44	.44	.46	.43	.44	.43	.37	.20	.35	.46

Note. APSD = Antisocial Process Screening Device; IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; Narc = Narcissism; Imp = Impulsivity; CU = Callous-unemotional traits. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

Table 3-9*Female-Specific Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls*

	Power Proxies						APSD			
	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2	Total	Narc	Imp	CU	Total
Pearson correlations										
Physical aggression	.23	.21	.27	.23	.25	.23	.16	.31	.16	.29
Verbal aggression	.36	.36	.38	.35	.33	.36	.27	.31	.15	.34
Relational aggression	.41	.33	.33	.38	.28	.37	.39	.34	.23	.43
Anger	.50	.35	.36	.43	.32	.43	.43	.35	.28	.47
Hostility	.38	.24	.25	.29	.19	.30	.34	.21	.27	.37
Anger/hostility	.51	.35	.36	.42	.30	.42	.45	.33	.32	.49
Reactive aggression	.40	.30	.32	.36	.30	.36	.35	.33	.26	.44
Behavioural conduct	-.56	-.52	-.58	-.53	-.54	-.57	-.35	-.52	-.44	-.60
Conduct problems	.52	.46	.45	.48	.41	.49	.40	.41	.46	.57
Hyperactivity	.37	.27	.42	.33	.38	.35	.21	.46	.19	.39
Prosocial behaviour	-.31	-.39	-.25	-.36	-.32	-.35	-.22	-.23	-.37	-.36
Coercive resource control	.47	.42	.34	.45	.29	.43	.60	.26	.47	.59
Substance abuse	.32	.28	.35	.30	.31	.29	.08	.33	.06	.26
Deviance tolerance	.49	.51	.54	.49	.51	.53	.36	.37	.40	.53
Unintentional incivility	.41	.39	.48	.39	.43	.41	.29	.33	.34	.46
Life history strategy	-.36	-.45	-.40	-.39	-.39	-.42	-.27	-.25	-.48	-.42
Spearman correlations										
School bullying	.41	.32	.34	.38	.30	.39	.40	.25	.17	.37
Cyber aggression	.40	.32	.36	.37	.30	.37	.32	.30	.19	.37
Proactive aggression	.40	.30	.26	.36	.25	.35	.37	.32	.26	.43
Theft	.33	.34	.41	.34	.38	.37	.24	.28	.21	.35
Vandalism	.30	.31	.29	.29	.28	.32	.21	.18	.19	.27
Violence	.28	.35	.36	.29	.36	.34	.12	.15	.28	.26
Total delinquency	.36	.37	.44	.37	.42	.39	.18	.34	.21	.36
Intentional incivility	.36	.36	.31	.35	.28	.35	.39	.13	.33	.41

Note. APSD = Antisocial Process Screening Device; IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; Narc = Narcissism; Imp = Impulsivity; CU = Callous-unemotional traits. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

Table 3-10*General Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Discriminant Variables in Total Sample*

	Power Proxies						APSD			
	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2	Total	Narc	Imp	CU	Total
Pearson correlations										
Social competence	-.09	-.02	-.06	<i>-.12</i>	<i>-.13</i>	-.09	-.08	-.05	<i>-.29</i>	<i>-.17</i>
Athletic competence	-.08	.02	-.06	-.06	<i>-.13</i>	-.05	-.04	-.04	<i>-.21</i>	<i>-.13</i>
Romantic appeal	-.02	-.02	-.06	-.04	-.10	-.02	-.07	-.10	<i>-.14</i>	<i>-.13</i>
Pleasure sensitivity	<i>-.13</i>	<i>-.18</i>	<i>-.13</i>	<i>-.21</i>	-.09	<i>-.16</i>	-.09	-.04	<i>-.24</i>	<i>-.14</i>
Perceptual sensitivity	-.04	<i>-.14</i>	<i>-.14</i>	-.10	-.10	-.10	-.07	.00	<i>-.29</i>	<i>-.14</i>
Shyness	.05	.00	-.01	.04	.07	.02	.04	.01	<i>.14</i>	.08
Surgency	.06	<i>.14</i>	<i>.16</i>	.07	.09	.08	.07	<i>.11</i>	-.09	.08
Peer-valued characteristics	.08	.07	-.01	.04	-.04	.07	.08	-.06	<i>-.25</i>	-.08
Spearman correlation										
School victimization	.08	.01	.07	.04	.10	.05	<i>.18</i>	<i>.18</i>	<i>.12</i>	<i>.23</i>

Note. APSD = Antisocial Process Screening Device; IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; Narc = Narcissism; Imp = Impulsivity; CU = Callous-unemotional traits. Correlations are nonsignificant ($p \geq .05$) unless indicated in italics.

Table 3-11*Male-Specific Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Discriminant Variables in Boys*

	Power Proxies						APSD			
	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2	Total	Narc	Imp	CU	Total
Pearson correlations										
Social competence	-.13	-.15	.00	-.16	-.09	-.09	-.09	.04	-.36	-.18
Athletic competence	-.03	.01	.01	-.01	-.05	.00	-.01	.01	-.21	-.10
Romantic appeal	-.12	-.12	-.09	-.13	-.10	-.10	-.13	-.06	-.15	-.16
Pleasure sensitivity	-.10	-.15	-.06	-.15	-.05	-.13	-.11	.08	-.30	-.14
Perceptual sensitivity	.00	-.12	-.06	-.07	-.10	-.05	-.08	.06	-.36	-.17
Shyness	.04	.05	.01	.05	.10	.03	.08	.00	.22	.13
Surgency	.18	.18	.28	.18	.17	.19	.10	.11	-.08	.10
Peer-valued characteristics	.08	.03	.06	.04	.03	.10	.09	.03	-.27	-.05
Spearman correlation										
School victimization	-.01	-.06	.02	-.06	.04	-.05	.08	.08	.03	.11

Note. APSD = Antisocial Process Screening Device; IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; Narc = Narcissism; Imp = Impulsivity; CU = Callous-unemotional traits. Correlations are nonsignificant ($p \geq .05$) unless indicated in italics.

Table 3-12*Female-Specific Proxies' and APSD Scales' Correlations with Discriminant Variables in Girls*

	Power Proxies						APSD			
	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2	Total	Narc	Imp	CU	Total
Pearson correlations										
Social competence	<i>-.23</i>	<i>-.19</i>	<i>-.17</i>	<i>-.18</i>	<i>-.15</i>	<i>-.21</i>	<i>-.09</i>	<i>-.12</i>	<i>-.26</i>	<i>-.20</i>
Athletic competence	<i>-.15</i>	<i>-.04</i>	<i>-.12</i>	<i>-.05</i>	<i>-.06</i>	<i>-.09</i>	<i>-.05</i>	<i>-.07</i>	<i>-.20</i>	<i>-.13</i>
Romantic appeal	<i>-.05</i>	<i>-.07</i>	<i>-.05</i>	<i>-.02</i>	<i>-.04</i>	<i>-.07</i>	<i>-.07</i>	<i>-.13</i>	<i>-.16</i>	<i>-.14</i>
Pleasure sensitivity	<i>-.09</i>	<i>-.13</i>	<i>-.07</i>	<i>-.13</i>	<i>-.12</i>	<i>-.13</i>	<i>-.04</i>	<i>-.09</i>	<i>-.10</i>	<i>-.08</i>
Perceptual sensitivity	<i>.03</i>	<i>-.10</i>	<i>-.12</i>	<i>-.01</i>	<i>-.12</i>	<i>-.08</i>	<i>-.03</i>	<i>-.03</i>	<i>-.17</i>	<i>-.08</i>
Shyness	<i>.17</i>	<i>.11</i>	<i>-.02</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>-.03</i>	<i>.06</i>	<i>.03</i>	<i>.02</i>	<i>.11</i>	<i>.07</i>
Surgency	<i>.01</i>	<i>.14</i>	<i>.15</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.18</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.13</i>	<i>-.05</i>	<i>.10</i>
Peer-valued characteristics	<i>.00</i>	<i>-.02</i>	<i>-.04</i>	<i>.03</i>	<i>-.03</i>	<i>-.01</i>	<i>.09</i>	<i>-.11</i>	<i>-.20</i>	<i>-.07</i>
Spearman correlation										
School victimization	<i>.23</i>	<i>.18</i>	<i>.16</i>	<i>.19</i>	<i>.09</i>	<i>.18</i>	<i>.28</i>	<i>.25</i>	<i>.24</i>	<i>.36</i>

Note. APSD = Antisocial Process Screening Device; IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; Narc = Narcissism; Imp = Impulsivity; CU = Callous-unemotional traits. Correlations are nonsignificant ($p \geq .05$) unless indicated in italics.

References

- Andershed, H., Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Levander, S. (2002). Psychopathic traits in non-referred youths: A new assessment tool. In E. Blaauw & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Psychopaths: Current international perspectives* (pp. 131–158). Elsevier.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878>
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., Blais, J., Hosker-Field, A., Methot-Jones, T., Gauthier, N. Y., Volk, A., Holden, R. R., & D'Agata, M. T. (2016). Unpacking more “evil”: What is at the core of the dark tetrad? *Personality and Individual Differences, 90*, 269–272. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.009>
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., & Volk, A. A. (2015). Unpacking “evil”: Claiming the core of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 73*, 29–38. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.016>
- Brandt, J. R., Kennedy, W. A., Patrick, C. J., & Curtin, J. J. (1997). Assessment of psychopathy in a population of incarcerated adolescent offenders. *Psychological Assessment, 9*, 429–435. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.9.4.429>
- Bryant, F. B., & Smith, B. D. (2001). Refining the architecture of aggression: A measurement model for the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*, 138–167. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.2000.2302>
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 452–459. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.3.452>
- Campbell, M. A., Porter, S., & Santor, D. (2004). Psychopathic traits in adolescent

- offenders: An evaluation of criminal history, clinical, and psychosocial correlates. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 22, 23–47. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.572>
- Capaldi, D. M., & Rothbart, M. K. (1992). Development and validation of an early adolescent temperament measure. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 12, 153–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431692012002002>
- Caputo, A. A., Frick, P. J., & Brodsky, S. L. (1999). Family violence and juvenile sex offending: The potential role of psychopathic traits and negative attitudes toward women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26, 338–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854899026003004>
- Decuyper, M., De Pauw, S., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., & De Clercq, B. J. (2009). A meta-analysis of psychopathy-, antisocial PD- and FFM associations. *European Journal of Personality*, 23, 531–565. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.729>
- Despoti, G., Kokkinos, C. M., & Fanti, K. A. (2021). Bullying, victimization, and psychopathy in early adolescents: The moderating role of social support. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 18, 747–764. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2020.1858787>
- Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1987). Social-information-processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1146–1158. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1146>
- Edens, J. F., Campbell, J. S., Weir, J. M. (2006). Youth psychopathy and criminal recidivism: A meta-analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist measures. *Law and Human Behavior*, 31, 53–75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9019-y>
- Ellis, L. K., & Rothbart, M. K. (2001). *Revision of the early adolescent temperament*

- questionnaire*. [Poster presentation]. Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Fanti, K. A., & Kimonis, E. R. (2013). Dimensions of juvenile psychopathy distinguish “bullies,” “bully-victims,” and “victims”. *Psychology of Violence, 3*, 396–409. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033951>
- Farrell, A. H., Provenzano, D. A., Spadafora, N., Marini, Z. A., & Volk, A. A. (2015). Measuring adolescent attitudes toward classroom incivility: Exploring differences between intentional and unintentional incivility. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 34*, 577–588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282915623446>
- Figueredo, A. J., Vásquez, G., Brumbach, B. H., Schneider, S. M. R., Sefcek, J. A., Tal, I., Hill, D., Wenner, C. J., & Jacobs, W. J. (2006). Consilience and Life History Theory: From genes to brain to reproductive strategy. *Developmental Review, 26*, 243–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2006.02.002>
- Forth, A. E., Kosson, D., & Hare, R. (2003). *Manual for the Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Frick, P. J. (2004). *The Inventory of Callous-Unemotional Traits* [Unpublished rating scale].
- Frick, P., & Hare, R. D. (2001). *Manual for the Antisocial Process Screening Device*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Gilbert, P. (2000). Varieties of submissive behavior as forms of social defense: Their evolution and role in depression. In L. Sloman & P. Gilbert (Eds.), *Subordination and defeat: An evolutionary approach to mood disorders and their therapy* (pp. 3–45). Erlbaum.

- Gilbert, P., Price, J., & Allan, S. (1995). Social comparison, social attractiveness and evolution: How might they be related? *New Ideas in Psychology, 13*, 149–165.
[http://doi.org/10.1016/0732-118X\(95\)00002-X](http://doi.org/10.1016/0732-118X(95)00002-X)
- Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 38*, 581-586.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01545.x>
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Manual for the Revised Psychopathy Checklist* (2nd ed.). Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2008). Psychopathy as a clinical and empirical construct. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 4*, 217–246.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091452>
- Harter, S. (1988). *Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents*. University of Denver.
- Hawley, P. H. (2003). Prosocial and coercive configurations of resource control in early adolescence: A case for the well-adapted Machiavellian. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 49*, 279–309. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2003.0013>
- Hawley, P. H., Little, T. D., & Card N. A. (2007). The allure of a mean friend: Relationship quality and processes of aggressive adolescents with prosocial skills. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 170–180.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025407074630>
- Hawley, P. H., Little, T. D., & Card N. A. (2008). The myth of the alpha male: A new

look at dominance-related beliefs and behaviors among adolescent males and females. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 32, 76–88.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025407084054>

Hodson, G., Book, A., Visser, B. A., Volk, A. A., Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2018). Is the Dark Triad common factor distinct from low Honesty-Humility? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 73, 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.012>

Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. L. (1977). *Problem behavior and psychosocial development: A longitudinal study of youth*. Academic Press.

Jessor, R., Van Den Bos, J., Vanderryn, J., Costa, F. M., & Turbin, M. S. (1995). Protective factors in adolescent problem behavior: Moderator effects and developmental change. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 923–933.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.31.6.923>

Knack, J. M., Tsar, V., Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2012). What protects rejected adolescents from also being bullied by their peers? The moderating role of peer-valued characteristics. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 22, 467–479. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2012.00792.x>

Kosson, D. S., Neumann, C. S., Forth, A. E., Salekin, R. T., Hare, R. D., Krischer, M. K., & Sevecke, K. (2013). Factor structure of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL:YV) in adolescent females. *Psychological Assessment*, 25, 71–83.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028986>

Lapierre, K. R., & Dane, A. V. (2019). Cyberbullying, cyber aggression, and cyber

victimization in relation to adolescents' dating and sexual behavior: An evolutionary perspective. *Aggressive Behavior*, 46, 49–59.

<http://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21864>

LeBlanc, M., & Fréchette, M. (1989). *Male criminal activity from childhood through youth: Multilevel and developmental perspectives*. Springer-Verlag.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 2–5.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.048>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100.

Assessment, 25, 543–556. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116659134>

Lee, I. A., & Preacher, K. J. (2013). *Calculation for the test of the difference between two dependent correlations with one variable in common* [Computer software].

<http://quantpsy.org/corrttest/corrttest2.htm>

Leistico, A. R., Salekin, R. T., DeCoster, J., & Rogers, R. (2008). A large-scale meta-analysis relating the Hare measures of psychopathy to antisocial conduct. *Law and Human Behavior*, 32, 28–45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-007-9096-6>

Lynam, D. R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Raine, A., Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (2005). Adolescent psychopathy and the Big Five: Results from two samples. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33, 431–443.

<http://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-005-5724-0>

Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2015). Psychopathy from a basic trait perspective: The utility of a Five-Factor Model approach. *Journal of Personality*, 83, 611–626.

<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12132>

- Međedović, J. (2017). Can HEXACO-PI-R adequately represent the four-factor model of psychopathy? *Psihologijske Teme*, *26*, 557–576. <http://doi.org/10.31820/pt.26.3.4>.
- Miller, J., Lynam, D., Widiger, T., & Leukefeld, C. (2001). Personality disorders as extreme variants of common personality dimensions: Can the Five-Factor Model adequately represent psychopathy? *Journal of Personality*, *69*, 253–276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00144>
- Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the Dark Triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 183–204. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616666070>
- Murrie, D. C., Cornell, D. G., Kaplan, S., McConville, D., & Levy-Elkon, A. (2004). Psychopathy scores and violence among juvenile offenders: A multi-measure study. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *22*, 49–67. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.573>
- Myers, L., & Sirois, M. J. (2006). Spearman correlation coefficients, differences between. In S. Kotz, N. Balakrishnan, C. B. Read, & B. Vidakovic (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of statistical sciences* (pp. 7901–7903). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471667196.ess5050.pub2>
- Neumann, C. S., Kosson, D. S., Forth, A. E., & Hare, R. D. (2006). Factor structure of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL:YV) in incarcerated adolescents. *Psychological Assessment*, *18*, 142–154. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.142>
- O’Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A

meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the Dark Triad and Five-Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Personality*, *83*, 644–664.

<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12126>

Patrick, C. (2010). Operationalizing the Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Preliminary description of brief scales for assessment of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition [Unpublished manual]. Florida State University.

Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2016). *Manual for the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Fourth Edition*. Multi-Health Systems.

Provenzano, D. A., Dane, A. V., Farrell, A. H., Marini, Z. A., & Volk, A. A. (2018). Do bullies have more sex? The role of personality. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, *4*, 221–232. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-017-0126-4>

Ruchensky, J. R., Donnellan, M. B., & Edens, J. F. (2018). Development and initial validation of the HEXACO-Triarchic scales. *Psychological Assessment*, *30*, 1560–1566. <http://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000609>

Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2006). Aggression and social status: The moderating roles of sex and peer-valued characteristics. *Aggressive Behavior*, *32*, 396–408. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20138>

Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying is power: Implications for school-based intervention strategies. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, *19*, 157–176. https://doi.org/10.1300/J008v19n02_10

Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., Collison, K. L., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Differences among

Dark Triad components: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 9, 101–111.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/per0000222>

Volk, A. A., & Lagzdins, L. (2009). Bullying and victimization among adolescent girl athletes. *Athletic Insight*, 11, 13–31.

Widiger, T. A., & Lynam, D. R. (1998). Psychopathy and the Five-Factor Model of personality. In T. Millon, E. Simonsen, M. Birket-Smith, & R. D. Davis (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal, and violent behavior* (pp. 171–187). Guilford Press.

Zar, J. H. (2005). Spearman rank correlation. In P. Armitage & T. Colton (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of biostatistics* (pp. 4191–4196). Wiley.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/0470011815.b2a15150>

CHAPTER FOUR

Incorporating HEXACO-100 Items Into the Power Proxies of Psychopathic Traits

Although the construct of psychopathy receives a great deal of attention within the field of abnormal psychology, research suggests that psychopathic traits are associated with basic (i.e., “normal”) personality traits. For example, psychopathic personality has been found to significantly overlap with the well-established Big Five model of personality, especially Big Five Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (e.g., Decuyper et al., 2009; Lynam & Miller, 2015; Miller et al., 2001; Muris et al., 2017; O’Boyle et al., 2015; Vize et al., 2018; Widiger & Lynam, 1998). However, the HEXACO model of personality, which restructures some of the Big Five domains and adds a sixth domain, has demonstrated a particularly high degree of overlap with psychopathic traits.

The HEXACO’s theoretical and empirical relevance to the construct of psychopathy has inspired some researchers to attempt to measure psychopathic traits using items originally designed to assess HEXACO traits. While some of these proxy measures use items derived from the 100-item version of the HEXACO Personality Inventory (HEXACO-100; Lee & Ashton, 2018), the Power Proxies (Power et al., under review) use the 60-item version (HEXACO-60; Ashton & Lee, 2009). While it is true that the shorter HEXACO-60 is frequently used in research, especially when studies include several other measures, the HEXACO-100 is often used as well. Thus, the general goal of the present study is to incorporate items from the HEXACO-100 into the Power Proxies of psychopathic traits.

Using the HEXACO to Measure Psychopathy

The HEXACO model of personality is a personality structure that encompasses both “normal” and “dark” personality variance (Lee & Ashton, 2014). Its prominent inclusion of “dark” personality variance, largely through its signature Honesty-Humility domain, sets it apart from other models of basic personality. Accordingly, the HEXACO model of personality strongly overlaps with psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism (i.e., the Dark Triad; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Not only does Honesty-Humility explain a substantial proportion of the variance shared between the Dark Triad components (Book et al., 2015; Hodson et al., 2018), but other HEXACO domains have been found to be associated with the components’ individual non-shared variances. For instance, while psychopathy, arguably the “darkest” construct of the trio, is evidently associated with (low) Honesty-Humility, it also seems to be associated with (low) Emotionality, (low) Conscientiousness, and (low) Agreeableness (Lee et al., 2013).

Because psychopathy exists on a continuum (Hare & Neumann, 2008) and psychopathic traits clearly overlap with the personality space captured by the HEXACO, researchers have created proxy measures of psychopathy using HEXACO items. Ruchensky et al. (2018) created the HEXACO-Triarchic scales, which measure the three dimensions of the Triarchic Model of psychopathy (i.e., boldness, meanness, and disinhibition; Patrick, 2010) using items from the HEXACO-100. Moreover, Međedović (2017) used items from the HEXACO-100 to create proxies for the facets of Hare’s model of psychopathy (i.e., interpersonal manipulation, callous affect, erratic lifestyle, and antisocial behaviour) as measured by the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP; Paulhus et al., 2016), though he was unsuccessful in creating a proxy for antisocial behaviour.

The Power Proxies

Similar to Međedović (2017), we constructed HEXACO proxies for Hare's model of psychopathy (Power et al., under review), though we only used items from the HEXACO-60. However, in addition to the SRP facets, we constructed proxies for Factor 1 (Interpersonal/Affective), Factor 2 (Lifestyle/Antisocial), and total psychopathy score.

The Power Proxies were also the first to account for sex differences in how psychopathy relates to the HEXACO items. It has been proposed that men and women may differ in the expression of psychopathic traits (e.g., Forouzan & Cooke, 2005; Kreis & Cooke, 2012; Nicholls & Petrila, 2005; Wynn et al., 2012), the relative importance of certain prototypical psychopathic traits (e.g., Grann, 2000; Strand & Belfrage, 2005), and the overall structure of psychopathy (e.g., Jackson et al., 2002; Salekin et al., 1997). Accordingly, we decided to investigate whether men and women differ in which HEXACO items best capture the SRP scales by examining the correlations between the measures separately for each sex. We found that while there were several items that met the cutoff for inclusion on the proxy scales in both sexes, there were also several differences in how the HEXACO items mapped onto the various scales. As a result, we constructed "general" proxies that only included the items on each scale that met the cutoff in both men and women, along with male- and female-specific proxies that added items to the scales for which they met the cutoff in one sex but not the other (Power et al., under review).

Upon examining the item pools for the general, male-specific, and female-specific proxies, we noticed that many items met the cutoff for multiple facets; there were also items that met the cutoff for both factors (Power et al., under review). This overlap was

most prevalent in the female-specific item pool, but was also present in the general and male-specific item pools. In order to maximize the number of relevant items on each scale, we decided to allow items to be included on all proxy scales for which they met the cutoff. This decision was largely driven by the observation that there were Honesty Humility items on every scale and most of these items met the cutoff for multiple scales (Power et al., under review). Thus, considering the theoretical and empirical importance of the Honesty-Humility domain to psychopathy as a whole, we did not want to remove these items from any scale. That said, we did create alternative “non-overlapping” versions of the proxies where each HEXACO item was only included on the proxy for the facet/factor that it was most strongly correlated with. However, the interpersonal manipulation facet and Factor 1 monopolized the Honesty-Humility items, leading to the non-overlapping versions of the remaining scales losing virtually all of the “dark” personality variance believed to be crucial to the construct of psychopathy. Consequently, we consider the proxies that allow overlapping items to be superior in their ability to capture the SRP scales, though we acknowledge that the correlations between these proxies are undoubtedly inflated.

In addition to creating proxies for SRP psychopathy, we used the HEXACO items to identify potentially meaningful sex differences in how psychopathy is expressed by examining the magnitudes of the differences between men and women in the correlations between the proxy items and the SRP scales (Power et al., under review).

The Present Study

Because the original Power Proxies were created using the HEXACO-60, the goal of the present study was to update each version of the proxies to include HEXACO-100

items. Although the HEXACO-60 proxies already demonstrated good psychometric properties and strong correlations with several psychopathy-relevant variables, adding these extra items will allow researchers to take full advantage of whichever version of the HEXACO Personality Inventory is included in their datasets. Relatedly, we originally used the HEXACO-60 items to help identify practical sex differences in how psychopathy relates to basic personality traits. Thus, examining the relations between the SRP and 40 new HEXACO items in men and women will allow us to expand on our previous findings pertaining to practically significant sex differences in how psychopathy is expressed.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) and were paid \$3 USD upon completion of the study. The initial sample consisted of 951 participants, but many were excluded based on failing an attention check or completing the study in what was deemed an unrealistic amount of time (i.e., less than 15 minutes). A variable was then calculated in the remaining participants to detect additional poor responding behaviour. This variable was the sum of all the raw item ratings on the two key measures described below. We justified the exclusion of participants with extreme scores on this variable because both measures contain multiple scales as well as reverse-scored items. Thus, it would be highly improbable for any participant to almost exclusively provide ratings of either 1 or 5 across all 264 items if they were paying attention and/or responding truthfully. The final sample consisted of 471 participants from the United States (246 women, 225 men) and ranged from 19 to 74 years of age ($M = 40.26$, $SD = 12.38$). The sample was predominantly White (77.4%)

Measures

Note that the means and standard deviations of the study variables can be found in Appendix A (Table A4-1).

Key Variables

Psychopathy. Psychopathy was measured using the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Fourth Edition (SRP:4; Paulhus et al., 2016), which consists of 64 statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). The scale measures four facets of psychopathy: interpersonal

manipulation (IPM; e.g., “I purposely flatter people to get them on my side,” $\alpha = .87$), callous affect (CA; e.g., “I’m more tough-minded than other people,” $\alpha = .84$), erratic lifestyle (ELS; e.g., “I’m a rebellious person,” $\alpha = .82$), and antisocial behaviour (ASB; e.g., “I was convicted of a serious crime,” $\alpha = .85$). The interpersonal manipulation and callous affect facets can be combined to capture Hare’s Factor 1 ($\alpha = .91$), and the erratic lifestyle and antisocial behaviour facets can be combined to capture Hare’s Factor 2 ($\alpha = .89$). Total psychopathy score can also be calculated ($\alpha = .94$).

HEXACO Personality Traits. The HEXACO model of personality was measured using the 200-item version of the HEXACO Personality Inventory-Revised (HEXACO-200; Lee & Ashton, 2004), though only the items that are included in the 100-item version (HEXACO-100; Lee & Ashton, 2018) were utilized for the purpose of this study. Each version of the HEXACO consists of statements to which participants rate their agreement on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) and measures six domains of normal personality: Honesty-Humility (e.g., “I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed”), Emotionality (e.g., “I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions”), Extraversion (e.g., “I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone”), Agreeableness (e.g., “I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me”), Conscientiousness (e.g., “I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute”), and Openness to Experience (e.g., “I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries”). Note that scores on these domains were not calculated in the present study as our focus is on how the individual HEXACO items, not the domains, relate to psychopathy.

Additional Variables

Aggression. Overt reactive and proactive aggression were measured using the Reactive-Proactive Aggression Questionnaire (RPQ; Raine et al., 2006), which consists of items that describe various aggressive behaviours. Participants indicate how often they engage in each behaviour on a 3-point scale from 0 (*never*) to 2 (*often*). The scale measures overt reactive aggression through 11 items (e.g., “How often have you yelled at others when they have annoyed you?” $\alpha = .86$) and overt proactive aggression through 12 items (e.g., “How often have you had fights with others to show who was on top?” $\alpha = .88$).

Relational reactive and proactive aggression, as well as relational aggression in romantic relationships, were measured using Murray-Close et al.’s (2010) version of the Self-Report of Aggression and Social Behavior Measure (SRASBM; Morales & Crick, 1998). Each subscale consists of statements and participants indicate how often each statement is true for them on a 5-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). Peer-directed reactive relational aggression is measured through five items (e.g., “When I am not invited to do something with a group of people, I will exclude those people from future activities,” $\alpha = .83$), peer-directed proactive relational aggression through four items (e.g., “I have intentionally ignored a person until they gave me my way about something,” $\alpha = .84$), and relational aggression in romantic relationships through five items (e.g., “I have tried to make my romantic partner jealous when mad at him/her,” $\alpha = .75$).

Workplace Deviance. Interpersonal and organizational workplace deviance were measured using the Workplace Deviance Questionnaire (WDQ; Bennett & Robinson,

2000). Each subscale consists of various deviant workplace behaviours and participants indicate how often they engage in each behaviour on a 7-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*daily*). Interpersonal deviance is measured through seven items (e.g., “Said something hurtful to someone at work,” $\alpha = .86$) and organizational deviance is measured through 12 items (e.g., “Taken property from work without permission,” $\alpha = .87$).

Antisocial Behaviour. Lifetime prevalence of antisocial behaviour was measured using a list of various antisocial behaviours adapted from Alegria et al. (2013). The list consisted of 32 behaviours and participants indicated whether or not they had ever engaged in each behaviour by selecting either *no* or *yes*. The behaviours were separated into four categories in order to measure the prevalence of different types of antisocial behaviours. Illegal behaviour was measured through nine items (e.g., “Stole something from another person,” $\alpha = .78$), violent behaviour through seven items (e.g., “Physically hurt someone on purpose,” $\alpha = .73$), irresponsible/reckless behaviour through 12 items (e.g., “Did things that could have easily hurt you and/or others,” $\alpha = .77$), and deceptive behaviour through four items (e.g., “Used a false or made-up name/alias,” $\alpha = .57$). An overall antisocial behaviour score was also calculated ($\alpha = .90$).

Data Analysis and Results

Updating Proxy Scales

Selecting New Items

In order to determine which items could be added to the proxies, we first identified the 40 HEXACO-100 items that are not included in the HEXACO-60. We then used the procedure outlined in Power et al. (under review) to determine which of these new items to add to each proxy scale. That is, we examined the bivariate correlations between the 40 new items and each of the SRP scales and identified the ones that met the correlation cutoff of $\pm.25$. In line with Power et al. (under review), we examined the correlations separately for men and women in order to develop general, male-specific, and female-specific item pools. As there are two versions of the original HEXACO-60 proxies (i.e., ones that allow overlapping items between scales and ones that do not), we decided to create HEXACO-100 versions of both. Thus, to update the overlapping proxies, we added the new items to all proxy scales for which they met the cutoff. To update the non-overlapping proxies, we assigned the new items that met multiple cutoffs to only the facet and/or factor scale it was most strongly correlated with. Note that we focus on the updated overlapping proxies here; information pertaining to the updated non-overlapping proxies can be found in Appendix A (Tables A4-2–A4-7). Additionally, the proportion of original HEXACO-60 items that met the $\pm.25$ cutoff for the various proxy scales in the present study can be found in Table 4-1.

Evaluating Construct Validity

In addition to the HEXACO and the SRP, a selection of psychopathy-relevant variables (e.g., aggression, antisocial behaviours) were included in the study. If the Power

Proxies are in fact measuring psychopathic traits, they should demonstrate the ability to relate to these types of variables. Thus, the proxy scales were correlated with the variables as a way to evaluate their performance. Of note, Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was used in most cases, but Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used for three variables that violated the parametric assumption of normality. As was the case in Power et al. (under review), several batches of correlation comparisons were completed using Lee and Preacher's (2013) calculator, which tests the difference between two dependent correlations with one variable in common. We first compared the correlations between the updated (HEXACO-100) proxies and the variables to the correlations between the original (HEXACO-60) proxies and the variables to determine whether adding the new items improved the performances of the proxies. We then compared the correlations between the updated sex-specific proxies and the variables to the correlations between the updated general proxies and the variables. These comparisons were conducted in order to determine whether the male- and/or female-specific proxies still had any incremental ability over the general proxies to be related to other variables once the new HEXACO-100 items were added. Finally, we compared the correlations between our updated proxies and the variables with the correlations between Međedović's proxies and the variables. It was important to conduct these comparisons as Međedović's full HEXACO-100 proxies could not be calculated in the original study.

The raw differences between the pairs of correlations were also taken into consideration when interpreting the overall results in order to account for the different sample sizes and correlations between compared scales. For all correlation comparisons, we operationalized a meaningful difference as any that a) was statistically significant at p

< .05, and/or b) had a raw difference of at least .05 (i.e., half a small effect size; Cohen, 1988).

General Proxies

Table 4-2 provides a breakdown of the new HEXACO-100 items that were added to the general proxy scales along with the psychometric properties of the updated proxies. Excluding ASB, convergent correlations between proxies and their corresponding SRP scales ranged from .72 to .83 and Cronbach's alphas ranged from .82 to .89.

Each of the updated (HEXACO-100) general proxies demonstrated notable improvements over the respective original (HEXACO-60) general proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables (Table 4-3). Note that the raw differences, *z*-scores, and exact *p*-values for all correlation comparisons can be found in Appendix A (Tables A4-8–A4-49).

The updated IPM and CA general proxies demonstrated marked improvements over Međedović's respective proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables, with the improvement of the CA proxy being especially noticeable. There were no statistically significant or practically significant differences between the performances of the ELS proxies (Table 4-4).

Male-Specific Proxies

Table 4-5 provides a breakdown of the new HEXACO-100 items that were added to the male-specific proxy scales along with the psychometric properties of the updated proxies. Excluding ASB, convergent correlations between proxies and their corresponding SRP scales ranged from .68 to .78 and Cronbach's alphas ranged from .78 to .86.

Each of the updated (HEXACO-100) male-specific proxies demonstrated marked improvements over the respective original (HEXACO-60) male-specific proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables (Table 4-6).

The updated male-specific proxies demonstrated some improvements over the respective updated general proxies in their correlations with relevant variables, especially in the cases of ASB and ELS. However, the results of some scales (CA, F2) were relatively ambiguous in terms of deciding which performed better overall (Table 4-7).

While the updated male-specific ELS proxy performed similarly to Međedović's ELS proxy in its correlations with relevant variables, the updated male-specific IPM and CA proxies demonstrated considerable improvements over Međedović's IPM and CA proxies (Table 4-8).

Female-Specific Proxies

Table 4-9 provides a breakdown of the new HEXACO-100 items that were added to the female-specific proxy scales along with the psychometric properties of the updated proxies. Excluding ASB, convergent correlations between proxies and their corresponding SRP scales ranged from .70 to .82 and Cronbach's alphas ranged from .85 to .91.

The updated (HEXACO-100) female-specific ELS, ASB, and F2 proxies demonstrated notable improvements over the respective original (HEXACO-60) female-specific proxies in terms of their correlations with relevant variables. The performances of the other updated scales were relatively similar to that of the respective original scales (Table 4-10).

The updated female-specific CA proxy demonstrated some improvements over the updated general CA proxy in its correlations with relevant variables. However, the remaining female-specific proxies performed similarly to the respective general proxies (Table 4-11).

Each of the updated female-specific proxies demonstrated improvements over Međedović's respective proxies in their correlations with relevant variables, with the most considerable improvement being for CA (Table 4-12).

Proxies vs. SRP

As the proxies are not perfectly correlated with their respective SRP scales, we would not expect the associations between the proxies and the psychopathy-relevant variables to correspond exactly to the associations between the SRP scales and the variables. However, the updated proxies did correlate strongly with these variables, and they tended to correlate with the variables in an overall manner similar to that of the SRP (Tables 4-13–4-15).

Sex Differences in Correlations

The correlations between the HEXACO items and the various SRP scales were compared between men and women in order to identify potentially meaningful sex differences in how the HEXACO items relate to psychopathy. For any given psychopathy scale, we only compared items that were included on a proxy for that scale. Table 4-16 summarizes these sex differences. Though the table shows the correlations that differed by at least .05 between men and women, our focus is on the correlations that differed by at least .10 (i.e., a small effect; Cohen, 1988). The actual correlations for these items can be found in Appendix A (see Tables A4-50–A4-56).

One Honesty-Humility item, one Emotionality item, one Conscientiousness item, one Openness item, and one altruism item were more strongly correlated (by a magnitude of .10 or greater) with at least one SRP scale in men compared to women. By contrast, three Honesty-Humility items, one Emotionality item, one Extraversion item, two Agreeableness items, three Conscientiousness items, three Openness items, and two altruism items were more strongly correlated (by a magnitude of .10 or greater) with at least one SRP scale in women compared to men.

Additionally, there were two Honesty-Humility items, two Emotionality items, one Extraversion item, one Openness item, and one altruism item that were more strongly correlated (by a magnitude of at least .05, but less than .10) with at least one SRP scale in men. There was also one Extraversion item and two Agreeableness items that were more strongly correlated (by a magnitude of at least .05, but less than .10) with at least one SRP scale in women.

Discussion

The present study had two objectives: 1) to create updated versions of the Power Proxies that incorporate HEXACO-100 items, and 2) to identify potentially meaningful sex differences in how these new items relate to psychopathy by examining the magnitudes of the differences in the corresponding HEXACO-SRP correlations between men and women.

Objective 1: Updating the Power Proxies with HEXACO-100 Items

Several new HEXACO-100 items met the cutoff to be included on the various scales of the Power Proxies. Similar to what was previously found with the HEXACO-60 (Power et al., under review), Honesty-Humility was important to psychopathy as a whole. That is, in addition to Honesty-Humility items being included on the proxies for total psychopathy, they were often included on multiple facets/factors. The interstitial altruism facet, which is not included in the HEXACO-60, also appears to have an overarching role in capturing the psychopathy scales. This facet assesses an individual's tendency to be sympathetic and to have an overall prosocial orientation (Ashton & Lee, 2007). As these traits are conceptually at odds with prototypical psychopathic traits, it is unsurprising that altruism negatively correlates with psychopathy. In fact, all four altruism items were included on the general, male-specific, and female-specific proxies for total psychopathy score as well as multiple facets/factors. Thus, when using only the items in the HEXACO-60, Honesty-Humility seems to make up much of the core of the SRP; however, when using the HEXACO-100 items, both Honesty-Humility and altruism seem to underlie the scales. The altruism facet also largely facilitated the creation of general and male-specific ASB proxies, as all four altruism items, along with a small selection of

additional HEXACO-100 items (mostly from the Honesty-Humility domain) met the cutoff for ASB in men. Thus, while these ASB proxies could not previously be created using the HEXACO-60, they were able to be created in the present study using the HEXACO-100. However, all versions of the ASB proxies had the smallest number of items and least favourable psychometric properties. Therefore, they do not seem to capture the ASB scale of the SRP to the same extent that the other proxies capture their respective SRP scales.

In the original study, there was a degree of overlap in which SRP scales the HEXACO-60 items met the cutoff for, though the overlap was less prominent in men. However, the new HEXACO-100 items overlapped more in men than was the case in Power et al. (under review), which resulted in somewhat more overlap in the general and male-specific item pools for the new items than what was previously found for the original items. However, the proxy scales still had their own distinct combinations of new items that differentiated them from each other (e.g., Emotionality items being especially relevant to CA). Interestingly, there was a small number of Extraversion and Openness items in the present study that met the cutoff for both men and women, which differed from Power et al. (under review) where Extraversion items only met the cutoff for women and Openness items did not meet the cutoff for either sex. That said, these two domains contributed the fewest number of items overall and do not seem to be overly important to capturing SRP psychopathy.

After updating the Power Proxies to incorporate items from the HEXACO-100, several batches of correlation comparisons were completed in order to examine how these versions performed in terms of their relationships with a number of psychopathy-relevant

variables. Compared to the HEXACO-60 proxies, each set of HEXACO-100 proxies as a whole was more strongly related to several variables. This was expected, as the number of items on each updated proxy scale is roughly twice that of its original counterpart. As a result, the updated proxies are likely able to explain a greater amount of variance in the SRP scales. This is supported by the convergent correlations of the updated proxies, which are all larger than the convergent correlations of the original proxies (Power et al., under review). Thus, by incorporating the additional HEXACO-100 items that met the inclusion criteria, the proxies seem to better capture the SRP scales.

Neither set of the updated sex-specific proxies offered much of an improvement over the updated general proxies in their associations with relevant variables. This contrasts the original HEXACO-60 proxy findings, where the sex-specific proxies, particularly the female-specific, demonstrated improvements over the general proxies (Power et al., under review). This previous finding indicated that the original general proxies did not maximize the variance in the SRP scales that could be accounted for by the HEXACO. Thus, adding more items to each scale (by creating sex-specific proxies) increased the proportion of variance they shared with the SRP scales, which resulted in improved psychometric properties and associations with relevant variables. The updated sex-specific proxies' relative lack of improvement over the updated general proxies in the present study can be conceivably explained by the number of items already added to the general proxies. Each of the updated general proxy scales contain, at minimum, double the items of the original general proxy scales. They also contain more items than the original sex-specific proxies, implying that the updated general proxies may already be able to explain variance in the SRP scales that cannot be explained by any of the original

(i.e., general or sex-specific) proxies. However, there is a limit to how many items that can be added to a scale in order to account for additional variance in the construct it aims to capture. In theory, scales with many items should account for more variance in the construct than scales with few items and, in turn, longer scales should be more limited in how much incremental variance new items would be able to explain. In other words, the scales with the fewest number of items likely have the most room to improve, but there becomes less room to improve as more items are added. Thus, considering how many HEXACO items were already added to the general proxies, we could not explain much additional variance in the SRP scales by simply adding even more (i.e., creating updated sex-specific proxies). This idea is further supported when considering the performance of the updated set of female-specific proxies compared to the performance of the original set of female-specific proxies. As mentioned above, all updated sets performed better than the original sets overall. However, the original female-specific proxies contained more items than the original general or male-specific proxies, and the original female-specific scales that contained the most items (i.e., IPM, CA, F1, total) improved the least through adding more items.

As a whole, the updated proxies were more strongly associated with relevant variables than were Međedović's proxies. Specifically, the IPM and CA proxies demonstrated significant improvements. In terms of CA, our general and sex-specific proxies include six to eight Honesty-Humility items, whereas Međedović's proxy does not include any. As Honesty-Humility accounts for such a large proportion of the shared Dark Triad variance (Book et al., 2015; Hodson et al., 2018), and has been found to be particularly important to capturing all of the facets of psychopathy, it is not surprising

that our CA proxies outperformed Međedović's in their relations with external variables; this was also the case with the HEXACO-60 proxies (Power et al., under review). In terms of IPM, our general and both sex-specific proxies include all four items from the interstitial altruism facet scale, whereas Međedović's proxy does not include any. Similar to the overarching role that Honesty-Humility has in capturing the various SRP scales, the present findings indicate that altruism also appears to be extremely relevant to psychopathy as a whole. Thus, the additional variance accounted for by the altruism items is likely the driving force behind our IPM proxies' stronger correlations with relevant variables. It should be noted that Međedović did include several Honesty-Humility items and the four altruism items in his proxies. However, because items were not included on multiple scales, the Honesty-Humility items were mostly constrained to the IPM proxy whereas the altruism items were mostly constrained to the CA proxy. Thus, as previously suggested with the original HEXACO-60 proxies (Power et al., under review), it seems that allowing overlapping items between scales significantly improves the HEXACO's ability to capture the SRP. This is not to say that our facet proxies should always be preferred over Međedović's; it would be perfectly reasonable to use Međedović's proxies if one's priorities for the scales more closely align with his than with ours (i.e., if one places a higher value on scale independence than we did).

Objective 2: Practical Sex Differences

In order to uncover potential sex differences in the manifestation of psychopathy, it was pertinent to examine the items that differentially related to the SRP between men and women. As we did not expect the HEXACO-SRP relations to differ drastically

between the sexes, we decided to identify and comment on the differences of at least .10 in magnitude (i.e., a small effect; Cohen, 1988).

Stronger Relationships in Men

Five items were more strongly related to at least one SRP scale in men compared to women. In men, psychopathy was more strongly related to believing oneself to be better than others (low Honesty-Humility; CA), not wanting to share one's worries/concerns with another person (low Emotionality; CA), quitting on goals before reaching them (low Conscientiousness; ASB), not wanting a job that requires a routine rather than being creative (high Openness; ELS, F2, total), and being seen as a hard-hearted person (low altruism; ASB). It should be noted that the specific content of the items seems to be more important than where they came from, as none came from the same HEXACO scale.

Most of the items that were more strongly related to the psychopathy scales in men also tended to have higher ratings in the corresponding direction in men. For example, not only was "I am an ordinary person who is no better than others" more strongly negatively related to psychopathy in men, which aligns with previous findings that psychopathic men tend to be more grandiose than psychopathic women (Forouzan & Cooke, 2005; Kreis & Cooke, 2012), but men scored lower on this item overall. Further, "People see me as a hard-hearted person" was more positively related to psychopathy in men and men also scored higher on this item overall. Thus, it seems that these traits are already more strongly exhibited in the average man compared to the average woman to an extent, but they are even more pronounced in men with high psychopathy scores. The only trait identified as having a stronger association with psychopathy in men that did not

differ much between men and women in average ratings was not wanting a job that requires a routine rather than being creative. In the context of psychopathy, this item is more likely capturing a desire to not follow a routine rather than a desire to be creative, as a key feature of psychopathy is proneness to boredom or a need for stimulation (Hare, 2003).

Stronger Relationships in Women

Many items were more strongly related to at least one SRP scale in women compared to men. These items came from all six HEXACO domains plus the interstitial altruism facet, so no specific scales stood out as particularly more relevant in women. Therefore, as was the case with the items that were more strongly related to psychopathy in men, it is important to examine the specific content of the items rather than focus on which scales they came from.

When the HEXACO items were scored in the direction indicative of psychopathic traits (i.e., higher ratings associated with higher SRP scores), several of the items that were more strongly related to psychopathy in women had notably lower average ratings in women overall. These items included being tempted to buy stolen property (low Honesty-Humility; IPM, ELS, F1, F2, total), wanting to live in a high-class neighborhood (low Honesty-Humility; IPM), not minding jobs that involve doing dangerous work (low Emotionality; ELS, F2), not cleaning one's office or home frequently (low Conscientiousness; ELS, F2, total), not willing to spend time reading poetry (low Openness; IPM, F1, total), not liking to spend time watching wind blow through trees (low Openness; IPM, ASB, total), not trying to give to those in need (low altruism; IPM, F1), and not being bothered to harm someone one did not like (low altruism; CA, F1,

total). It seems that these items are more relevant to measuring psychopathic traits in women because there is a larger discrepancy in the items' ratings between women who score high vs. low on the SRP compared to this discrepancy in men. While both psychopathic women and psychopathic men would likely score highly on these items, the average woman scores lower than the average man, resulting in higher ratings being a somewhat better indicator of high psychopathy scores in women. For instance, a woman indicating that she is strongly tempted to buy stolen property might be more likely to have a high SRP score than a man indicating the same thing because women are less likely to score highly on this item in general, not because psychopathic women are more tempted to buy stolen property than psychopathic men.

While several of the items that had stronger relationships with the SRP scales in women can be potentially explained by sex differences in the items' average ratings, several more of these items did not differ much in their average ratings between men and women. Therefore, these items are likely getting at sex differences in the actual expression of psychopathic traits more so than the items listed above. For example, psychopathy (F1) in women was more strongly associated with acting nicely towards someone one dislikes to get something (low Honesty-Humility). This is similar to a finding from the original study, where psychopathy in women was more strongly associated with pretending to like someone to get favors (Power et al., under review). Perhaps these findings demonstrate slight differences in how psychopathic women and psychopathic men go about manipulating others. Forouzan and Cooke (2005) suggest that manipulative women may rely more on flirtation than manipulative men, who are more likely to express their manipulative tendencies through scams or fraud. Though these

items do not specifically refer to flirtatious behaviour, they describe scenarios where flirtation could effectively be used (i.e., the manipulation is more personal rather than large scale).

Often being told to cheer up (low Extraversion) was also more strongly related to psychopathy (IPM, F1) in women, which relates to previous findings that psychopathy in women is more strongly associated with negative affect and internalizing psychopathology than psychopathy in men (e.g., Blonigen et al., 2005, Visser et al., 2010). This finding also corresponds with a finding from the original study, where psychopathy was more negatively related to feeling cheerful in women (Power et al., under review).

Psychopathy (IPM, CA, F1) in women was more strongly related to not accepting people's faults without complaining about them (low Agreeableness), implying that psychopathy is more strongly associated with relational aggression (if the complaining is happening to a third party), and/or verbal aggression (if the complaining is happening directly to the person). This finding makes empirical sense as relational and verbal aggression tend to be the forms of aggression most strongly associated with psychopathy in women, whereas psychopathy in men tends to be more strongly associated with physical aggression (Wynn et al., 2012).

Having a hard time controlling one's temper after being insulted (low Agreeableness) was also more strongly related to psychopathy (IPM, CA, F1, total) in women. This finding clearly corresponds with past findings that psychopathy in women is more strongly associated with borderline personality disorder (BPD; Sprague et al., 2012; Wynn et al., 2012), as difficulty controlling anger is one of the core features of

BPD listed in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.; DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Having a quick temper was also more strongly related to psychopathy in women in the original study (Power et al., under review).

Being joked with about the messiness of one's room or desk (low Conscientiousness) was more strongly related to psychopathy (ELS, F2) in women. Women did indicate that they were less often joked with about the messiness of their room/desk on average, but the difference in ratings between women and men was relatively small. Thus, while the stronger relationship in women might be partially explained by sex differences in the discrepancy in high and low SRP scorers, this finding might also be due to other factors (e.g., psychopathic women being more likely than psychopathic men to *actually have* messier living/work spaces, and/or psychopathic women being more likely than psychopathic men *to be joked with* about the state of their living/work spaces).

Psychopathy (F1, total) in women was more strongly associated with allowing impulses to govern one's behaviour (low Conscientiousness), which aligns with previous findings. For example, Kreis and Cooke (2012) found that biographical accounts of real-life psychopathic women often depict these women as more impulsive than psychopathic men. This finding can be explained by the strong connection between psychopathy and BPD, particularly in women, mentioned above; impulsivity is another core feature of the disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

Lastly, thinking of oneself as an eccentric person (high Openness) was more strongly associated with psychopathy (ELS) in women, perhaps due to the "male-typical"

nature of psychopathy. To illustrate, the average woman exhibits higher levels of Honesty-Humility and Emotionality than the average man (Lee & Ashton, 2020), and psychopathy is also negatively associated with these traits (e.g., Lee et al., 2013). As a result, a woman with very low levels of Honesty-Humility and Emotionality differs more from the average woman than a man with similarly low levels of these traits differs from the average man. Thus, it is conceivable that psychopathic women, compared to psychopathic men, may be somewhat more likely to view themselves as unconventional. This finding could also be related to self-esteem, which has been found to be more negatively associated with psychopathy in women (Visser et al., 2010). Though the term *eccentric* does not have an inherently negative connotation, it seems probable that many individuals with self-esteem issues may view themselves as “odd” or “strange”.

Limitations and Future Research

There are some limitations and potential biases of the data that should be noted. While the updated proxy scales showed clear improvements over their original counterparts, this is currently the only study to test their correlations with psychopathy-relevant variables. Also, variables were not included to test their discriminant validity. In order to further establish the validity and practical utility of the updated proxies, it will be necessary to examine how they perform in other datasets as well as how they relate to a greater variety of variables.

Self-report questionnaires, which were used in the present study, are subject to social desirability bias. The associations between self-report variables are also subject to shared method bias. Thus, future studies could address these biases by incorporating non-self-report data.

Although MTurk is a widely used data collection platform, it is not without its limitations. For example, MTurk workers may be more demographically diverse than typical student samples (Buhrmester et al., 2011), but this does not necessarily mean that they are more representative of the general population; several differences have been found between individuals who choose to complete studies on MTurk and those who do not (Chandler & Shapiro, 2016). Further, as with all online samples, it is hard to ensure that participants are paying attention and/or answering honestly. Random responding may be especially problematic for crowdsourcing platforms such as MTurk, where there is incentive to finish studies as quickly as possible in order to maximize compensation. Nevertheless, MTurk has been found to be able to produce high-quality data, especially when measures are put in place to address these potential issues (e.g., Buhrmester et al., 2011; Buhrmester et al., 2018).

Though many of the present findings corresponded to what was previously found with the HEXACO-60 items, there were some inconsistencies (e.g., more overlap between proxy scales in men, more items related to ASB). At present, we cannot be certain as to why these differences were found, but they could be a function of the samples used (the proxies were originally created using a student sample with a mean age of approximately 21; they were updated using a MTurk sample with a mean age of approximately 40). Perhaps it is possible that the associations between the HEXACO items and SRP scales differ in some ways across the lifespan. Future research would be needed in order to specifically address this.

It is worth noting that not all of the original HEXACO-60 proxy items met the $\pm .25$ cutoff in the present study. However, the majority of HEXACO-60 items that did

not meet the cutoff still demonstrated correlations with their respective SRP scales, often around $\pm.20$. Thus, while not necessarily meeting the cutoff in all cases, most HEXACO-60 proxy items still seemed relevant to capturing the SRP scales. That said, the correlations between the HEXACO items and the SRP scales could be examined in additional datasets in order to make revisions to the content of the proxy scales if necessary. If certain items that are currently included do not consistently relate to the SRP scales, or if any items that are not currently included appear more relevant in future studies, the Power Proxies should be modified accordingly.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we updated the Power Proxies, which were originally created using HEXACO-60 items, by incorporating relevant HEXACO-100 items. The number of items included on the proxy scales effectively doubled, resulting in improved psychometric properties and stronger relations with a selection of relevant variables. While the updated general, male-specific, and female-specific proxy scales performed better than their original counterparts and a previous attempt to measure the SRP facets using HEXACO items, neither set of updated sex-specific proxies performed much better than the updated general proxies. The updated general proxies already seem to capture the SRP scales very well in both sexes and, considering the principle of parsimony, might be the preferred option for practical use when datasets include the HEXACO-100. In addition to incorporating HEXACO-100 items into the Power Proxies, we built on our previous findings and identified further potentially meaningful sex differences in how psychopathy is expressed through HEXACO items.

Table 4-1*Proportion of HEXACO-60 Items Meeting Cutoff for Inclusion on Proxy Scales in the Present Study*

	General			Male-Specific			Female-Specific		
	A	B	%	A	B	%	A	B	%
IPM	11	11	100.0%	13	14	92.9%	17	17	100.0%
CA	6	11	54.5%	10	15	66.7%	13	19	68.4%
ELS	7	8	87.5%	7	9	77.8%	13	14	92.9%
ASB	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	6	50.0%
F1	13	15	86.7%	15	18	83.3%	19	21	90.5%
F2	8	8	100.0%	9	9	100.0%	12	14	85.7%
Total	11	13	84.6%	14	17	82.4%	20	21	95.2%

Note. A = Number of items meeting cutoff in current study; B = Number of items included in HEXACO-60 proxy; IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2.

Table 4-2*New HEXACO-100 Items Added to General Proxy Scales*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2	Total
6 (H: sincerity)	x		x		x	x	x
36 (H: fairness)	x		x	x	x	x	x
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	x						
24r (H: modesty)	x				x	x	x
48r (H: modesty)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
29 (E: fearfulness)		x	x		x	x	x
65r (E: dependence)		x					
89 (E: dependence)		x					
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x		x
28r (X: social self-esteem)	x	x		x	x	x	x
70 (X: liveliness)		x	x		x	x	x
33r (A: gentleness)	x	x			x		x
87 (A: flexibility)					x		
93 (A: patience)						x	x
68r (C: prudence)	x		x				
97r (altruism)	x	x		x	x	x	x
98r (altruism)	x	x		x	x		x
99 (altruism)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
100 (altruism)	x	x	x		x	x	x
# of items	23	23	16	7	34	19	27
Cronbach's α	.88	.85	.82	.75	.89	.84	.87
Convergent r	.79	.81	.73	.53	.83	.72	.81
M	2.31	2.40	2.29	2.10	2.41	2.23	2.32
SD	0.60	0.55	0.61	0.70	0.53	0.59	0.56

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Psychometric properties and descriptive statistics are for full proxy scales that include previously selected HEXACO-60 items.

Table 4-3*Updated General Proxies' and Original General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample*

	IPM		CA		ELS		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations												
Organizational deviance	.45	.41	.38	.36	.46	.42	.44	.41	.48	.44	.45	.41
Overt RA	.39	.36	.27	.22	.32	.23	.40	.36	.38	.32	.38	.32
Relational PA	.53	.47	.46	.42	.49	.39	.52	.48	.54	.45	.54	.50
Relational RA	.58	.52	.47	.43	.48	.38	.57	.53	.55	.45	.56	.50
RARR	.40	.37	.30	.25	.36	.27	.39	.35	.40	.33	.39	.36
Antisocial behaviour	.31	.27	.33	.30	.36	.31	.35	.30	.38	.33	.33	.28
Illegal behaviour	.31	.27	.33	.31	.35	.30	.34	.30	.37	.32	.33	.28
Irresponsible behaviour	.20	.18	.23	.19	.25	.22	.24	.19	.26	.22	.21	.17
Deceptive behaviour	.30	.27	.27	.23	.34	.31	.31	.27	.36	.32	.31	.27
Spearman correlations												
Interpersonal deviance	.40	.35	.40	.37	.40	.30	.43	.40	.43	.34	.44	.39
Overt PA	.43	.38	.37	.34	.38	.30	.43	.39	.42	.35	.43	.38
Violent behaviour	.34	.30	.34	.31	.36	.29	.37	.33	.39	.31	.37	.31

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Updated general proxy; B = Original general proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. All correlations are significant ($p < .05$). Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 4-4

Updated General Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	IPM		CA		ELS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations						
Organizational deviance	.45	.37	.38	.20	.46	.46
Overt RA	.39	.40	.27	.11	.32	.33
Relational PA	.53	.44	.46	.24	.49	.48
Relational RA	.58	.54	.47	.24	.48	.46
RARR	.40	.36	.30	.14	.36	.35
Antisocial behaviour	.31	.25	.33	.22	.36	.35
Illegal behaviour	.31	.24	.33	.23	.35	.33
Irresponsible behaviour	.20	.17	.23	.17	.25	.24
Deceptive behaviour	.30	.24	.27	.13	.34	.33
Spearman correlations						
Interpersonal deviance	.40	.31	.40	.26	.40	.38
Overt PA	.43	.37	.37	.21	.38	.36
Violent behaviour	.34	.28	.34	.20	.36	.35

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; A = General proxy; B = Međedović's proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. All correlations are significant ($p < .05$). Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 4-5*New HEXACO-100 Items Added to Male-Specific Proxy Scales*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2	Total
6 (H: sincerity)	x		x		x	x	x
36 (H: fairness)	x		x	x	x	x	x
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	x				x		
24r (H: modesty)	x	x		x	x	x	x
48r (H: modesty)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
29 (E: fearfulness)		x	x		x	x	x
59r (E: anxiety)			x				
65r (E: dependence)		x			x		
89 (E: dependence)		x					
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x		x
28r (X: social self-esteem)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
70 (X: liveliness)		x	x		x	x	x
33r (A: gentleness)	x	x			x		x
87 (A: flexibility)					x		
93 (A: patience)						x	x
56 (C: diligence)	x			x	x	x	x
68r (C: prudence)	x		x				
73r (O: aesthetic appreciation)		x					
13r (O: creativity)			x			x	x
97r (altruism)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
98r (altruism)	x	x		x	x		x
99 (altruism)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
100 (altruism)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
# of items	27	29	21	10	35	21	33
Cronbach's α	.86	.84	.78	.74	.86	.83	.85
Convergent r	.73	.77	.69	.56	.78	.68	.77
M	2.52	2.61	2.53	2.34	2.60	2.43	2.55
SD	0.53	0.47	0.49	0.62	0.47	0.54	0.47

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness. Psychometric properties and descriptive statistics are for full proxy scales that include previously selected HEXACO-60 items.

Table 4-6*Updated Male-Specific Proxies' and Original Male-Specific Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men*

	IPM		CA		ELS		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations												
Organizational deviance	.42	.37	.38	.34	.45	.35	.42	.36	.48	.42	.45	.37
Overt RA	.40	.36	.34	.32	.36	.21	.40	.37	.35	.27	.40	.32
Relational PA	.52	.42	.43	.35	.46	.31	.49	.41	.54	.45	.52	.44
Relational RA	.55	.49	.45	.41	.41	.29	.52	.48	.48	.40	.52	.45
RARR	.48	.43	.36	.32	.42	.32	.45	.41	.46	.41	.48	.42
Antisocial behaviour	.37	.31	.37	.33	.43	.31	.39	.33	.42	.35	.40	.31
Illegal behaviour	.31	.26	.31	.29	.35	.27	.33	.29	.35	.30	.33	.26
Irresponsible behaviour	.29	.25	.31	.28	.37	.25	.32	.28	.34	.27	.33	.24
Deceptive behaviour	.32	.27	.29	.23	.35	.27	.32	.26	.37	.31	.34	.27
Spearman correlations												
Interpersonal deviance	.33	.27	.35	.27	.33	.17	.36	.30	.35	.26	.38	.27
Overt PA	.40	.35	.39	.31	.39	.27	.40	.35	.43	.38	.43	.34
Violent behaviour	.35	.29	.36	.29	.38	.26	.36	.29	.39	.33	.38	.27

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Updated male-specific proxy; B = Original male-specific proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. All correlations are significant ($p < .05$). Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 4-7*Updated Male-Specific Proxies' and Updated General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men*

	IPM		CA		ELS		ASB		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations														
Organizational deviance	.42	.41	.38	.38	.45	.41	.43	.35	.42	.41	.48	.45	.45	.43
Overt RA	.40	.37	.34	.32	.36	.30	.35	.28	.40	.40	.35	.38	.40	.36
Relational PA	.52	.51	.43	.41	.46	.44	.53	.43	.49	.49	.54	.52	.52	.52
Relational RA	.55	.52	.45	.41	.41	.39	.51	.42	.52	.50	.48	.48	.52	.50
RARR	.48	.46	.36	.35	.42	.38	.42	.31	.45	.44	.46	.45	.48	.45
Antisocial behaviour	.37	.37	.37	.39	.43	.40	.40	.37	.39	.40	.42	.43	.40	.39
Illegal behaviour	.31	.31	.31	.33	.35	.33	.34	.32	.33	.34	.35	.37	.33	.32
Irresponsible behaviour	.29	.30	.31	.34	.37	.33	.30	.30	.32	.34	.34	.35	.33	.32
Deceptive behaviour	.32	.32	.29	.29	.35	.33	.34	.29	.32	.32	.37	.37	.34	.33
Spearman correlations														
Interpersonal deviance	.33	.32	.35	.36	.33	.29	.34	.27	.36	.35	.35	.36	.38	.37
Overt PA	.40	.40	.39	.40	.39	.35	.40	.35	.40	.41	.43	.44	.43	.43
Violent behaviour	.35	.35	.36	.36	.38	.36	.36	.30	.36	.37	.39	.40	.38	.37

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Male-specific proxy; B = General proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. All correlations are significant ($p < .05$). Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 4-8

Updated Male-Specific Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	IPM		CA		ELS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations						
Organizational deviance	.42	.34	.38	.19	.45	.44
Overt RA	.40	.37	.34	.15	.36	.33
Relational PA	.52	.41	.43	<i>.13</i>	.46	.49
Relational RA	.55	.46	.45	.17	.41	.41
RARR	.48	.41	.36	<i>.12</i>	.42	.42
Antisocial behaviour	.37	.27	.37	.22	.43	.40
Illegal behaviour	.31	.23	.31	.19	.35	.33
Irresponsible behaviour	.29	.22	.31	.21	.37	.31
Deceptive behaviour	.32	.25	.29	<i>.10</i>	.35	.37
Spearman correlations						
Interpersonal deviance	.33	.23	.35	.17	.33	.31
Overt PA	.40	.33	.39	.19	.39	.38
Violent behaviour	.35	.26	.36	.17	.38	.37

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; A = Male-specific proxy; B = Međedović's proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 4-9*New HEXACO-100 Items Added to Female-Specific Proxy Scales*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2	Total
6 (H: sincerity)	x		x	x	x	x	x
36 (H: fairness)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	x						
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	x						
24r (H: modesty)	x				x	x	x
48r (H: modesty)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
29 (E: fearfulness)		x	x		x	x	x
65r (E: dependence)		x					
89 (E: dependence)		x					
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x		x
28r (X: social self-esteem)	x	x		x	x	x	x
70 (X: liveliness)	x	x	x		x	x	x
75 (A: forgiveness)	x	x			x		
33r (A: gentleness)	x	x			x		x
87 (A: flexibility)	x				x		
93 (A: patience)	x	x	x		x	x	x
2r (C: organization)			x			x	x
50 (C: organization)			x			x	x
68r (C: prudence)	x		x		x	x	x
25 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	x				x		x
73r (O: aesthetic appreciation)	x			x	x		x
67 (O: unconventionality)			x				
97r (altruism)	x	x		x	x	x	x
198r (altruism)	x	x		x	x	x	x
99 (altruism)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
100 (altruism)	x	x	x		x	x	x
# of items	36	34	26	14	40	29	40
Cronbach's α	.91	.88	.85	.81	.90	.87	.90
Convergent r	.79	.75	.75	.48	.82	.70	.81
M	2.25	2.29	2.18	2.01	2.27	2.13	2.16
SD	0.56	0.51	0.53	0.60	0.52	0.52	0.51

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness. Psychometric properties and descriptive statistics are for full proxy scales that include previously selected HEXACO-60 items.

Table 4-10*Updated Female-Specific Proxies' and Original Female-Specific Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women*

	IPM		CA		ELS		ASB		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations														
Organizational deviance	.45	.46	.37	.37	.47	.43	.39	.34	.43	.44	.47	.42	.45	.45
Overt RA	.47	.46	.32	.27	.40	.31	.26	.13	.43	.40	.39	.31	.41	.38
Relational PA	.53	.54	.47	.47	.52	.46	.48	.43	.52	.53	.52	.45	.53	.53
Relational RA	.63	.59	.53	.50	.57	.47	.52	.44	.61	.58	.58	.48	.60	.57
RARR	.35	.35	.28	.26	.33	.26	.26	.19	.33	.33	.32	.25	.33	.32
Antisocial behaviour	.23	.24	.27	.26	.28	.25	.14	.08	.24	.25	.25	.24	.22	.24
Illegal behaviour	.24	.25	.26	.25	.27	.25	.18	.10	.25	.25	.26	.25	.24	.24
Irresponsible behaviour	.09	.11	.13	.13	.14	.12	.01	-.02	.10	.12	.10	.11	.08	.10
Deceptive behaviour	.28	.30	.29	.29	.34	.32	.24	.19	.30	.30	.32	.32	.30	.31
Spearman correlations														
Interpersonal deviance	.43	.43	.38	.38	.42	.37	.36	.28	.45	.43	.44	.39	.44	.43
Overt PA	.42	.41	.36	.34	.41	.35	.35	.28	.41	.41	.40	.32	.41	.40
Violent behaviour	.34	.37	.38	.37	.37	.31	.27	.23	.37	.37	.37	.33	.36	.37

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Updated female-specific proxy; B = Original female-specific proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 4-11*Updated Female-Specific Proxies' and Updated General Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women*

	IPM		CA		ELS		ASB		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations														
Organizational deviance	.45	.44	.37	.32	.47	.48	.39	.37	.43	.41	.47	.45	.45	.42
Overt RA	.47	.42	.32	.24	.40	.34	.26	.27	.43	.41	.39	.40	.41	.40
Relational PA	.53	.53	.47	.48	.52	.50	.48	.42	.52	.53	.52	.53	.53	.54
Relational RA	.63	.63	.53	.50	.57	.56	.52	.47	.61	.63	.58	.60	.60	.62
RARR	.35	.33	.28	.26	.33	.33	.26	.22	.33	.34	.32	.34	.33	.34
Antisocial behaviour	.23	.21	.27	.21	.28	.27	.14	.20	.24	.24	.25	.27	.22	.22
Illegal behaviour	.24	.23	.26	.23	.27	.27	.18	.25	.25	.25	.26	.27	.24	.24
Irresponsible behaviour	<i>.09</i>	<i>.07</i>	.13	<i>.09</i>	.14	.14	<i>.01</i>	<i>.04</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.11</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.13</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.08</i>
Deceptive behaviour	.28	.28	.29	.25	.34	.36	.24	.28	.30	.29	.32	.34	.30	.28
Spearman correlations														
Interpersonal deviance	.43	.42	.38	.36	.42	.41	.36	.33	.45	.43	.44	.42	.44	.45
Overt PA	.42	.42	.36	.33	.41	.37	.35	.32	.41	.41	.40	.39	.41	.42
Violent behaviour	.34	.32	.38	.32	.37	.34	.27	.29	.37	.35	.37	.35	.36	.36

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Female-specific proxy; B = General proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 4-12

Updated Female-Specific Proxies' and Međedović's Proxies' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	IPM		CA		ELS	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations						
Organizational deviance	.45	.38	.37	<i>.11</i>	.47	.44
Overt RA	.47	.42	.32	<i>.06</i>	.40	.35
Relational PA	.53	.46	.47	.27	.52	.44
Relational RA	.63	.59	.53	.27	.57	.48
RARR	.35	.31	.28	<i>.12</i>	.33	.27
Antisocial behaviour	.23	.20	.27	.15	.28	.25
Illegal behaviour	.24	.19	.26	.16	.27	.23
Irresponsible behaviour	<i>.09</i>	<i>.10</i>	.13	<i>.09</i>	.14	.14
Deceptive behaviour	.28	.23	.29	.13	.34	.30
Spearman correlations						
Interpersonal deviance	.43	.33	.38	.23	.42	.35
Overt PA	.42	.38	.36	.18	.41	.31
Violent behaviour	.34	.28	.38	.18	.37	.30

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; A = Female-specific proxy; B = Međedović's proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics. Any correlation that was significantly larger ($p < .05$) than the correlation to which it was compared is indicated in bold.

Table 4-13*Updated General Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample*

	IPM		CA		ELS		ASB		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations														
Organizational deviance	.45	.41	.38	.34	.46	.44	.39	.40	.44	.40	.48	.46	.45	.47
Overt RA	.39	.37	.27	.30	.32	.37	.28	.31	.40	.37	.38	.38	.38	.41
Relational PA	.53	.54	.46	.41	.49	.41	.45	.49	.52	.52	.54	.50	.54	.55
Relational RA	.58	.51	.47	.40	.48	.38	.45	.38	.57	.50	.55	.42	.56	.50
RARR	.40	.39	.30	.31	.36	.39	.28	.41	.39	.38	.40	.44	.39	.44
Antisocial behaviour	.31	.35	.33	.35	.36	.52	.32	.58	.35	.38	.38	.61	.33	.53
Illegal behaviour	.31	.35	.33	.34	.35	.47	.34	.59	.34	.37	.37	.59	.33	.52
Irresponsible behaviour	.20	.23	.23	.24	.25	.46	.19	.45	.24	.26	.26	.50	.21	.41
Deceptive behaviour	.30	.33	.27	.27	.34	.40	.29	.41	.31	.33	.36	.45	.31	.42
Spearman correlations														
Interpersonal deviance	.40	.42	.40	.44	.40	.42	.34	.41	.43	.47	.43	.45	.44	.50
Overt PA	.43	.44	.37	.41	.38	.43	.35	.49	.43	.46	.42	.51	.43	.52
Violent behaviour	.34	.35	.34	.36	.36	.42	.30	.44	.37	.38	.39	.47	.37	.47

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = General proxy; B = SRP scale; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. All correlations are significant ($p < .05$).

Table 4-14*Updated Male-Specific Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men*

	IPM		CA		ELS		ASB		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations														
Organizational deviance	.42	.41	.38	.36	.45	.46	.43	.46	.42	.42	.48	.50	.45	.50
Overt RA	.40	.34	.34	.33	.36	.42	.35	.40	.40	.37	.35	.45	.40	.44
Relational PA	.52	.52	.43	.39	.46	.39	.53	.51	.49	.49	.54	.50	.52	.54
Relational RA	.55	.49	.45	.35	.41	.31	.51	.40	.52	.46	.48	.39	.52	.46
RARR	.48	.42	.36	.36	.42	.43	.42	.45	.45	.43	.46	.48	.48	.49
Antisocial behaviour	.37	.38	.37	.36	.43	.60	.40	.63	.39	.40	.42	.67	.40	.59
Illegal behaviour	.31	.33	.31	.27	.35	.50	.34	.61	.33	.33	.35	.61	.33	.51
Irresponsible behaviour	.29	.31	.31	.30	.37	.58	.30	.50	.32	.33	.34	.59	.33	.50
Deceptive behaviour	.32	.34	.29	.28	.35	.45	.34	.44	.32	.34	.37	.49	.34	.45
Spearman correlations														
Interpersonal deviance	.33	.38	.35	.43	.33	.42	.34	.44	.36	.44	.35	.47	.38	.50
Overt PA	.40	.43	.39	.46	.39	.50	.40	.57	.40	.48	.43	.59	.43	.59
Violent behaviour	.35	.31	.36	.37	.38	.45	.36	.53	.36	.36	.39	.54	.38	.50

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Male-specific proxy; B = SRP scale; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. All correlations are significant ($p < .05$).

Table 4-15*Updated Female-Specific Proxies' and SRP Scales' Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women*

	IPM		CA		ELS		ASB		F1		F2		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Pearson correlations														
Organizational deviance	.45	.34	.37	.19	.47	.35	.39	.22	.43	.30	.47	.33	.45	.35
Overt RA	.47	.40	.32	.30	.40	.35	.26	.22	.43	.39	.39	.33	.41	.40
Relational PA	.53	.53	.47	.37	.52	.37	.48	.39	.52	.50	.52	.43	.53	.52
Relational RA	.63	.50	.53	.43	.57	.41	.52	.32	.61	.52	.58	.42	.60	.52
RARR	.35	.34	.28	.25	.33	.34	.26	.34	.33	.33	.32	.39	.33	.40
Antisocial behaviour	.23	.25	.27	.27	.28	.40	.14	.47	.24	.29	.25	.49	.22	.43
Illegal behaviour	.24	.27	.26	.28	.27	.35	.18	.50	.25	.31	.26	.47	.24	.43
Irresponsible behaviour	.09	.11	.13	.14	.14	.32	.01	.36	.10	.14	.10	.39	.08	.28
Deceptive behaviour	.28	.31	.29	.25	.34	.35	.24	.36	.30	.31	.32	.40	.30	.39
Spearman correlations														
Interpersonal deviance	.43	.40	.38	.38	.42	.33	.36	.31	.45	.44	.44	.35	.44	.44
Overt PA	.42	.42	.36	.37	.41	.36	.35	.41	.41	.44	.40	.42	.41	.47
Violent behaviour	.34	.36	.38	.33	.37	.37	.27	.32	.37	.39	.37	.39	.36	.43

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; A = Female-specific proxy; B = SRP scale; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

Table 4-16

Magnitudes of Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100 Proxy Items and SRP Scales

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2	Total
Men more strongly related							
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	.08	-	-	-	.09	-	-
24r (H: modesty)	-	.14	-	-	.07	-	-
48r (H: modesty)	.06	-	-	-	.05	-	-
59r (E: anxiety)	-	-	.07	-	-	-	-
65r (E: dependence)	-	.11	-	-	.08	-	-
89 (E: dependence)	-	.06	-	-	-	-	-
28r (X: social self-esteem)	-	-	.09	.08	-	.08	-
56 (C: diligence)	.05	-	-	.10	.09	-	.07
73r (O: aesthetic appreciation)	-	.09	-	-	-	-	-
13r (O: creativity)	-	-	.11	-	-	.17	.25
97r (altruism)	-	.07	.06	.08	-	.07	-
100 (altruism)	-	-	-	.17	-	.09	-
Women more strongly related							
6 (H: sincerity)	.08	-	-	.08	.10	.05	.09
36 (H: fairness)	.15	.09	.10	.06	.14	.10	.15
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	.14	-	-	-	-	-	-
29 (E: fearfulness)	-	-	.13	-	-	.11	.07
28r (X: social self-esteem)	.07	.05	-	-	.07	-	-
70 (X: liveliness)	.15	-	-	-	.10	-	.06
75 (A: forgiveness)	.09	-	-	-	.07	-	-
33r (A: gentleness)	.16	.11	-	-	.16	-	.09
87 (A: flexibility)	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-
93 (A: patience)	.15	.14	.05	-	.17	-	.10
2r (C: organization)	-	-	.29	-	-	.30	.26
50 (C: organization)	-	-	.19	-	-	.11	.07
68r (C: prudence)	.05	-	.09	-	.10	.09	.11
25 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	.16	-	-	-	.10	-	.14
73r (O: aesthetic appreciation)	.15	-	-	.15	.05	-	.11
67 (O: unconventionality)	-	-	.12	-	-	-	-
98r (altruism)	.16	-	-	-	.11	-	.09
99 (altruism)	.08	.16	.05	-	.14	-	.11

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness. Only raw differences of .05 or greater are shown. Bold items differ by .10 or greater for at least one SRP scale.

References

- Alegria, A. A., Blanco, C., Petry, N. M., Skodol, A. E., Liu, S., Grant, B., & Hasin, D. (2013). Sex differences in antisocial personality disorder: Results from the National Epidemiological Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 4*, 214–222.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031681>
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 150–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294907>
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340–345.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878>
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 349–360.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349>
- Blonigen D. M., Hicks, B. M., Krueger, R. F., Patrick, C. J., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Psychopathic personality traits: Heritability and genetic overlap with internalizing and externalizing psychopathology. *Psychological Medicine, 35*, 637–648.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704004180>
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., & Volk, A. A. (2015). Unpacking “evil”: Claiming the core of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 73*, 29–38.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.016>

- Buhrmester, M. D., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*, 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980>
- Buhrmester, M. D., Talaifar, S., & Gosling, S. D. (2018). An evaluation of Amazon's Mechanical Turk, its rapid rise, and its effective use. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *13*, 149–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617706516>
- Chandler, J., & Shapiro, D. (2016). Conducting clinical research using crowdsourced convenience samples. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *12*, 53–81. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-021815-093623>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- Decuyper, M., De Pauw, S., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., & De Clercq, B. J. (2009). A meta-analysis of psychopathy-, antisocial PD- and FFM associations. *European Journal of Personality*, *23*, 531–565. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.729>
- Forouzan, E., & Cooke, D. J. (2005). Figuring out la femme fatale: Conceptual and assessment issues concerning psychopathy in females. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *23*, 765–778. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.669>
- Grann, M. (2000). The PCL-R and gender. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *16*, 147–149. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.16.3.147>
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Manual for the Revised Psychopathy Checklist* (2nd ed.). Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2008). Psychopathy as a clinical and empirical construct.

Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 4, 217–246.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091452>

Hodson, G., Book, A., Visser, B. A., Volk, A. A., Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2018). Is the Dark Triad common factor distinct from low Honesty-Humility? *Journal of*

Research in Personality, 73, 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.012>

Jackson, R. L., Rogers, R., Neumann, C. S., & Lambert, P. L. (2002). Psychopathy in female offenders: An investigation of its underlying dimensions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 692–704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009385402237922>

Kreis, M. K. F., & Cooke, D. J. (2012). The manifestation of psychopathic traits in women: An exploration using case examples. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 11, 267–279. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2012.746755>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39, 329–358.

http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 2–5.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.048>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment*, 25, 543–556. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116659134>

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2020). Sex differences in HEXACO personality characteristics across countries and ethnicities. *Journal of Personality*, 88, 1075–1090.

<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12551>

Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., Visser, B. A., & Gallucci, A.

- (2013). Sex, power, and money: Prediction from the Dark Triad and Honesty-Humility. *European Journal of Personality*, *27*, 169–184.
<http://doi.org/10.1002/per.1860>
- Lee, I. A., & Preacher, K. J. (2013). *Calculation for the test of the difference between two dependent correlations with one variable in common* [Computer software].
<http://quantpsy.org/corrtest/corrtest2.htm>
- Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2015). Psychopathy from a basic trait perspective: The utility of a Five-Factor Model approach. *Journal of Personality*, *83*, 611–626.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12132>
- Međedović, J. (2017). Can HEXACO-PI-R adequately represent the four-factor model of psychopathy? *Psihologijske Teme*, *26*, 557–576. <http://doi.org/10.31820/pt.26.3.4>.
- Miller, J., Lynam, D., Widiger, T., & Leukefeld, C. (2001). Personality disorders as extreme variants of common personality dimensions: Can the Five-Factor Model adequately represent psychopathy? *Journal of Personality*, *69*, 253–276.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00144>
- Morales, J. R., & Crick, N. R. (1998). *Self-report measure of aggression and victimization* [Unpublished measure].
- Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the Dark Triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 183–204. <http://doi.org/10.1177/17456916166666070>
- Murray-Close, D., Ostrov, J. M., Nelson, D. A., Crick, N. R., & Coccaro, E. F. (2010).

Proactive, reactive, and romantic relational aggression in adulthood: Measurement, predictive validity, gender differences, and association with intermittent explosive disorder. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *44*, 393–404.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2009.09.005>

Nicholls, T. L., & Petrila, J. (2005). Gender and psychopathy: An overview of important issues and introduction to the special issue. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *23*, 729–741. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.677>

O’Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the Dark Triad and Five-Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Personality*, *83*, 644–664.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12126>

Patrick, C. (2010). Operationalizing the Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Preliminary description of brief scales for assessment of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition [Unpublished manual]. Florida State University.

Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2016). *Manual for the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Fourth Edition*. Multi-Health Systems.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *36*, 556–563. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)

Raine, A., Dodge, K., Loeber, R., Gatzke-Kopp, L., Lynam, D., Reynolds, C., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Liu, J. (2006). The Reactive–Proactive Aggression Questionnaire: Differential correlates of reactive and proactive aggression in

adolescent boys. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 159–171.

<http://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20115>

Ruchensky, J. R., Donnellan, M. B., & Edens, J. F. (2018). Development and initial validation of the HEXACO-Triarchic scales. *Psychological Assessment*, 30, 1560–1566. <http://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000609>

Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., & Sewell, K. W. (1997). Construct validity of psychopathy in a female offender sample: A multitrait-multimethod evaluation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 576–585. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.106.4.576>

Sprague, J., Javdani, S., Sadeh, N., Newman, J. P., & Verona, E. (2012). Borderline personality disorder as a female phenotypic expression of psychopathy? *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3, 127–139. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0024134>

Strand, S., & Belfrage, H. (2005). Gender differences in psychopathy in a Swedish offender sample. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 837–850. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.674>

Visser, B. A., Pozzebon, J. A., Bogaert, A. F., & Ashton, M. C. (2010). Psychopathy, sexual behavior, and esteem: It's different for girls. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 833–838. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.008>

Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., Collison, K. L., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Differences among Dark Triad components: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 9, 101–111. <http://doi.org/10.1037/per0000222>

- Widiger, T. A., & Lynam, D. R. (1998). Psychopathy and the Five-Factor Model of personality. In T. Millon, E. Simonsen, M. Birket-Smith, & R. D. Davis (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal, and violent behavior* (pp. 171–187). Guilford Press.
- Wynn, R., Høiseth, M. H., & Pettersen, G. (2012). Psychopathy in women: Theoretical and clinical perspectives. *International Journal of Women's Health, 4*, 257–263.
<http://doi.org/10.2147/IJWH.S25518>

CHAPTER FIVE

General Discussion

The construct of psychopathy is often found to be associated with “normal” personality traits (e.g., Decuyper et al., 2009; Muris et al., 2017; O’Boyle et al., 2015; Vize et al., 2018), and the HEXACO model of personality demonstrates a particularly notable degree of overlap with the construct due to its ability to capture “dark” personality variance (e.g., Lee & Ashton, 2014; Lee et al., 2013). For this reason, we created proxies for Hare’s two-factor/four-facet model of psychopathy using HEXACO-60 items (Study 1), demonstrated that the proxies could be reasonably extended to youth samples (Study 2), and expanded the proxies to include additional HEXACO-100 items to improve their overall performance (Study 3). Though there has been a previous attempt to measure Hare’s model of psychopathy using HEXACO items (Međedović, 2017), the current program of research distinguishes itself by taking into consideration past research suggesting that sex differences exist in the construct of psychopathy (e.g., Blonigen et al., 2005; Forouzan & Cooke, 2005; Grann, 2000; Kreis & Cooke, 2012; Jackson et al., 2002; Nicholls & Petrila, 2005; Strand & Belfrage, 2005; Wynn et al., 2012). Thus, the proxies were created by examining the correlations between the HEXACO items and SRP scales in men and women separately, allowing for the creation of sex-specific proxies in addition to proxy scales that include only items relevant to the construct in both sexes. Relatedly, we also investigated how psychopathy might be expressed differently between men and women through basic personality traits by identifying any HEXACO-SRP correlations that differed between the sexes to a potentially meaningful extent (Studies 1

and 3). The overall findings and implications of this program of research are discussed below.

Measuring Psychopathy Using the HEXACO

As expected, there was significant overlap between the SRP (Paulhus et al., 2016) and both the HEXACO-60 (Ashton & Lee, 2009) and HEXACO-100 (Lee & Ashton, 2018), and Honesty-Humility stood out as especially important to measuring psychopathic traits overall. In both Studies 1 and 3, Honesty-Humility items often met the cutoff for multiple psychopathy facets and/or both psychopathy factors, aligning with previous research demonstrating Honesty-Humility's ability to capture the "core" of "dark" personality (Book et al., 2015; Book et al., 2016; Hodson et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2013). This particular finding in Study 1 substantially influenced the decision to create proxies that allowed items to be included on more than one facet and/or both factors, as we did not want to remove the "dark" personality variance from any SRP scale. In Study 3, the interstitial altruism facet also stood out as having a similar role as the Honesty-Humility domain; each of the altruism items included in the HEXACO-100 met the cutoff for most, and sometimes all, of the SRP scales. Because Mededović's proxies did not allow overlapping items, his IPM proxy largely monopolized the Honesty-Humility items while his CA proxy largely monopolized the altruism items. Thus, the Power Proxies' stronger associations with many psychopathy-relevant variables is presumably due in large part to the inclusion of multiple Honesty-Humility items and, in the HEXACO-100 version, multiple altruism items on every scale.

Although Honesty-Humility and altruism seem to be more or less at the core of the SRP scales, this does not mean that Honesty-Humility and/or altruism items on their

own can sufficiently capture psychopathy. Items from the other HEXACO domains were also included on the proxies, but they were more consistently associated with specific facets and/or factors. Emotionality was particularly relevant to capturing CA, Agreeableness to capturing both IPM and CA (and therefore F1 as a whole), and Conscientiousness to capturing ELS and F2. Extraversion and Openness items were also included on some of the proxy scales to a limited extent, but these domains were markedly less important than the others in capturing SRP psychopathy. These findings correspond with previous meta-analytic findings (Decuyper et al., 2009; Muris et al., 2017; O'Boyle et al., 2015; Vize et al., 2018), as Conscientiousness is one of the Big Five domains that is most strongly related to psychopathy, whereas Extraversion and Openness are only weakly related (note that Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Openness do not differ between the Big Five and HEXACO models of personality; Ashton, 2018). Further, Agreeableness is the Big Five domain most strongly associated with psychopathy; Big Five Agreeableness overlaps with aspects of HEXACO Agreeableness and HEXACO Emotionality (Ashton, 2018), both of which were relevant to capturing psychopathic traits in the current research. In addition, Lee et al. (2013) reported that, while Honesty-Humility accounted for nearly all of the variance shared between the Dark Triad components, the unique psychopathy variance was also significantly associated with HEXACO Emotionality, Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness, but not Extraversion or Openness. Thus, because psychopathy is associated with multiple HEXACO personality traits, the proxies should be able to capture the SRP more closely than could any singular HEXACO scale, including Honesty-Humility or altruism.

Although the associations described above were found in both men and women, the exact HEXACO items that met the cutoff for each SRP scale differed to such an extent that it was deemed worthwhile to create sex-specific proxies to supplement the general proxies, which were designed to include only items that were relevant to both sexes. The female-specific proxies in particular demonstrated notable improvements over the general proxies when using only HEXACO-60 items, though neither set of sex-specific proxies offered much advantage over the general proxies when the additional HEXACO-100 items were incorporated. It seems that there were already plenty of HEXACO items included in the updated general proxies that met the cutoff for both sexes. As a result, using even more items to try to capture the SRP scales (i.e., using the updated sex-specific proxies in samples of exclusively men or women) became largely unnecessary. Thus, the general proxies will likely be the preferred option in most cases, as the only scenario throughout this program of research where a sex-specific proxy offered much practical utility was estimating SRP scores in girls/women when only the HEXACO-60 items were available. That said, it would also be reasonable to use the general proxies to estimate SRP scores in women even when only the HEXACO-60 items are available. The sex-specific proxies were originally intended as a possible option to better capture the SRP scales in samples of exclusively men or exclusively women, but they were never intended to be used in combined samples of men and women. In any given study, the same scoring procedure should be used to calculate the variables for all participants; if the same variables are not scored in the same way for different groups, comparisons between groups cannot be made. Relatedly, researchers may also choose to use the general proxies in samples of exclusively women if they are concerned with being

able to make comparisons between men and women across studies. Essentially, the sex-specific proxies were created as a way to identify sex differences in the expression of psychopathy from a normal trait perspective, and while they may be considered for practical use in some cases, the general proxies may always be used instead.

Overall, the Power Proxies seem to be a viable option for capturing Hare's model of psychopathy, with the exception of the ASB facet. The proxy scales were strongly correlated with the original SRP scales and related to many variables in a similar manner as that of the SRP. Importantly, the proxies were created to determine how the various psychopathy scales are expressed through basic personality traits; they were not created to replace the SRP. Thus, we believe that it would be appropriate to use the proxies when either the HEXACO-60 or HEXACO-100, but not the SRP, is included in a dataset. However, because the proxies do not perfectly correlate with the SRP and do not capture ASB very well, we would mostly suggest using the proxies in cases where using the actual SRP is not feasible. For example, if a researcher conducts a study that includes the HEXACO, but does not include a measure of psychopathy, the proxies could be used to approximate the SRP scales if the researcher wishes they had included some measure of psychopathic traits after the data has already been collected. Perhaps the proxies could also be used in lieu of the SRP to reduce the length of studies when psychopathy is not the main focus, yet researchers would still like to incorporate some measure of psychopathic traits. Ultimately, it is up to the discretion of each researcher to decide whether using the Power Proxies would be suitable for the purpose of their research studies. It is also up to the researcher to decide which version to use.

The Role of Antisocial Behaviour

In Study 1, very few HEXACO items met the cutoff for ASB, which was especially the case for men. As a result, there were no general or male-specific ASB proxies created, and the female-specific ASB proxy had the weakest convergent correlation and internal consistency of any proxy in that study; accordingly, we do not recommend this proxy for practical use. In Study 3, however, more items met the cutoff for ASB and we were therefore able to construct general and male-specific ASB proxies as well as update the female-specific ASB proxy. Nevertheless, ASB still remained the SRP scale that the HEXACO was least able to capture.

It should be noted that the ASB proxies are heavily reliant on Honesty-Humility and altruism items, which we have established as having a largely overarching role across all of the SRP scales. If we consider Honesty-Humility and altruism to be essentially at the core of SRP psychopathy, it makes sense for some items from these scales to be relevant to the ASB facet; all of the SRP facets, including ASB, are strongly correlated with each other. However, compared to the other facets, ASB does not seem to have as many HEXACO items that capture its unique variance (e.g., the role that Conscientiousness items have in capturing ELS). Thus, it seems that the HEXACO is able to somewhat capture the variance that ASB shares with the other SRP facets, but is less able to capture the variance that differentiates it from the other facets.

As mentioned in Study 1, there is an ongoing debate about the relationship between psychopathy and antisocial behaviour. Some researchers adhere to the notion that antisocial behaviour is a core feature of psychopathy (e.g., Hare & Neumann, 2010; Neumann et al., 2015). This view is clearly reflected in Hare's conceptualization of the construct through the specific inclusion of the ASB facet. Others have questioned the

inclusion of this facet (e.g., Cooke et al., 2006; Skeem & Cooke, 2010a, 2010b), arguing against the idea that antisocial *behaviour* can be considered a fundamental part of a *personality* construct. Importantly, neither side of the debate denies there being a strong association between psychopathic personality and antisocial behaviour; instead, the disagreement centers around the nature of this association. Thus, those who disagree with the inclusion of antisocial behaviour within the definition of psychopathy typically view engaging in antisocial behaviour as a consequence of possessing psychopathic personality traits.

The present findings support an association between antisocial behaviour and HEXACO personality traits, namely Honesty-Humility and altruism. However, as the overlap between the HEXACO and the ASB facet was markedly less than that of the other SRP scales, the results suggest a possible distinction between psychopathic *personality* traits, which overlap with HEXACO personality traits, and antisocial *behaviours*. It is worth noting that while the IPM, CA, and ELS scales of the SRP focus on assessing psychopathic tendencies or beliefs (e.g., “I rarely follow the rules”; “Most people are wimps”), the ASB scale more so assesses lifetime prevalence of particular antisocial behaviours (e.g., “I have assaulted a law enforcement official or social worker”; “I purposely tried to hit someone with the vehicle I was driving”). Thus, while individuals with higher levels of psychopathic personality traits are presumably more likely to engage in these acts, it does seem more fitting to treat one’s lifetime prevalence of these (often very specific) behaviours as possible consequences or outcomes of a malevolent personality construct rather than inherent features of it.

Using the Power Proxies with Different Age Groups

Throughout this program of research, we constructed and/or tested the Power Proxies in three different age groups ($M = 20.69$, 14.64 , and 40.26 years old for Studies 1–3, respectively). While the results of the studies generally support the proxies' abilities to adequately function in each of these age groups, there were some inconsistencies in the findings. For example, compared to the primarily young adult sample of Study 1, the youth sample of Study 2 demonstrated less benefit to using the male-specific proxies; the female-specific F2 proxy also performed worse than the general proxy in Study 2, which did not happen in Study 1. In addition, when examining how the HEXACO items met the cutoff for the various SRP scales in Study 3, there was somewhat more overlap in men than what was found in the comparatively younger adult sample of Study 1.

It is possible that the associations between the individual HEXACO items and the SRP scales may change somewhat with age. Indeed, although personality traits are considered relatively stable, they are not completely unchanging. For example, barring a short-lived decrease during adolescence, Honesty-Humility has been found to generally increase with age (Ashton & Lee, 2016). This increase also seems to be greater in men, meaning sex differences in Honesty-Humility become somewhat less apparent at older ages (Ashton & Lee, 2016). Age trends have been observed in the other HEXACO domains as well, but the strengths and directions of the relationships tend to differ more according to facet (Ashton & Lee, 2016).

If different age groups tend to score higher or lower on certain personality traits on average, the HEXACO items that are most relevant to capturing psychopathy might also differ by age. As discussed in Studies 1 and 3, some of the sex differences in the magnitudes of the relations between the HEXACO items and SRP scales were

conceivably explained by sex differences in the mean ratings of the items. For instance, when scored in the direction indicative of psychopathic traits, some of the items that were more strongly positively related to the SRP scales in women also had lower average ratings in women. Thus, even though these items probably assess traits that are relevant to psychopathy in both sexes, they are likely more able to distinguish between high and low psychopathy levels in women, resulting in stronger correlations with the SRP scales. Hypothetically, this logic can be extended to age by substituting any two age groups in place of men and women. That is, some HEXACO items might be relevant to the expression of psychopathic traits across the lifespan, but their relative ability to *predict* psychopathy levels might differ by age (if the average ratings on these items differ between the age groups). Therefore, the HEXACO items that would meet our criteria for inclusion on the proxy scales might also differ in some ways depending on the average age of the sample that is used.

Although the specific combinations of HEXACO items that would optimally capture the SRP scales could very well differ with age, we do not believe the inconsistent findings between the studies are prevalent enough to conclude that the proxies cannot be used with different age groups. On the contrary, even if the original proxies created in Study 1 are optimized to capture psychopathy in young adults, they still related to several psychopathy-relevant variables in a youth sample and a largely middle-aged sample. Likewise, even if the HEXACO-100 items that were incorporated into the proxies in Study 3 are optimized to capture psychopathy in a middle-aged sample, it is unlikely that these new items would be entirely unrelated to the SRP scales in younger samples.

In sum, we believe that the present findings provide evidence that the Power Proxies can be reasonably used with samples of different ages. Across the three studies, we created and/or tested the proxy scales in individuals whose ages ranged from 12 to 74, and although the results did not correspond perfectly in all cases, the proxies functioned as intended in each age group.

Addressing Concerns About Applying Psychopathy to Youth Populations

Though multiple instruments have been developed to assess psychopathic traits in children and adolescents (e.g., Andershed et al., 2002; Forth et al., 2003; Frick, 2004; Frick & Hare, 2001), and past research has demonstrated similarities in psychopathic traits in adults and youths (e.g., Brandt et al., 1997; Campbell et al., 2004; Edens et al., 2006; Kosson et al., 2013; Leistico et al., 2008; Lynam et al., 2005; Murrie et al., 2004; Neumann et al., 2006), the application of the construct of psychopathy to younger individuals has not gone undisputed. Some authors have highlighted concerns associated with generalizing the psychopathy construct to younger populations. One such concern is the weight associated with being labelled a psychopath (Petrila & Skeem, 2003). The Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003) was constructed as a risk assessment tool to be used in forensic settings. Further, psychopathy has a notorious reputation as an untreatable condition. As a result, receiving the label of “psychopath” has major implications for the treatment and sentencing of individuals in the justice system; a high psychopathy score is typically an aggravating factor (Morse, 2008), leading to harsher sentences and less opportunities for rehabilitation. It has been argued that applying such a label to juvenile offenders could lead to these individuals receiving similarly harsh treatment within the justice system, though the malleability of

psychopathic traits in youth has not been extensively researched (Edens et al., 2001; Petrila & Skeem, 2003). If psychopathic traits are more likely to respond to intervention in younger individuals than what is often found in adults, it would be extremely unfortunate for youth offenders scoring highly on measures of psychopathic traits to fall into the same category as the “untreatable” psychopathic adults, subsequently receiving harsher treatment in lieu of possibly beneficial intervention.

Another concern associated with applying psychopathy to children and adolescents relates to how aspects of normal development in youth can somewhat mirror certain prototypical psychopathic traits (Edens et al., 2001; Seagrave & Grisso, 2002). For example, youths tend to be more impulsive and engage in more risky and delinquent behaviour than adults. However, some degree of rebellion is a relatively normal part of the transition from youthhood to adulthood, and many youths who engage in these behaviours do not continue them as they get older (Seagrave & Grisso, 2002). Thus, certain characteristics that conceptually fall into the erratic lifestyle and antisocial behaviour facets of psychopathy may be temporarily manifested in younger individuals as part of normative development, not necessarily as precursors to adult psychopathy (Seagrave & Grisso, 2002). Importantly, Seagrave and Grisso (2002) acknowledge that there are some youths who will become psychopathic adults, and that these youths will have likely displayed warning signs throughout childhood and adolescence. Thus, the assertion is not that the traits used to identify psychopathic adults are irrelevant to identifying psychopathic development in youth, but that the false positive rate of identifying youths who will go on to become psychopathic adults may be problematic due to several of these traits temporarily manifesting in youth (Edens et al., 2001;

Seagrave & Grisso, 2002). Indeed, research suggests that the link between child and adult psychopathy is modest at best, implying that a considerable portion of those who display psychopathic traits in youth will not become psychopathic adults (Salekin et al., 2009).

We recognize that the weight of the “psychopath” label and the potentially problematic false positive rate of psychopathy in juvenile forensic settings are valid arguments against applying the construct of psychopathy to children and adolescents. However, we believe that these concerns are beyond the scope of the present research due to the nature and intended use of the Power Proxies. The proxies are not diagnostic tools by any measure, but tools for research. Accordingly, they are not intended to be used to identify psychopathic individuals in forensic settings. They were based on the SRP, which in and of itself is not a diagnostic tool. The SRP is considered a measure of *subclinical* psychopathy, as it cannot determine whether one’s levels of psychopathic traits reach the threshold for diagnosis. In order to determine whether one meets enough criteria to be classified as a psychopath, a professional must perform an assessment using the PCL-R. In short, the intent of Study 2 was not to argue for or against the appropriateness of using psychopathy measures to aid decision making in juvenile forensic settings, but to simply determine how the Power Proxies, which were created using an adult sample, function in a youth sample.

It is also important to emphasize that the findings of Study 2 provide evidence that the Power Proxies are able to *concurrently* relate to psychopathy-relevant variables in non-offender youths, but this does not mean they are able to accurately predict future behaviour, much less assess the risk of recidivism in juvenile offenders. As many adolescents may exhibit a temporary increase in certain psychopathic traits (Edens et al.,

2001; Seagrave & Grisso, 2002), the relations found in Study 2 between the proxies and the external variables are likely stronger than what would be found in longitudinal studies. For instance, the proxies were found to be related to several types of aggression. However, we cannot assume that the magnitudes of these concurrent relations in adolescence would accurately reflect the relations between the proxies in adolescence and aggression in adulthood; individuals who exhibit a decrease in psychopathic traits as they get older may very well exhibit a coinciding decrease in their aggression levels. In this case, psychopathy levels in youth would overestimate aggression levels in adulthood because the decrease in psychopathic traits over time was not taken into consideration.

In sum, we maintain that it would be appropriate to use the Power Proxies in youth samples to concurrently relate to variables in research settings, but it would be inappropriate to use them to predict future behaviour or assess risk, especially in forensic settings.

Overall Sex Difference Findings

Several of the correlations between the HEXACO items and SRP scales in Studies 1 and 3 were identified as differing by potentially meaningful magnitudes between men and women (i.e., at least a small effect; Cohen, 1988). Further, the HEXACO items were more likely to have stronger associations with the SRP scales in women in both studies. Women, on average, display lower levels of prototypical psychopathic traits/behaviours than men (e.g., Forth et al., 1996; Hare, 1991; Salekin et al., 1997; Verona & Vitale, 2006; Zágón & Jackson, 1994). Correspondingly, it seems that they also score lower, on average, on several HEXACO items that are indicative of psychopathic traits. Therefore, as previously discussed, some of the items' stronger associations with psychopathy in

women are seemingly because these items are simply more able to distinguish between high and low psychopathy levels in women compared to men, not because they illustrate female-typical expressions of psychopathic traits.

Because we were concerned with identifying potential sex differences in specific traits/behaviours, we focused more on the content of the items that differed in their correlations with the SRP scales between men and women than on which HEXACO domains or facets these items came from. Though we examined a different set of HEXACO items in each study (i.e., the HEXACO-60 items vs. the 40 new HEXACO-100 items), there were certain reoccurring themes that can be identified between the two studies in terms of how psychopathy in women may be specifically expressed. Note that these traits/behaviours are not necessarily irrelevant to psychopathy in men, but they do seem to be *more* relevant to capturing psychopathy in women. In both studies, the SRP scales in women were more strongly associated with having a quick temper, being impulsive, experiencing negative affect, and not fearing physical danger.

Notably, not fearing physical danger was the only one of these traits that tended to differ much in ratings between men and women (women reported fearing physical danger more strongly on average). Thus, although both psychopathic men and psychopathic women would likely report low levels of fear when it comes to physical danger, this lack of fear seems to be a better indicator of high psychopathy levels in women. The items associated with the remaining traits had very similar ratings between men and women, implying that they may be more likely getting at traits that are actually expressed more strongly in psychopathic women compared to psychopathic men.

As discussed in Studies 1 and 3, psychopathy has previously been found to have stronger associations with borderline personality disorder (BPD) in women compared to men (Wynn et al., 2012), with some researchers going so far as to consider the possibility that BPD may essentially be a female-typical form of psychopathy (e.g., Sprague et al., 2012). For this reason, we are not surprised that having a quick temper and being impulsive were more strongly related to the SRP scales in women, as they are both symptoms of BPD (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Further, negative affect is conceptually related to other BPD characteristics (e.g., chronic feelings of emptiness). While it is beyond the scope of the present research to attempt to answer the question of whether or not BPD is truly a female-typical variant of psychopathy, the finding that BPD symptomology was more strongly related to the SRP scales in women in both Studies 1 and 3 certainly provides further support that psychopathy and BPD are more closely connected in women than is the case in men.

Limitations

As noted in previous chapters, the data in this program of research was self-report. As a result, we cannot determine the extent to which shared method bias might have influenced the results. For example, if participants tended to view themselves as generally “good” or “bad” people, their ratings across all measures could have been biased to reflect this view (Furr, 2018). This bias could then lead to inflated correlations between the psychopathy proxies and the psychopathy-relevant variables, as most of these variables have a similar (presumably negative) valence (i.e., it is unlikely that participants would view many of these traits/behaviours as attributes of a fundamentally “good” person). In order to account for shared method variance, it would be

advantageous to examine the associations between the self-report proxy scales and various external variables that are measured using different methodologies, such as observer reports or direct observation of relevant behaviours.

Another limitation associated with self-report data is the potential for social desirability bias to influence the findings. Several malevolent personality traits and behaviours were assessed throughout the studies, so it is certainly possible that participants were not always truthful in their responses. That said, all participants were informed that their responses would be confidential and would not be associated with any identifying information. Still, socially desirable responding is always a potential issue when relying on self-report measures.

Each of the studies in this program of research employed a cross-sectional design. As a result, while we have demonstrated that the Power Proxies are able to concurrently relate to psychopathy-relevant variables, we have not shown that they can predict future behaviours or outcomes. This may be considered an overall limitation of this research. However, as mentioned above when describing the application of the proxies to youth populations, the purpose of the proxies is not necessarily to use them to predict future behaviour, and definitely not to assess risk in forensic settings. The SRP, which the proxies are based on, is intended to be used with the general population for research purposes (e.g., investigating how psychopathy relates to other constructs), not to assess future risk. Thus, we would not recommend using the proxies in situations where the SRP should not be used. That said, it is possible to employ longitudinal designs to determine how SRP scores predict future outcomes purely for research purposes, where there are no punitive implications for participants. Therefore, there are situations in which using the

SRP to predict future behaviour may not be problematic. Additional research would be needed to determine whether the SRP scales and the corresponding proxies similarly relate to variables measured at different timepoints.

It should be noted that the sample size for Study 1 ($n = 1,346$), where we created the original HEXACO-60 proxies, was significantly larger than the sample size for Study 3 ($n = 471$), where we updated the proxies to include HEXACO-100 items. As described above, a possible explanation for the inconsistencies found between these studies is the different ages of the samples. However, any of these inconsistencies could have been the result of some other characteristic(s) of one or both samples. The purpose of having a large sample size in research studies is to increase the chances of reporting accurate results that are representative of the population. Thus, it might be pertinent to have slightly more confidence in the generalizability of the original HEXACO-60 proxy items chosen in Study 1 compared to the HEXACO-100 items that were added in Study 3; the correlations between the HEXACO items and SRP scales in Study 1 may more closely represent the true population correlations due to the much larger sample that was used. That said, the items chosen in Study 3 tend to align with the items from Study 1, so we are not overly concerned about this possible issue.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we have shown that there is considerable overlap between the HEXACO model of personality and SRP psychopathy, providing further evidence that the HEXACO's incorporation of "dark" personality variance gives the model an advantage over other models of personality in capturing bad-natured constructs. Though most of the SRP scales were adequately captured by the HEXACO items, ASB was the

exception, a finding that contributes to the long-standing debate pertaining to the role of antisocial behaviour in models of psychopathy. Further, constructing the proxies with possible sex differences in mind, as well as creating versions that allowed overlapping items between scales, resulted in proxies that correlated more strongly with psychopathy-relevant variables than did a previous attempt to capture the SRP scales using HEXACO items. Lastly, several potentially meaningful sex differences in how the HEXACO items relate to the SRP scales were identified, many of which coincide with previous research and theory (e.g., psychopathy is more strongly associated with BPD symptomology in women compared to men). Overall, this program of research demonstrates that, despite their labels, “normal” personality traits and “abnormal” personality constructs are not decidedly mutually exclusive, as inventories designed to assess basic personality can be used to estimate psychopathy scores. Moreover, these studies highlight how it can be beneficial to approach research questions without the assumption that the findings would not differ as a function of sex.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>
- Andershed, H., Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Levander, S. (2002). Psychopathic traits in non-referred youths: A new assessment tool. In E. Blaauw & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Psychopaths: Current international perspectives* (pp. 131–158). Elsevier.
- Ashton, M. C. (2018). *Individual differences and personality* (3rd ed.). Academic Press.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878>
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2016). Age trends in HEXACO-PI-R self-reports. *Journal of Research in Personality, 64*, 102–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.08.008>
- Blonigen D. M., Hicks, B. M., Krueger, R. F., Patrick, C. J., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Psychopathic personality traits: Heritability and genetic overlap with internalizing and externalizing psychopathology. *Psychological Medicine, 35*, 637–648. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704004180>
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., Blais, J., Hosker-Field, A., Methot-Jones, T., Gauthier, N. Y., Volk, A., Holden, R. R., & D'Agata, M. T. (2016). Unpacking more “evil”: What is at the core of the dark tetrad? *Personality and Individual Differences, 90*, 269–272. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.009>
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., & Volk, A. A. (2015). Unpacking “evil”: Claiming the core of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 73*, 29–38. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.016>

- Brandt, J. R., Kennedy, W. A., Patrick, C. J., & Curtin, J. J. (1997). Assessment of psychopathy in a population of incarcerated adolescent offenders. *Psychological Assessment, 9*, 429–435. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.9.4.429>
- Campbell, M. A., Porter, S., & Santor, D. (2004). Psychopathic traits in adolescent offenders: An evaluation of criminal history, clinical, and psychosocial correlates. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 22*, 23–47. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.572>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- Cooke, D. J., Michie, C., & Hart, S. D. (2006). Facets of clinical psychopathy: Toward clearer measurement. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 91–106). Guilford Press.
- Decuyper, M., De Pauw, S., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., & De Clercq, B. J. (2009). A meta-analysis of psychopathy-, antisocial PD- and FFM associations. *European Journal of Personality, 23*, 531–565. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.729>
- Edens, J. F., Campbell, J. S., Weir, J. M. (2006). Youth psychopathy and criminal recidivism: A meta-analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist measures. *Law and Human Behavior, 31*, 53–75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9019-y>
- Edens, J. F., Skeem, J. L., Cruise, K. R., & Cauffman, E. (2001). Assessment of “juvenile psychopathy” and its association with violence: A critical review. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 19*, 53–80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.425>
- Forouzan, E., & Cooke, D. J. (2005). Figuring out la femme fatale: Conceptual and assessment issues concerning psychopathy in females. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 23*, 765–778. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.669>

- Forth, A. E., Brown, S. L., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1996). The assessment of psychopathy in male and female noncriminals: Reliability and validity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 20*, 531–543. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(95\)00221-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(95)00221-9)
- Forth, A. E., Kosson, D., & Hare, R. (2003). *Manual for the Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Frick, P. J. (2004). *The Inventory of Callous-Unemotional Traits* [Unpublished rating scale].
- Frick, P., & Hare, R. D. (2001). *Manual for the Antisocial Process Screening Device*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Furr, R. M. (2018). *Psychometrics: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Grann, M. (2000). The PCL-R and gender. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 16*, 147–149. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.16.3.147>
- Hare, R. D. (1991). *Manual for the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Manual for the Revised Psychopathy Checklist* (2nd ed.). Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2010). The role of antisociality in the psychopathy construct: Comment on Skeem and Cooke (2010). *Psychological Assessment, 22*, 446–454. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013635>
- Hodson, G., Book, A., Visser, B. A., Volk, A. A., Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2018). Is the Dark Triad common factor distinct from low Honesty-Humility? *Journal of Research in Personality, 73*, 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.012>

- Jackson, R. L., Rogers, R., Neumann, C. S., & Lambert, P. L. (2002). Psychopathy in female offenders: An investigation of its underlying dimensions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29*, 692–704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009385402237922>
- Kosson, D. S., Neumann, C. S., Forth, A. E., Salekin, R. T., Hare, R. D., Krischer, M. K., & Sevecke, K. (2013). Factor structure of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL:YV) in adolescent females. *Psychological Assessment, 25*, 71–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028986>
- Kreis, M. K. F., & Cooke, D. J. (2012). The manifestation of psychopathic traits in women: An exploration using case examples. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 11*, 267–279. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2012.746755>
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 67*, 2–5. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.048>
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment, 25*, 543–556. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191116659134>
- Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., Visser, B. A., & Gallucci, A. (2013). Sex, power, and money: Prediction from the Dark Triad and Honesty-Humility. *European Journal of Personality, 27*, 169–184. <http://doi.org/10.1002/per.1860>
- Leistico, A. R., Salekin, R. T., DeCoster, J., & Rogers, R. (2008). A large-scale meta-analysis relating the Hare measures of psychopathy to antisocial conduct. *Law and Human Behavior, 32*, 28–45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-007-9096-6>
- Lynam, D. R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Raine, A., Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M.

- (2005). Adolescent psychopathy and the Big Five: Results from two samples. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *33*, 431–443.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-005-5724-0>
- Međedović, J. (2017). Can HEXACO-PI-R adequately represent the four-factor model of psychopathy? *Psihologijske Teme*, *26*, 557–576. <http://doi.org/10.31820/pt.26.3.4>.
- Morse, S. J. (2008). Psychopathy and criminal responsibility. *Neuroethics*, *1*, 205–212.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-008-9021-9>
- Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the Dark Triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 183–204. <http://doi.org/10.1177/17456916166666070>
- Murrie, D. C., Cornell, D. G., Kaplan, S., McConville, D., & Levy-Elkon, A. (2004). Psychopathy scores and violence among juvenile offenders: A multi-measure study. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *22*, 49–67. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.573>
- Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D., & Pardini, D. A. (2015). Antisociality and the construct of psychopathy: Data from across the globe. *Journal of Personality*, *83*, 678–692.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12127>
- Neumann, C. S., Kosson, D. S., Forth, A. E., & Hare, R. D. (2006). Factor structure of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL:YV) in incarcerated adolescents. *Psychological Assessment*, *18*, 142–154.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.142>
- Nicholls, T. L., & Petrila, J. (2005). Gender and psychopathy: An overview of important

issues and introduction to the special issue. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 729–741. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.677>

O’Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the Dark Triad and Five-Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Personality*, 83, 644–664. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12126>

Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2016). *Manual for the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Fourth Edition*. Multi-Health Systems.

Petrla, J., & Skeem, J. L. (2003). An introduction to the special issues on juvenile psychopathy and some reflections on the current debate. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 21, 689–694. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.569>

Salekin, R. T., Rogers, R., & Sewell, K. W. (1997). Construct validity of psychopathy in a female offender sample: A multitrait-multimethod evaluation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 576–585. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.106.4.576>

Salekin, R. T., Rosenbaum, J., Lee, Z., & Lester, W. S. (2009). Child and adolescent psychopathy: Like a painting by Monet. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7, 239–255. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1541204009333832>

Seagrave, D., & Grisso, T. (2002). Adolescent development and the measurement of juvenile psychopathy. *Law and Human Behavior*, 26, 219–239. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014696110850>

Skeem, J. L., & Cooke, D. J. (2010a). Is criminal behavior a central component of

- psychopathy? Conceptual directions for resolving the debate. *Psychological Assessment*, 22, 433–445. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0008512>
- Skeem, J. L., & Cooke, D. J. (2010b). One measure does not a construct make: Directions toward reinvigorating psychopathy research — reply to Hare and Neumann (2010). *Psychological Assessment*, 22, 455–459. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0014862>
- Sprague, J., Javdani, S., Sadeh, N., Newman, J. P., & Verona, E. (2012). Borderline personality disorder as a female phenotypic expression of psychopathy? *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3, 127–139. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0024134>
- Strand, S., & Belfrage, H. (2005). Gender differences in psychopathy in a Swedish offender sample. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 837–850. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.674>
- Verona, E., & Vitale, J. (2006). Psychopathy in women: Assessment, manifestations, and etiology. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 415–436). Guilford Press.
- Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., Collison, K. L., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Differences among Dark Triad components: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 9, 101–111. <http://doi.org/10.1037/per0000222>
- Wynn, R., Høiseth, M. H., & Pettersen, G. (2012). Psychopathy in women: Theoretical and clinical perspectives. *International Journal of Women's Health*, 4, 257–263. <http://doi.org/10.2147/IJWH.S25518>
- Zágon, I. K., & Jackson, H. J. (1994). Construct validity of a psychopathy measure.

Personality and Individual Differences, 17, 125–135. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)90269-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90269-0)

Appendix A: Supplemental Tables

Table A2-1
Means and Standard Deviations of Study 1 Variables

	Men		Women		Total	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dataset 1						
Interpersonal manipulation	2.95	0.61	2.53	0.62	2.69	0.64
Callous affect	2.68	0.54	2.25	0.50	2.42	0.56
Erratic lifestyle	3.02	0.53	2.73	0.58	2.84	0.58
Antisocial behaviour	1.75	0.56	1.55	0.47	1.63	0.52
Factor 1	2.81	0.52	2.39	0.52	2.56	0.56
Factor 2	2.38	0.47	2.14	0.46	2.23	0.48
Total psychopathy	2.60	0.44	2.27	0.45	2.40	0.48
Exploitativeness	0.42	0.31	0.31	0.26	0.35	0.29
Entitlement	0.39	0.23	0.29	0.24	0.33	0.24
Vengeance	3.55	0.99	3.14	0.94	3.31	0.98
SDRT	2.75	0.85	2.13	0.76	2.38	0.85
STMO	3.85	1.19	2.99	1.06	3.33	1.19
LTMO	4.12	0.83	4.39	0.73	4.29	0.78
Proactive aggression	0.31	0.30	0.19	0.24	0.24	0.27
Reactive aggression	0.81	0.38	0.76	0.36	0.78	0.37
Narcissism	3.03	0.56	2.88	0.56	2.94	0.56
Psychopathy	2.47	0.59	2.10	0.62	2.24	0.64
Machiavellianism	3.25	0.66	2.94	0.70	3.06	0.70
Sadism	2.60	0.56	1.95	0.50	2.20	0.61
Dataset 2						
Interpersonal manipulation	2.81	0.59	2.41	0.57	2.57	0.61
Callous affect	2.62	0.50	2.13	0.50	2.33	0.55
Erratic lifestyle	2.86	0.59	2.50	0.56	2.65	0.60
Antisocial behaviour	1.66	0.51	1.49	0.53	1.56	0.53
Factor 1	2.71	0.49	2.27	0.49	2.45	0.53
Factor 2	2.26	0.47	2.00	0.47	2.10	0.49
Total psychopathy	2.49	0.43	2.13	0.45	2.28	0.47
PATD	6.24	2.04	5.09	1.97	5.56	2.08
Lie frequency	2.84	1.08	2.37	0.77	2.56	0.93
Lie ease	3.08	1.25	2.52	1.17	2.75	1.23
Lie severity	2.30	0.91	2.16	0.71	2.21	0.80
Lie success	3.71	1.08	3.73	0.90	3.72	0.98
Lie anxiety	2.31	1.16	3.15	1.13	2.81	1.21
Lie guilt	2.69	1.22	3.34	1.15	3.07	1.22
Lie fear	2.25	1.07	2.76	1.26	2.55	1.21
Lie enjoyment	1.96	1.08	1.64	0.95	1.77	1.01
Lie pride	1.75	1.02	1.50	0.87	1.60	0.94

Note. SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

Table A2-2*HEXACO-60 Items in General Proxy Scales (Non-Overlapping)*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2
6r (H: sincerity)	x				x	
30 (H: sincerity)	x				x	
54r (H: sincerity)	x				x	
12 (H: fairness)	x				x	
36r (H: fairness)	x				x	
60 (H: fairness)	x					x
24 (H: modesty)	x				x	
48 (H: modesty)	x				x	
29r (E: fearfulness)			x			
41 (E: dependence)		x				
23r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
59 (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
27r (A: forgiveness)	x				x	
9 (A: gentleness)		x			x	
57 (A: flexibility)	x				x	
21 (A: patience)		x			x	
2r (C: organization)			x			x
20 (C: prudence)			x			x
44 (C: prudence)			x			x
56 (C: prudence)			x			x
# of items	10	6	5	-	14	5
Cronbach's α	.75	.59	.57	-	.74	.62
Convergent r	.68	.69	.58	-	.74	.55
M	2.70	2.65	2.68	-	2.66	2.60
SD	0.63	0.63	0.63	-	0.53	0.69

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A2-3

General Proxies' (Non-Overlapping) Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.52	.37	.22	.54	.25
Entitlement	.46	.39	.21	.50	.23
Vengeance	.60	.47	.25	.66	.30
SDRT	.56	.52	.47	.59	.48
STMO	.45	.39	.39	.48	.39
LTMO	-.30	-.38	-.23	-.38	-.24
Proactive aggression	.53	.38	.31	.55	.39
Reactive aggression	.49	.30	.24	.51	.33
Narcissism	.39	.09	.17	.35	.16
Psychopathy	.64	.55	.47	.69	.52
Machiavellianism	.68	.47	.29	.70	.40
Sadism	.55	.57	.45	.62	.47
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.58	.32	.29	.54	.38
Lie frequency	.37	.22	.32	.37	.34
Lie ease	.41	.27	.36	.40	.37
Lie severity	.24	.12	.15	.23	.20
Lie success	.20	.08	.07	.19	.09
Lie anxiety	-.32	-.28	-.23	-.34	-.26
Lie guilt	-.29	-.33	-.25	-.34	-.28
Lie fear	-.22	-.22	-.20	-.24	-.18
Lie enjoy	.24	.08	.24	.22	.25
Lie pride	.29	.15	.17	.29	.21

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

^a $n = 497$. ^b $n = 378$.

Table A2-4*HEXACO-60 Items in Male-Specific Proxy Scales (Non-Overlapping)*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2
6r (H: sincerity)	x				x	
30 (H: sincerity)	x				x	
54r (H: sincerity)	x				x	
12 (H: fairness)			x		x	
36r (H: fairness)	x				x	
60 (H: fairness)	x					x
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	x				x	
24 (H: modesty)	x				x	
48 (H: modesty)	x				x	
29r (E: fearfulness)			x			
41 (E: dependence)		x				
23r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
59 (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
3r (A: forgiveness)		x			x	
27r (A: forgiveness)		x			x	
9 (A: gentleness)		x			x	
51r (A: gentleness)	x				x	
57 (A: flexibility)	x				x	
21 (A: patience)		x				x
2r (C: organization)			x			x
20 (C: prudence)			x			x
44 (C: prudence)			x			x
56 (C: prudence)			x			x
# of items	10	8	6	-	16	6
Cronbach's α	.76	.59	.54	-	.77	.59
Convergent r	.68	.65	.62	-	.73	.56
M	2.85	2.91	2.92	-	2.90	2.68
SD	0.64	0.55	0.61	-	0.53	0.64

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A2-5
Male-Specific Proxies' (Non-Overlapping) Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.47	.28	.17	.48	.17
Entitlement	.52	.38	.23	.53	.26
Vengeance	.53	.62	.27	.68	.30
SDRT	.50	.36	.48	.51	.43
STMO	.35	.27	.36	.40	.26
LTMO	-.25	-.38	-.23	-.35	-.27
Proactive aggression	.46	.30	.38	.47	.44
Reactive aggression	.46	.32	.27	.47	.39
Narcissism	.54	.04	.13	.39	.19
Psychopathy	.53	.49	.48	.58	.53
Machiavellianism	.62	.48	.25	.68	.28
Sadism	.48	.53	.46	.59	.49
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.55	.32	.32	.54	.32
Lie frequency	.34	.24	.30	.36	.32
Lie ease	.46	.29	.42	.47	.37
Lie severity	.25	.15	.24	.23	.30
Lie success	.30	.25	.22	.35	.17
Lie anxiety	-.37	-.31	-.22	-.40	-.20
Lie guilt	-.25	-.36	-.22	-.33	-.20
Lie fear	-.21	-.30	-.20	-.29	-.15
Lie enjoy	.23	.04	.17	.17	.26
Lie pride	.22	.16	.15	.22	.23

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

^a $n = 194$. ^b $n = 155$.

Table A2-6
HEXACO-60 Items in Female-Specific Proxy Scales (Non-Overlapping)

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2
6r (H: sincerity)	x				x	
30 (H: sincerity)	x				x	
54r (H: sincerity)	x				x	
12 (H: fairness)	x				x	
36r (H: fairness)	x				x	
60 (H: fairness)	x				x	
24 (H: modesty)	x				x	
48 (H: modesty)	x				x	
5r (E: fearfulness)		x				x
29r (E: fearfulness)			x			x
53 (E: fearfulness)			x			
17r (E: dependence)		x				
41 (E: dependence)		x			x	
23r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
59 (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
22r (X: liveliness)		x			x	
46 (X: liveliness)		x				
27r (A: forgiveness)	x				x	
9 (A: gentleness)	x				x	
15 (A: flexibility)	x				x	
57 (A: flexibility)	x				x	
21 (A: patience)	x				x	
2r (C: organization)			x			x
26 (C: organization)			x			
32 (C: diligence)	x				x	
20 (C: prudence)			x			x
44 (C: prudence)			x			x
56 (C: prudence)			x			x
# of items	14	8	7	-	19	6
Cronbach's α	.78	.64	.62	-	.78	.56
Convergent r	.67	.63	.57	-	.74	.52
M	2.65	2.50	2.54	-	2.59	2.58
SD	0.55	0.55	0.57	-	0.48	0.57

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A2-7
Female-Specific Proxies' (Non-Overlapping) Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.52	.32	.27	.54	.29
Entitlement	.41	.32	.20	.45	.21
Vengeance	.62	.35	.25	.64	.26
SDRT	.55	.53	.47	.61	.52
STMO	.41	.34	.32	.45	.38
LTMO	-.27	-.41	-.21	-.35	-.24
Proactive aggression	.56	.24	.30	.56	.28
Reactive aggression	.57	.18	.25	.55	.23
Narcissism	.29	.00	.16	.25	.19
Psychopathy	.69	.46	.46	.73	.47
Machiavellianism	.70	.32	.39	.69	.35
Sadism	.54	.51	.44	.61	.47
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.49	.24	.25	.51	.28
Lie frequency	.35	.09	.28	.32	.32
Lie ease	.31	.16	.31	.32	.29
Lie severity	.22	.01	.05	.19	.04
Lie success	.10	-.07	-.02	.07	.03
Lie anxiety	-.18	-.17	-.21	-.23	-.20
Lie guilt	-.22	-.27	-.28	-.28	-.29
Lie fear	-.13	-.17	-.18	-.17	-.21
Lie enjoy	.24	.03	.21	.21	.25
Lie pride	.32	.15	.14	.32	.17

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

^a $n = 302$. ^b $n = 223$.

Table A2-8

General IPM Proxy's and Međedović's IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.522	.508	.014	1.10	.270
Entitlement	.471	.468	.003	0.23	.819
Vengeance	.616	.611	.005	0.43	.669
SDRT	.561	.518	.043	3.48	.001
STMO	.455	.401	.054	4.02	<.001
LTMO	-.305	-.273	.032	2.24	.025
Proactive aggression	.539	.520	.019	1.52	.128
Reactive aggression	.511	.523	.012	0.95	.342
Narcissism	.383	.423	.040	2.98	.003
Psychopathy	.653	.625	.028	2.50	.013
Machiavellianism	.697	.674	.023	2.17	.030
Sadism	.562	.507	.055	4.47	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.564	.522	.042	2.84	.004
Lie frequency	.381	.354	.027	1.63	.103
Lie ease	.398	.395	.003	0.18	.854
Lie severity	.245	.251	.006	0.35	.727
Lie success	.206	.220	.014	0.80	.425
Lie anxiety	-.304	-.284	.020	1.17	.241
Lie guilt	-.279	-.243	.036	2.09	.036
Lie fear	-.198	-.173	.025	1.43	.153
Lie enjoyment	.239	.239	.000	0.00	1.000
Lie pride	.296	.299	.003	0.18	.860

Note. A = General IPM proxy; B = Međedović's IPM proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 492$, $r_{AB} = .947$. ^b $n = 377$, $r_{AB} = .941$.

Table A2-9

General CA Proxy's and Međedović's CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.476	.400	.076	2.42	.015
Entitlement	.498	.387	.111	3.56	<.001
Vengeance	.600	.370	.230	7.73	<.001
SDRT	.676	.509	.167	6.22	<.001
STMO	.506	.396	.110	3.53	<.001
LTMO	-.397	-.341	.056	1.71	.044
Proactive aggression	.529	.259	.270	8.63	<.001
Reactive aggression	.436	.105	.331	10.04	<.001
Narcissism	.279	.185	.094	2.76	.006
Psychopathy	.703	.453	.250	9.43	<.001
Machiavellianism	.633	.374	.259	9.03	<.001
Sadism	.653	.533	.120	4.46	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.529	.315	.214	5.93	<.001
Lie frequency	.323	.127	.196	4.92	<.001
Lie ease	.392	.250	.142	3.67	<.001
Lie severity	.206	.005	.201	4.94	<.001
Lie success	.168	.033	.135	3.27	.001
Lie anxiety	-.369	-.283	.086	2.22	.026
Lie guilt	-.388	-.346	.042	1.10	.270
Lie fear	-.271	-.233	.038	0.96	.339
Lie enjoyment	.198	.018	.180	4.41	<.001
Lie pride	.261	.086	.175	4.34	<.001

Note. A = General CA proxy; B = Međedović's CA proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 492$, $r_{AB} = .697$. ^b $n = 377$, $r_{AB} = .683$.

Table A2-10
General ELS Proxy's and Međedović's ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.351	.311	.040	1.95	.051
Entitlement	.314	.286	.028	1.35	.178
Vengeance	.429	.419	.010	0.51	.612
SDRT	.628	.567	.061	3.57	<.001
STMO	.503	.468	.035	1.84	.065
LTMO	-.312	-.317	.005	0.24	.405
Proactive aggression	.472	.438	.034	1.77	.076
Reactive aggression	.388	.376	.012	0.60	.548
Narcissism	.219	.171	.048	2.27	.023
Psychopathy	.623	.600	.023	1.37	.171
Machiavellianism	.481	.454	.027	1.42	.154
Sadism	.573	.567	.006	0.34	.732
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.502	.376	.126	5.10	<.001
Lie frequency	.381	.386	.005	0.19	.847
Lie ease	.435	.366	.069	2.70	.007
Lie severity	.192	.211	.019	0.69	.489
Lie success	.169	.080	.089	3.17	.002
Lie anxiety	-.339	-.302	.037	1.39	.164
Lie guilt	-.366	-.331	.035	1.33	.183
Lie fear	-.277	-.258	.019	0.70	.482
Lie enjoyment	.250	.288	.038	1.41	.159
Lie pride	.229	.241	.012	0.44	.660

Note. A = General ELS proxy; B = Međedović's ELS proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 492$, $r_{AB} = .886$. ^b $n = 377$, $r_{AB} = .853$.

Table A2-11
Male-Specific IPM Proxy's and General IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.478	.499	.021	1.47	.143
Entitlement	.534	.517	.017	1.22	.224
Vengeance	.648	.610	.038	3.02	.003
SDRT	.502	.529	.027	1.94	.053
STMO	.406	.395	.011	0.73	.466
LTMO	-.286	-.299	.013	0.83	.409
Proactive aggression	.502	.518	.016	1.14	.254
Reactive aggression	.528	.505	.023	1.65	.099
Narcissism	.477	.472	.005	0.35	.728
Psychopathy	.598	.607	.009	0.69	.489
Machiavellianism	.668	.680	.012	1.00	.317
Sadism	.563	.561	.002	0.15	.881
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.550	.572	.022	1.47	.142
Lie frequency	.384	.389	.005	0.30	.767
Lie ease	.473	.478	.005	0.31	.756
Lie severity	.275	.270	.005	0.29	.775
Lie success	.334	.328	.006	0.35	.730
Lie anxiety	-.392	-.371	.021	1.24	.214
Lie guilt	-.292	-.289	.003	0.17	.864
Lie fear	-.263	-.238	.025	1.42	.157
Lie enjoyment	.218	.199	.019	1.07	.287
Lie pride	.252	.227	.025	1.41	.158

Note. A = Male-specific IPM proxy; B = General IPM proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .975$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .975$.

Table A2-12
Male-Specific CA Proxy's and General CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.425	.372	.053	2.38	.017
Entitlement	.516	.480	.036	1.71	.087
Vengeance	.687	.566	.121	6.75	<.001
SDRT	.553	.619	.066	3.42	.001
STMO	.379	.350	.029	1.28	.201
LTMO	-.402	-.387	.015	0.67	.503
Proactive aggression	.498	.471	.027	1.28	.201
Reactive aggression	.471	.381	.090	4.16	<.001
Narcissism	.288	.258	.030	1.29	.198
Psychopathy	.652	.628	.024	1.30	.193
Machiavellianism	.651	.618	.033	1.78	.075
Sadism	.638	.602	.036	1.93	.054
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.514	.503	.011	0.54	.591
Lie frequency	.352	.291	.061	2.69	.007
Lie ease	.438	.449	.011	0.51	.608
Lie severity	.255	.219	.036	1.56	.120
Lie success	.341	.334	.007	0.31	.758
Lie anxiety	-.397	-.397	.000	0.00	1.000
Lie guilt	-.364	-.382	.018	0.81	.417
Lie fear	-.313	-.304	.009	0.40	.692
Lie enjoyment	.166	.134	.032	1.35	.176
Lie pride	.214	.173	.041	1.75	.081

Note. A = Male-specific CA proxy; B = General CA proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .945$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .957$.

Table A2-13

Male-Specific ELS Proxy's and General ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.271	.247	.024	1.69	.092
Entitlement	.351	.316	.035	2.53	.012
Vengeance	.383	.372	.011	0.81	.419
SDRT	.585	.569	.016	1.35	.179
STMO	.396	.375	.021	1.55	.122
LTMO	-.246	-.274	.028	1.97	.049
Proactive aggression	.459	.469	.010	0.77	.439
Reactive aggression	.360	.351	.009	0.66	.510
Narcissism	.278	.217	.061	4.32	<.001
Psychopathy	.552	.564	.012	0.99	.321
Machiavellianism	.398	.362	.036	2.67	.008
Sadism	.536	.539	.003	0.25	.806
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.436	.422	.014	0.93	.352
Lie frequency	.318	.336	.018	1.14	.256
Lie ease	.505	.473	.032	2.20	.028
Lie severity	.250	.253	.003	0.19	.853
Lie success	.305	.278	.027	1.67	.094
Lie anxiety	-.349	-.317	.032	2.03	.043
Lie guilt	-.302	-.291	.011	0.69	.491
Lie fear	-.274	-.259	.015	0.93	.352
Lie enjoyment	.214	.193	.021	1.28	.200
Lie pride	.193	.174	.019	1.16	.248

Note. A = Male-specific ELS proxy; B = General ELS proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .980$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .979$.

Table A2-14

Male-Specific F1 Proxy's and General F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.463	.476	.013	1.06	.292
Entitlement	.534	.519	.015	1.27	.206
Vengeance	.679	.649	.030	2.92	.004
SDRT	.537	.563	.026	2.26	.024
STMO	.392	.380	.012	0.93	.352
LTMO	-.368	-.390	.022	1.70	.089
Proactive aggression	.512	.525	.013	1.10	.272
Reactive aggression	.514	.490	.024	2.01	.045
Narcissism	.396	.378	.018	1.41	.159
Psychopathy	.630	.640	.010	0.94	.349
Machiavellianism	.685	.695	.010	1.00	.317
Sadism	.615	.620	.005	0.46	.644
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.542	.563	.021	1.60	.111
Lie frequency	.365	.367	.002	0.14	.893
Lie ease	.466	.472	.006	0.43	.670
Lie severity	.248	.240	.008	0.52	.603
Lie success	.348	.347	.001	0.07	.947
Lie anxiety	-.402	-.388	.014	0.96	.339
Lie guilt	-.348	-.358	.010	0.67	.502
Lie fear	-.291	-.276	.015	0.98	.325
Lie enjoyment	.191	.170	.021	1.34	.180
Lie pride	.236	.212	.024	1.55	.122

Note. A = Male-specific F1 proxy; B = General F1 proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .982$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .981$.

Table A2-15

Male-Specific F2 Proxy's and General F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.291	.249	.042	3.22	.001
Entitlement	.362	.313	.049	3.85	<.001
Vengeance	.430	.392	.038	3.09	.002
SDRT	.562	.524	.038	3.39	.001
STMO	.353	.327	.026	2.04	.042
LTMO	-.318	-.293	.025	1.93	.053
Proactive aggression	.532	.508	.024	2.09	.036
Reactive aggression	.443	.437	.006	0.50	.620
Narcissism	.290	.228	.062	4.79	<.001
Psychopathy	.615	.584	.031	2.90	.004
Machiavellianism	.438	.385	.053	4.36	<.001
Sadism	.569	.554	.015	1.36	.175
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.445	.418	.027	2.06	.039
Lie frequency	.366	.359	.007	0.51	.608
Lie ease	.466	.434	.032	2.46	.014
Lie severity	.319	.299	.020	1.45	.148
Lie success	.260	.256	.004	0.28	.779
Lie anxiety	-.304	-.285	.019	1.36	.174
Lie guilt	-.245	-.254	.009	0.64	.524
Lie fear	-.210	-.212	.002	0.14	.889
Lie enjoyment	.268	.238	.030	2.13	.033
Lie pride	.245	.220	.025	1.76	.078

Note. A = Male-specific F2 proxy; B = General F2 proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .983$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .984$.

Table A2-16

Male-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's and General Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.478	.464	.014	0.87	.386
Entitlement	.538	.508	.030	1.93	.054
Vengeance	.657	.592	.065	4.68	<.001
SDRT	.582	.589	.007	0.48	.634
STMO	.427	.381	.046	2.75	.006
LTMO	-.339	-.339	.000	0.00	1.000
Proactive aggression	.542	.538	.004	0.26	.793
Reactive aggression	.511	.481	.030	1.91	.057
Narcissism	.416	.392	.024	1.45	.149
Psychopathy	.658	.646	.012	0.88	.382
Machiavellianism	.663	.657	.006	0.44	.659
Sadism	.643	.634	.009	0.65	.516
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.546	.566	.020	1.23	.217
Lie frequency	.360	.352	.008	0.43	.664
Lie ease	.510	.476	.034	1.99	.046
Lie severity	.283	.277	.006	0.32	.750
Lie success	.357	.325	.032	1.72	.086
Lie anxiety	-.403	-.390	.013	0.72	.472
Lie guilt	-.340	-.334	.006	0.32	.746
Lie fear	-.289	-.261	.028	1.48	.138
Lie enjoyment	.214	.201	.013	0.68	.499
Lie pride	.257	.217	.040	2.10	.036

Note. A = Male-specific total psychopathy proxy; B = General total psychopathy proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .969$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .971$.

Table A2-17
Male-Specific IPM Proxy's and Međedović's IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.478	.476	.002	0.09	.929
Entitlement	.534	.510	.024	1.11	.267
Vengeance	.648	.601	.047	2.40	.016
SDRT	.502	.505	.003	0.14	.890
STMO	.406	.363	.043	1.83	.067
LTMO	-.286	-.277	.009	0.37	.713
Proactive aggression	.502	.488	.014	0.64	.523
Reactive aggression	.528	.510	.018	0.84	.403
Narcissism	.477	.517	.040	1.83	.067
Psychopathy	.598	.580	.018	0.89	.375
Machiavellianism	.668	.641	.027	1.43	.153
Sadism	.563	.501	.062	2.94	.003
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.550	.516	.034	1.61	.108
Lie frequency	.384	.376	.008	0.34	.733
Lie ease	.473	.509	.036	1.64	.101
Lie severity	.275	.267	.008	0.33	.741
Lie success	.334	.342	.008	0.33	.739
Lie anxiety	-.392	-.378	.014	0.60	.549
Lie guilt	-.292	-.266	.026	1.07	.284
Lie fear	-.263	-.227	.036	1.47	.142
Lie enjoyment	.218	.239	.021	0.85	.393
Lie pride	.252	.241	.011	0.45	.653

Note. A = Male-specific IPM proxy; B = Međedović's IPM proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .940$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .952$.

Table A2-18

Male-Specific CA Proxy's and Međedović's CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.425	.311	.114	1.95	.051
Entitlement	.516	.265	.251	4.42	<.001
Vengeance	.687	.357	.330	6.64	<.001
SDRT	.553	.335	.218	3.99	<.001
STMO	.379	.208	.171	2.84	.005
LTMO	-.402	-.286	.116	1.96	.050
Proactive aggression	.498	.126	.372	6.46	<.001
Reactive aggression	.471	.029	.442	7.56	<.001
Narcissism	.288	.054	.234	3.79	<.001
Psychopathy	.652	.308	.344	6.69	<.001
Machiavellianism	.651	.374	.277	5.45	<.001
Sadism	.638	.348	.290	5.65	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.514	.272	.242	3.77	<.001
Lie frequency	.352	.048	.304	4.36	<.001
Lie ease	.438	.253	.185	2.77	.006
Lie severity	.255	-.027	.282	3.98	<.001
Lie success	.341	.183	.158	2.26	.024
Lie anxiety	-.397	-.279	.118	1.75	.080
Lie guilt	-.364	-.414	.050	0.76	.447
Lie fear	-.313	-.305	.008	0.12	.907
Lie enjoyment	.166	-.116	.282	3.22	.001
Lie pride	.214	-.059	.273	3.82	<.001

Note. A = Male-specific CA proxy; B = Međedović's CA proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .623$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .604$.

Table A2-19

Male-Specific ELS Proxy's and Međedović's ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.271	.141	.130	3.09	.002
Entitlement	.351	.230	.121	2.95	.003
Vengeance	.383	.297	.086	2.14	.032
SDRT	.585	.449	.136	3.82	<.001
STMO	.396	.293	.103	2.56	.010
LTMO	-.246	-.255	.009	0.22	.829
Proactive aggression	.459	.365	.094	2.44	.015
Reactive aggression	.360	.304	.056	1.39	.164
Narcissism	.278	.100	.178	4.27	<.001
Psychopathy	.552	.468	.084	2.32	.020
Machiavellianism	.398	.249	.149	3.72	<.001
Sadism	.536	.477	.059	1.63	.103
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.436	.287	.149	3.08	.002
Lie frequency	.318	.307	.011	0.22	.826
Lie ease	.505	.321	.184	3.91	<.001
Lie severity	.250	.289	.039	0.77	.440
Lie success	.305	.144	.161	3.12	.002
Lie anxiety	-.349	-.165	.184	3.63	<.001
Lie guilt	-.302	-.136	.166	3.25	.001
Lie fear	-.274	-.175	.099	1.93	.054
Lie enjoyment	.214	.229	.015	0.29	.771
Lie pride	.193	.218	.025	0.48	.628

Note. A = Male-specific ELS proxy; B = Međedović's ELS proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 192$, $r_{AB} = .828$. ^b $n = 154$, $r_{AB} = .790$.

Table A2-20

Female-Specific IPM Proxy's and General IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.508	.506	.002	0.13	.900
Entitlement	.411	.407	.004	0.24	.813
Vengeance	.637	.592	.045	3.09	.002
SDRT	.568	.541	.027	1.76	.078
STMO	.431	.419	.012	0.71	.477
LTMO	-.302	-.267	.035	1.95	.051
Proactive aggression	.570	.526	.044	2.87	.004
Reactive aggression	.575	.511	.064	4.18	<.001
Narcissism	.249	.301	.052	2.95	.003
Psychopathy	.720	.650	.070	5.41	<.001
Machiavellianism	.709	.684	.025	1.92	.054
Sadism	.577	.533	.044	2.91	.004
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.488	.516	.028	1.38	.166
Lie frequency	.351	.308	.043	1.94	.053
Lie ease	.328	.276	.052	2.31	.021
Lie severity	.226	.197	.029	1.26	.208
Lie success	.094	.103	.009	0.38	.703
Lie anxiety	-.191	-.169	.022	0.95	.344
Lie guilt	-.241	-.203	.038	1.65	.100
Lie fear	-.137	-.118	.019	0.81	.417
Lie enjoyment	.243	.231	.012	0.52	.600
Lie pride	.334	.328	.006	0.27	.787

Note. A = Female-specific IPM proxy; B = General IPM proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .950$. ^b $n = 223$, $r_{AB} = .939$.

Table A2-21

Female-Specific CA Proxy's and General CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.487	.502	.015	0.81	.420
Entitlement	.445	.462	.017	0.89	.373
Vengeance	.592	.587	.005	0.29	.774
SDRT	.697	.645	.052	3.34	.001
STMO	.479	.466	.013	0.68	.494
LTMO	-.400	-.355	.045	2.25	.025
Proactive aggression	.515	.526	.011	0.60	.546
Reactive aggression	.472	.473	.001	0.05	.958
Narcissism	.198	.247	.049	2.36	.018
Psychopathy	.736	.696	.040	2.76	.006
Machiavellianism	.604	.602	.002	0.12	.905
Sadism	.657	.595	.062	3.81	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.455	.468	.013	0.59	.557
Lie frequency	.308	.243	.065	2.70	.007
Lie ease	.303	.263	.040	1.66	.097
Lie severity	.144	.162	.018	0.72	.469
Lie success	.022	.047	.025	0.99	.323
Lie anxiety	-.229	-.211	.018	0.73	.464
Lie guilt	-.323	-.294	.029	1.21	.227
Lie fear	-.207	-.171	.036	1.46	.145
Lie enjoyment	.198	.179	.019	0.77	.442
Lie pride	.305	.291	.014	0.58	.559

Note. A = Female-specific CA proxy; B = General CA proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .933$. ^b $n = 223$, $r_{AB} = .931$.

Table A2-22

Female-Specific ELS Proxy's and General ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.438	.368	.070	3.46	.001
Entitlement	.320	.252	.068	3.20	.001
Vengeance	.471	.413	.058	2.90	.004
SDRT	.645	.610	.035	2.05	.040
STMO	.476	.475	.001	0.05	.959
LTMO	-.313	-.284	.029	1.36	.175
Proactive aggression	.478	.427	.051	2.60	.009
Reactive aggression	.437	.404	.033	1.65	.100
Narcissism	.200	.179	.021	0.97	.332
Psychopathy	.664	.606	.058	3.48	.001
Machiavellianism	.580	.499	.081	4.44	<.001
Sadism	.582	.525	.057	3.15	.002
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.495	.502	.007	0.33	.740
Lie frequency	.382	.349	.033	1.45	.147
Lie ease	.369	.344	.025	1.09	.275
Lie severity	.123	.103	.020	0.82	.412
Lie success	.068	.082	.014	0.57	.570
Lie anxiety	-.280	-.258	.022	0.93	.353
Lie guilt	-.386	-.350	.036	1.58	.115
Lie fear	-.254	-.231	.023	0.97	.334
Lie enjoyment	.271	.246	.025	1.06	.291
Lie pride	.239	.236	.003	0.13	.900

Note. A = Female-specific ELS proxy; B = General ELS proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .928$. ^b $n = 223$, $r_{AB} = .934$.

Table A2-23

Female-Specific F1 Proxy's and General F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.536	.535	.001	0.08	.936
Entitlement	.446	.440	.006	0.45	.652
Vengeance	.635	.622	.013	1.12	.262
SDRT	.639	.589	.050	4.35	<.001
STMO	.470	.456	.014	1.06	.290
LTMO	-.366	-.336	.030	2.14	.032
Proactive aggression	.563	.549	.014	1.14	.253
Reactive aggression	.544	.529	.015	1.21	.228
Narcissism	.253	.278	.025	1.77	.077
Psychopathy	.746	.702	.044	4.45	<.001
Machiavellianism	.679	.679	.000	0.00	1.000
Sadism	.631	.586	.045	3.91	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.509	.497	.012	0.75	.454
Lie frequency	.338	.297	.041	2.32	.020
Lie ease	.343	.290	.053	3.00	.003
Lie severity	.188	.202	.014	0.77	.444
Lie success	.066	.070	.004	0.21	.831
Lie anxiety	-.240	-.216	.024	1.32	.187
Lie guilt	-.291	-.272	.019	1.06	.291
Lie fear	-.195	-.174	.021	1.15	.252
Lie enjoyment	.231	.216	.015	0.83	.410
Lie pride	.324	.331	.007	0.40	.691

Note. A = Female-specific F1 proxy; B = General F1 proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .968$. ^b $n = 223$, $r_{AB} = .962$.

Table A2-24
Female-Specific F2 Proxy's and General F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.461	.368	.093	3.88	<.001
Entitlement	.354	.253	.101	4.01	<.001
Vengeance	.514	.456	.058	2.50	.013
SDRT	.685	.556	.129	6.48	<.001
STMO	.523	.449	.074	3.20	.001
LTMO	-.366	-.242	.124	4.89	<.001
Proactive aggression	.496	.479	.017	0.74	.460
Reactive aggression	.454	.488	.034	1.46	.143
Narcissism	.206	.152	.054	2.08	.037
Psychopathy	.703	.627	.076	3.99	<.001
Machiavellianism	.576	.561	.015	0.70	.484
Sadism	.615	.493	.122	5.73	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.518	.460	.058	2.12	.034
Lie frequency	.372	.369	.003	0.10	.919
Lie ease	.361	.336	.025	0.84	.401
Lie severity	.141	.146	.005	0.16	.874
Lie success	.081	.093	.012	0.38	.707
Lie anxiety	-.282	-.227	.055	1.79	.074
Lie guilt	-.402	-.322	.080	2.70	.007
Lie fear	-.263	-.191	.072	2.33	.020
Lie enjoyment	.259	.250	.009	0.29	.770
Lie pride	.251	.235	.016	0.52	.604

Note. A = Female-specific F2 proxy; B = General F2 proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .897$. ^b $n = 223$, $r_{AB} = .889$.

Table A2-25

Female-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's and General Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.531	.521	.010	0.57	.567
Entitlement	.423	.425	.002	0.11	.915
Vengeance	.597	.589	.008	0.48	.631
SDRT	.678	.612	.066	0.63	<.001
STMO	.494	.460	.034	1.87	.062
LTMO	-.381	-.320	.061	3.14	.002
Proactive aggression	.554	.555	.001	0.06	.953
Reactive aggression	.513	.506	.007	0.40	.691
Narcissism	.267	.286	.019	0.97	.333
Psychopathy	.753	.706	.047	3.46	.001
Machiavellianism	.663	.677	.014	0.93	.350
Sadism	.646	.572	.074	4.67	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.499	.495	.004	0.19	.853
Lie frequency	.373	.327	.046	1.96	.050
Lie ease	.338	.292	.046	1.93	.054
Lie severity	.170	.201	.031	1.26	.209
Lie success	.043	.065	.022	0.87	.384
Lie anxiety	-.253	-.198	.055	2.24	.025
Lie guilt	-.338	-.268	.070	2.92	.004
Lie fear	-.226	-.165	.061	2.48	.013
Lie enjoyment	.270	.247	.023	0.95	.343
Lie pride	.332	.306	.026	1.09	.274

Note. A = Female-specific total psychopathy proxy; B = General total psychopathy proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .938$. ^b $n = 223$, $r_{AB} = .931$.

Table A2-26

Female-Specific IPM Proxy's and Međedović's IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.508	.505	.003	0.16	.873
Entitlement	.411	.416	.005	0.25	.802
Vengeance	.637	.597	.040	2.33	.020
SDRT	.568	.501	.067	3.67	<.001
STMO	.431	.371	.060	2.98	.003
LTMO	-.302	-.233	.069	3.24	.001
Proactive aggression	.570	.521	.049	2.70	.007
Reactive aggression	.575	.527	.048	2.66	.008
Narcissism	.249	.342	.093	4.51	<.001
Psychopathy	.720	.636	.084	5.46	<.001
Machiavellianism	.709	.677	.032	2.08	.037
Sadism	.577	.504	.073	4.06	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.488	.501	.013	0.54	.590
Lie frequency	.351	.279	.072	2.72	.007
Lie ease	.328	.257	.071	2.66	.008
Lie severity	.226	.216	.010	0.37	.714
Lie success	.094	.108	.014	0.50	.618
Lie anxiety	-.191	-.151	.040	1.45	.148
Lie guilt	-.241	-.170	.071	2.58	.010
Lie fear	-.137	-.097	.040	1.44	.150
Lie enjoyment	.243	.205	.038	1.39	.163
Lie pride	.334	.330	.004	0.15	.879

Note. A = Female-specific IPM proxy; B = Međedović's IPM proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .930$. ^b $n = 223$, $r_{AB} = .914$.

Table A2-27
Female-Specific CA Proxy's and Međedović's CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.487	.394	.093	2.25	.024
Entitlement	.445	.393	.052	1.24	.215
Vengeance	.592	.295	.297	7.38	<.001
SDRT	.697	.487	.210	5.98	<.001
STMO	.479	.291	.188	4.41	<.001
LTMO	-.400	-.315	.085	1.95	.052
Proactive aggression	.515	.241	.274	6.56	<.001
Reactive aggression	.472	.115	.357	8.30	<.001
Narcissism	.198	.203	.005	0.11	.912
Psychopathy	.736	.423	.313	9.20	<.001
Machiavellianism	.604	.280	.324	8.26	<.001
Sadism	.657	.443	.214	5.86	<.001
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.455	.217	.238	4.74	<.001
Lie frequency	.308	.036	.272	5.12	<.001
Lie ease	.303	.138	.165	3.11	.002
Lie severity	.144	-.028	.172	3.16	.002
Lie success	.022	-.076	.098	1.78	.075
Lie anxiety	-.229	-.109	.120	2.23	.026
Lie guilt	-.323	-.180	.143	2.71	.007
Lie fear	-.207	-.095	.112	2.08	.038
Lie enjoyment	.198	.012	.186	3.44	.001
Lie pride	.305	.123	.182	3.44	.001

Note. A = Female-specific CA proxy; B = Međedović's CA proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .680$. ^b $n = 223$, $r^{AB} = .672$.

Table A2-28

Female-Specific ELS Proxy's and Međedović's ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Dataset 1 ^a					
Exploitativeness	.438	.369	.069	3.94	<.001
Entitlement	.320	.254	.066	3.58	<.001
Vengeance	.471	.443	.028	1.63	.104
SDRT	.645	.572	.073	4.89	<.001
STMO	.476	.453	.023	1.34	.179
LTMO	-.313	-.307	.006	0.33	.745
Proactive aggression	.478	.439	.039	2.30	.022
Reactive aggression	.437	.414	.023	1.33	.185
Narcissism	.200	.167	.033	1.76	.079
Psychopathy	.664	.619	.045	3.12	.002
Machiavellianism	.580	.516	.064	4.07	<.001
Sadism	.582	.543	.039	2.49	.013
Dataset 2 ^b					
PATD	.495	.348	.147	6.69	<.001
Lie frequency	.382	.383	.001	0.04	.965
Lie ease	.369	.326	.043	1.84	.065
Lie severity	.123	.119	.004	0.16	.872
Lie success	.068	.039	.029	1.16	.247
Lie anxiety	-.280	-.274	.006	0.25	.802
Lie guilt	-.386	-.382	.004	0.17	.862
Lie fear	-.254	-.237	.017	0.71	.481
Lie enjoyment	.271	.280	.009	0.38	.707
Lie pride	.239	.216	.023	0.95	.343

Note. A = Female-specific ELS proxy; B = Međedović's ELS proxy; SDRT = Status-driven risk taking; STMO = Short-term mating orientation; LTMO = Long-term mating orientation; PATD = Perceived ability to deceive.

^a $n = 299$, $r_{AB} = .946$. ^b $n = 223$, $r_{AB} = .932$.

Table A2-29
Sex Differences in Correlations Between HEXACO Items and Interpersonal Manipulation

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
6 (H: sincerity)	-.387	-.339	.048
30 (H: sincerity)	.491	.386	.105
36 (H: fairness)	-.431	-.337	.094
60 (H: fairness)	.459	.411	.048
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	.333	.208	.125
24 (H: modesty)	.378	.329	.049
48 (H: modesty)	.384	.338	.046
Women more strongly related			
22 (X: liveliness)	-.116	-.282	.166
15 (A: flexibility)	.227	.289	.062
21 (A: patience)	.208	.352	.144
32 (C: diligence)	.156	.318	.162
44 (C: prudence)	.155	.287	.132

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A2-30
Sex Differences in Correlations Between HEXACO Items and Callous Affect

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
30 (H: sincerity)	.256	.156	.100
36 (H: fairness)	-.352	-.246	.106
3 (A: forgiveness)	-.271	-.177	.094
27 (A: forgiveness)	-.347	-.240	.107
Women more strongly related			
5 (E: fearfulness)	-.072	-.284	.212
29 (E: fearfulness)	-.170	-.300	.130
17 (E: dependence)	-.215	-.262	.047
47 (E: sentimentality)	-.314	-.389	.075
59 (E: sentimentality)	.395	.495	.100
22 (X: liveliness)	-.224	-.302	.078
46 (X: liveliness)	.206	.251	.045
15 (A: flexibility)	.177	.277	.100
21 (A: patience)	.249	.333	.084
32 (C: diligence)	.197	.278	.081
44 (C: prudence)	.127	.248	.121

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A2-31
Sex Differences in Correlations Between HEXACO Items and Erratic Lifestyle

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
36 (H: fairness)	-.351	-.290	.061
60 (H: fairness)	.431	.354	.077
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	.275	.167	.108
56 (C: prudence)	.413	.338	.075
Women more strongly related			
5 (E: fearfulness)	-.181	-.265	.084
53 (E: fearfulness)	.095	.254	.159
21 (A: patience)	.232	.332	.100
32 (C: diligence)	.214	.312	.098
44 (C: prudence)	.314	.398	.084

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A2-32
Sex Differences in Correlations Between HEXACO Items and Antisocial Behaviour

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
60 (H: fairness)	.357	.311	.046
Women more strongly related			
54 (H: sincerity)	-.135	-.245	.110
12 (H: fairness)	.229	.303	.074
48 (H: modesty)	.143	.256	.113
47 (E: sentimentality)	-.098	-.249	.151

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality.

Table A2-33

Sex Differences in Correlations Between HEXACO Items and Factor 1

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
30 (H: sincerity)	.427	.307	.120
36 (H: fairness)	-.438	-.323	.115
60 (H: fairness)	.444	.391	.053
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	.312	.189	.123
3 (A: forgiveness)	-.298	-.229	.069
27 (A: forgiveness)	-.355	-.290	.065
Women more strongly related			
29 (E: fearfulness)	-.130	-.250	.120
41 (E: dependence)	.201	.249	.048
47 (E: sentimentality)	-.251	-.306	.055
59 (E: sentimentality)	.343	.402	.059
22 (X: liveliness)	-.183	-.319	.136
15 (A: flexibility)	.228	.311	.083
21 (A: patience)	.251	.376	.125
32 (C: diligence)	.194	.328	.134
44 (C: prudence)	.160	.295	.135

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A2-34
Sex Differences in Correlations Between HEXACO Items and Factor 2

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
60 (H: fairness)	.457	.391	.066
56 (C: prudence)	.348	.261	.087
Women more strongly related			
6 (H: sincerity)	-.173	-.274	.101
5 (E: fearfulness)	-.138	-.255	.117
29 (E: fearfulness)	-.232	-.280	.048
23 (E: sentimentality)	-.130	-.251	.121
59 (E: sentimentality)	.143	.265	.122
21 (A: patience)	.265	.326	.061
32 (C: diligence)	.193	.313	.120
44 (C: prudence)	.272	.371	.099

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A2-35
Sex Differences in Correlations Between HEXACO Items and Total Psychopathy

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
30 (H: sincerity)	.348	.300	.048
36 (H: fairness)	-.433	-.338	.095
60 (H: fairness)	.505	.424	.081
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	.273	.197	.076
3 (A: forgiveness)	-.289	-.193	.096
27 (A: forgiveness)	-.301	-.233	.068
56 (C: prudence)	.302	.232	.070
Women more strongly related			
5 (E: fearfulness)	-.101	-.266	.165
29 (E: fearfulness)	-.200	-.287	.087
23 (E: sentimentality)	-.261	-.321	.060
47 (E: sentimentality)	-.206	-.282	.076
59 (E: sentimentality)	.276	.366	.090
22 (X: liveliness)	-.180	-.300	.120
21 (A: patience)	.289	.383	.094
32 (C: diligence)	.214	.349	.135
44 (C: prudence)	.240	.359	.119

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table A3-1
Means and Standard Deviations of Study 2 Variables

	Boys		Girls		Total	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Narcissism	0.46	0.34	0.39	0.33	0.42	0.34
Impulsivity	0.77	0.37	0.72	0.38	0.74	0.38
Callous-unemotional traits	0.64	0.36	0.48	0.28	0.55	0.32
Antisocial Process Screen Device	0.59	0.25	0.50	0.25	0.54	0.25
School bullying	1.18	0.34	1.12	0.25	1.14	0.29
School victimization	1.28	0.43	1.32	0.47	1.31	0.45
Physical aggression	1.43	0.41	1.23	0.31	1.32	0.37
Verbal aggression	1.42	0.43	1.29	0.37	1.34	0.40
Relational aggression	1.32	0.35	1.38	0.40	1.36	0.38
Cyber aggression	1.23	0.32	1.23	0.38	1.23	0.35
Reactive aggression	1.76	0.70	1.56	0.63	1.65	0.67
Proactive aggression	1.43	0.71	1.22	0.54	1.31	0.62
Anger	2.57	1.28	2.44	1.21	2.50	1.24
Hostility	2.75	1.13	2.80	1.17	2.79	1.16
Anger/hostility	2.65	1.07	2.62	1.05	2.64	1.06
Behavioural conduct	3.02	0.52	3.18	0.50	3.11	0.52
Social competence	2.86	0.56	2.79	0.54	2.82	0.56
Athletic competence	3.01	0.68	3.07	0.71	3.05	0.70
Romantic appeal	2.64	0.52	2.55	0.56	2.58	0.55
Conduct problems	1.39	0.37	1.30	0.31	1.34	0.34
Prosocial behaviour	2.44	0.38	2.64	0.33	2.56	0.36
Hyperactivity	1.92	0.49	1.83	0.52	1.87	0.51
Coercive resource control	1.97	0.73	1.81	0.69	1.88	0.71
Theft	1.24	0.37	1.14	0.30	1.18	0.33
Vandalism	1.14	0.35	1.06	0.25	1.10	0.29
Substance abuse	1.46	0.77	1.40	0.66	1.42	0.70
Violence	1.20	0.37	1.07	0.27	1.13	0.32
Total delinquency	1.24	0.36	1.13	0.25	1.17	0.31
Deviance tolerance	1.59	0.51	1.45	0.49	1.51	0.50
Intentional incivility	1.38	0.59	1.18	0.47	1.26	0.53
Unintentional incivility	2.26	0.87	2.29	0.87	2.28	0.87
Life history strategy	0.88	0.79	1.09	0.83	1.00	0.83
Pleasure sensitivity	3.07	0.77	3.50	0.80	3.32	0.81
Perceptual sensitivity	3.60	0.75	3.83	0.67	3.74	0.72
Shyness	2.78	1.04	2.97	1.08	2.89	1.06
Surgency	3.23	0.69	3.41	0.72	3.34	0.71
Peer-valued characteristics	4.95	1.00	5.08	0.95	5.02	0.97

Table A3-2

Male-Specific IPM Proxy's and General IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.294	.278	.016	0.77	.444
Verbal aggression	.272	.279	.007	0.33	.740
Relational aggression	.231	.220	.011	0.52	.605
Anger	.235	.221	.014	0.66	.510
Hostility	.198	.206	.008	0.37	.711
Anger/hostility	.238	.234	.004	0.19	.850
Reactive aggression	.361	.336	.025	1.22	.221
Behavioural conduct	-.422	-.422	.000	0.00	1.000
Conduct problems	.396	.428	.032	1.61	.107
Hyperactivity	.267	.239	.028	1.33	.185
Prosocial behaviour	-.222	-.187	.035	1.64	.101
Coercive resource control	.482	.501	.019	0.98	.329
Substance abuse	.233	.224	.009	0.42	.675
Deviance tolerance	.474	.493	.019	1.00	.319
Unintentional incivility	.435	.437	.002	0.10	.919
Life history strategy	-.196	-.170	.026	1.19	.235
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.244	.230	.014	0.56	.575
Cyber aggression	.255	.236	.019	0.77	.444
Proactive aggression	.332	.310	.022	0.90	.367
Theft	.349	.348	.001	0.04	.967
Vandalism	.293	.307	.014	0.57	.570
Violence	.306	.271	.035	1.43	.153
Total delinquency	.374	.348	.026	1.09	.276
Intentional incivility	.438	.452	.014	0.61	.541

Note. A = Male-specific IPM proxy; B = General IPM proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .963$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .949$.

Table A3-3
Male-Specific CA Proxy's and General CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.322	.307	.015	0.61	.541
Verbal aggression	.142	.122	.020	0.78	.437
Relational aggression	.075	.007	.068	2.63	.009
Anger	.285	.247	.038	1.53	.127
Hostility	.125	.071	.054	2.08	.038
Anger/hostility	.237	.187	.050	1.98	.048
Reactive aggression	.297	.252	.045	1.81	.070
Behavioural conduct	-.391	-.323	.068	2.80	.005
Conduct problems	.400	.338	.062	2.59	.010
Hyperactivity	.223	.175	.048	1.89	.058
Prosocial behaviour	-.352	-.304	.048	1.97	.049
Coercive resource control	.437	.402	.035	1.46	.145
Substance abuse	.255	.251	.004	0.16	.874
Deviance tolerance	.516	.531	.015	0.68	.494
Unintentional incivility	.387	.413	.026	1.10	.272
Life history strategy	-.271	-.237	.034	1.33	.183
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.216	.183	.033	1.29	.199
Cyber aggression	.141	.122	.019	0.73	.463
Proactive aggression	.304	.287	.017	0.68	.498
Theft	.300	.292	.008	0.32	.748
Vandalism	.250	.256	.006	0.24	.814
Violence	.274	.247	.027	1.07	.284
Total delinquency	.336	.305	.031	1.25	.210
Intentional incivility	.438	.458	.020	0.86	.390

Note. A = Male-specific CA proxy; B = General CA proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .948$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .947$.

Table A3-4

Male-Specific ELS Proxy's and General ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.334	.337	.003	0.20	.843
Verbal aggression	.217	.209	.008	0.51	.611
Relational aggression	.071	.051	.020	1.25	.212
Anger	.279	.301	.022	1.43	.152
Hostility	.149	.173	.024	1.50	.134
Anger/hostility	.245	.271	.026	1.68	.094
Reactive aggression	.356	.346	.010	0.67	.506
Behavioural conduct	-.450	-.484	.034	2.38	.017
Conduct problems	.412	.459	.047	3.28	.001
Hyperactivity	.380	.388	.008	0.54	.589
Prosocial behaviour	-.181	-.197	.016	1.02	.310
Coercive resource control	.260	.251	.009	0.57	.572
Substance abuse	.361	.357	.004	0.26	.791
Deviance tolerance	.468	.467	.001	0.07	.944
Unintentional incivility	.451	.415	.036	2.50	.012
Life history strategy	-.321	-.344	.023	1.49	.136
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.248	.250	.002	0.11	.915
Cyber aggression	.257	.235	.022	1.17	.240
Proactive aggression	.314	.309	.005	0.27	.787
Theft	.376	.360	.016	0.89	.373
Vandalism	.235	.219	.016	0.84	.400
Violence	.267	.245	.022	1.18	.239
Total delinquency	.410	.395	.015	0.85	.396
Intentional incivility	.456	.458	.002	0.12	.907

Note. A = Male-specific ELS proxy; B = General ELS proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .980$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .971$.

Table A3-5

Male-Specific F1 Proxy's and General F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.336	.328	.008	0.44	.661
Verbal aggression	.212	.205	.007	0.37	.712
Relational aggression	.144	.118	.026	1.36	.175
Anger	.296	.295	.001	0.05	.957
Hostility	.165	.164	.001	0.05	.959
Anger/hostility	.261	.261	.000	0.00	1.000
Reactive aggression	.338	.311	.027	0.38	.701
Behavioural conduct	-.423	-.422	.001	0.06	.955
Conduct problems	.398	.425	.027	1.54	.125
Hyperactivity	.242	.213	.029	1.54	.123
Prosocial behaviour	-.319	-.305	.014	0.76	.446
Coercive resource control	.463	.475	.012	0.69	.493
Substance abuse	.259	.255	.004	0.21	.832
Deviance tolerance	.502	.522	.020	1.21	.227
Unintentional incivility	.429	.429	.000	0.00	1.000
Life history strategy	-.264	-.254	.010	0.53	.600
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.228	.215	.013	0.62	.537
Cyber aggression	.195	.166	.029	1.37	.171
Proactive aggression	.321	.313	.008	0.39	.697
Theft	.310	.310	.000	0.00	1.000
Vandalism	.275	.292	.017	0.82	.415
Violence	.296	.278	.018	0.87	.383
Total delinquency	.350	.329	.021	1.04	.299
Intentional incivility	.433	.471	.038	1.99	.047

Note. A = Male-specific F1 proxy; B = General F1 proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .971$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .964$.

Table A3-6

Male-Specific F2 Proxy's and General F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.373	.385	.012	0.77	.441
Verbal aggression	.272	.285	.013	0.80	.423
Relational aggression	.126	.126	.000	0.00	1.000
Anger	.401	.420	.019	1.24	.215
Hostility	.243	.253	.010	0.61	.544
Anger/hostility	.366	.384	.018	1.15	.248
Reactive aggression	.411	.391	.020	1.30	.194
Behavioural conduct	-.541	-.545	.004	0.28	.779
Conduct problems	.528	.528	.000	0.00	1.000
Hyperactivity	.397	.417	.020	1.30	.193
Prosocial behaviour	-.255	-.245	.010	0.61	.540
Coercive resource control	.343	.309	.034	2.08	.037
Substance abuse	.314	.345	.031	1.93	.053
Deviance tolerance	.519	.483	.036	2.49	.013
Unintentional incivility	.406	.423	.017	1.11	.267
Life history strategy	-.330	-.355	.025	1.55	.121
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.253	.268	.015	0.83	.406
Cyber aggression	.221	.246	.025	1.38	.168
Proactive aggression	.359	.326	.033	1.87	.061
Theft	.357	.379	.022	1.27	.204
Vandalism	.213	.224	.011	0.60	.550
Violence	.239	.251	.012	0.66	.507
Total delinquency	.368	.398	.030	1.75	.081
Intentional incivility	.444	.434	.010	0.60	.550

Note. A = Male-specific F2 proxy; B = General F2 proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .978$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .973$.

Table A3-7

Male-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's and General Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Boys

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.340	.334	.006	0.25	.800
Verbal aggression	.224	.230	.006	0.24	.807
Relational aggression	.140	.124	.016	0.64	.521
Anger	.317	.320	.003	0.13	.900
Hostility	.200	.196	.004	0.16	.872
Anger/hostility	.292	.290	.002	0.08	.934
Reactive aggression	.357	.314	.043	1.82	.069
Behavioural conduct	-.442	-.468	.026	1.16	.248
Conduct problems	.427	.448	.021	0.93	.351
Hyperactivity	.269	.217	.052	2.14	.033
Prosocial behaviour	-.256	-.240	.016	0.66	.511
Coercive resource control	.447	.495	.048	2.12	.034
Substance abuse	.260	.289	.029	1.19	.234
Deviance tolerance	.518	.553	.035	1.66	.097
Unintentional incivility	.445	.441	.004	0.18	.859
Life history strategy	-.236	-.207	.029	1.16	.246
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.258	.255	.003	0.11	.914
Cyber aggression	.208	.211	.003	0.11	.915
Proactive aggression	.350	.368	.018	0.67	.504
Theft	.339	.343	.004	0.15	.882
Vandalism	.280	.306	.026	0.94	.348
Violence	.314	.322	.008	0.29	.769
Total delinquency	.360	.359	.001	0.04	.970
Intentional incivility	.431	.470	.039	1.53	.126

Note. A = Male-specific total psychopathy proxy; B = General total psychopathy proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .951$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .936$.

Table A3-8

Female-Specific IPM Proxy's and General IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.227	.191	.036	1.32	.188
Verbal aggression	.361	.318	.043	1.63	.103
Relational aggression	.412	.390	.022	0.86	.390
Anger	.500	.369	.131	5.24	<.001
Hostility	.384	.296	.088	3.34	.001
Anger/hostility	.508	.379	.129	5.24	<.001
Reactive aggression	.397	.307	.090	3.41	.001
Behavioural conduct	-.555	-.415	.140	5.80	<.001
Conduct problems	.519	.380	.139	5.66	<.001
Hyperactivity	.365	.269	.096	3.62	<.001
Prosocial behaviour	-.309	-.274	.035	1.30	.193
Coercive resource control	.467	.449	.018	0.71	.476
Substance abuse	.319	.247	.072	2.68	.007
Deviance tolerance	.491	.434	.057	2.31	.021
Unintentional incivility	.412	.355	.057	2.22	.027
Life history strategy	-.357	-.275	.082	3.06	.002
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.410	.390	.020	0.76	.450
Cyber aggression	.397	.390	.007	0.26	.792
Proactive aggression	.398	.328	.070	2.58	.010
Theft	.329	.303	.026	0.95	.340
Vandalism	.295	.248	.047	1.67	.095
Violence	.282	.190	.092	3.30	.001
Total delinquency	.363	.292	.071	2.62	.009
Intentional incivility	.364	.333	.031	1.15	.250

Note. A = Female-specific IPM proxy; B = General IPM proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .914$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .909$.

Table A3-9
Female-Specific CA Proxy's and General CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.207	.149	.058	1.72	.085
Verbal aggression	.357	.287	.070	2.16	.031
Relational aggression	.329	.299	.030	0.92	.356
Anger	.352	.276	.076	2.32	.020
Hostility	.240	.107	.133	3.94	<.001
Anger/hostility	.347	.224	.123	3.78	<.001
Reactive aggression	.303	.235	.068	2.04	.041
Behavioural conduct	-.519	-.388	.131	4.32	<.001
Conduct problems	.460	.403	.057	1.85	.064
Hyperactivity	.274	.189	.085	2.55	.011
Prosocial behaviour	-.392	-.337	.055	1.73	.084
Coercive resource control	.419	.470	.051	1.65	.099
Substance abuse	.281	.201	.080	2.41	.016
Deviance tolerance	.512	.439	.073	2.45	.014
Unintentional incivility	.385	.325	.060	1.89	.059
Life history strategy	-.451	-.307	.144	4.55	<.001
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.322	.328	.006	0.17	.867
Cyber aggression	.318	.287	.031	0.86	.391
Proactive aggression	.298	.245	.053	1.44	.150
Theft	.335	.295	.040	1.12	.263
Vandalism	.308	.269	.039	1.06	.288
Violence	.348	.259	.089	2.49	.013
Total delinquency	.374	.271	.103	2.90	.004
Intentional incivility	.355	.409	.054	1.56	.119

Note. A = Female-specific CA proxy; B = General CA proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .872$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .844$.

Table A3-10

Female-Specific ELS Proxy's and General ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.265	.279	.014	0.52	.603
Verbal aggression	.375	.349	.026	1.00	.319
Relational aggression	.326	.297	.029	1.09	.275
Anger	.361	.340	.021	0.79	.427
Hostility	.251	.257	.006	0.22	.826
Anger/hostility	.356	.345	.011	0.42	.674
Reactive aggression	.324	.280	.044	1.63	.103
Behavioural conduct	-.583	-.548	.035	1.51	.130
Conduct problems	.446	.410	.036	1.43	.154
Hyperactivity	.415	.384	.031	1.21	.227
Prosocial behaviour	-.253	-.236	.017	0.62	.532
Coercive resource control	.339	.316	.023	0.86	.391
Substance abuse	.348	.327	.021	0.80	.425
Deviance tolerance	.542	.476	.066	2.77	.006
Unintentional incivility	.483	.444	.039	1.58	.113
Life history strategy	-.395	-.347	.048	1.83	.067
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.341	.278	.063	2.26	.024
Cyber aggression	.358	.371	.013	0.48	.635
Proactive aggression	.259	.220	.039	1.35	.176
Theft	.408	.381	.027	1.01	.313
Vandalism	.294	.286	.008	0.28	.778
Violence	.361	.324	.037	1.35	.177
Total delinquency	.444	.418	.026	0.99	.323
Intentional incivility	.305	.306	.001	0.04	.971

Note. A = Female-specific ELS proxy; B = General ELS proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .915$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .907$.

Table A3-11

Female-Specific F1 Proxy's and General F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.225	.180	.045	2.02	.044
Verbal aggression	.352	.298	.054	2.50	.012
Relational aggression	.381	.350	.031	1.46	.144
Anger	.429	.363	.066	3.14	.002
Hostility	.290	.233	.057	2.58	.010
Anger/hostility	.415	.344	.071	3.39	.001
Reactive aggression	.358	.314	.044	2.03	.043
Behavioural conduct	-.526	-.431	.095	4.76	<.001
Conduct problems	.480	.413	.067	3.30	.001
Hyperactivity	.325	.269	.056	2.57	.010
Prosocial behaviour	-.357	-.361	.004	0.19	.851
Coercive resource control	.453	.453	.000	0.00	1.000
Substance abuse	.299	.225	.074	3.37	.001
Deviance tolerance	.491	.449	.042	2.10	.036
Unintentional incivility	.392	.351	.041	1.94	.052
Life history strategy	-.392	-.325	.067	3.12	.002
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.384	.380	.004	0.19	.853
Cyber aggression	.372	.341	.031	1.42	.155
Proactive aggression	.364	.335	.029	1.32	.188
Theft	.340	.328	.012	0.55	.583
Vandalism	.294	.273	.021	0.93	.353
Violence	.294	.242	.052	2.33	.020
Total delinquency	.370	.301	.069	3.17	.002
Intentional incivility	.353	.365	.012	0.56	.579

Note. A = Female-specific F1 proxy; B = General F1 proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .943$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .941$.

Table A3-12

Female-Specific F2 Proxy's and General F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.245	.269	.024	0.70	.486
Verbal aggression	.332	.355	.023	0.69	.493
Relational aggression	.279	.329	.050	1.47	.141
Anger	.318	.449	.131	3.99	<.001
Hostility	.193	.320	.127	3.68	<.001
Anger/hostility	.298	.444	.146	4.47	<.001
Reactive aggression	.302	.367	.065	1.92	.055
Behavioural conduct	-.540	-.596	.056	1.91	.056
Conduct problems	.406	.491	.085	2.69	.007
Hyperactivity	.384	.438	.054	1.67	.096
Prosocial behaviour	-.319	-.256	.063	1.84	.065
Coercive resource control	.287	.355	.068	1.99	.047
Substance abuse	.307	.349	.042	1.25	.213
Deviance tolerance	.514	.488	.026	0.85	.395
Unintentional incivility	.430	.464	.034	1.67	.095
Life history strategy	-.389	-.336	.053	1.58	.114
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.303	.330	.027	0.76	.449
Cyber aggression	.300	.368	.068	1.93	.054
Proactive aggression	.250	.264	.014	0.38	.703
Theft	.382	.371	.011	0.32	.750
Vandalism	.284	.300	.016	0.44	.660
Violence	.356	.331	.025	0.71	.476
Total delinquency	.421	.412	.009	0.27	.791
Intentional incivility	.280	.341	.061	1.72	.085

Note. A = Female-specific F2 proxy; B = General F2 proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .861$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .847$.

Table A3-13

Female-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's and General Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Girls

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Physical aggression	.234	.173	.061	2.25	.025
Verbal aggression	.362	.291	.071	2.71	.007
Relational aggression	.368	.339	.029	1.12	.264
Anger	.430	.389	.041	1.61	.108
Hostility	.295	.235	.060	2.23	.026
Anger/hostility	.420	.360	.060	2.36	.018
Reactive aggression	.358	.296	.062	2.34	.019
Behavioural conduct	-.573	-.470	.103	4.38	<.001
Conduct problems	.489	.429	.060	2.44	.015
Hyperactivity	.353	.288	.065	2.47	.013
Prosocial behaviour	-.351	-.308	.043	1.64	.101
Coercive resource control	.425	.469	.044	1.76	.079
Substance abuse	.293	.228	.065	2.43	.015
Deviance tolerance	.529	.477	.052	2.19	.029
Unintentional incivility	.409	.361	.048	1.88	.060
Life history strategy	-.419	-.315	.104	4.01	<.001
Spearman correlations ^b					
School bullying	.388	.388	.000	0.00	1.000
Cyber aggression	.370	.354	.016	0.59	.556
Proactive aggression	.348	.286	.062	2.22	.026
Theft	.370	.308	.062	2.28	.023
Vandalism	.322	.283	.039	1.39	.165
Violence	.337	.266	.071	2.58	.010
Total delinquency	.391	.292	.099	3.65	<.001
Intentional incivility	.347	.367	.020	0.74	.460

Note. A = Female-specific total psychopathy proxy; B = General total psychopathy proxy.

^a $r_{AB} = .916$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .908$.

Table A4-1
Means and Standard Deviations of Study 3 Variables

	Men		Women		Total	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Interpersonal manipulation	2.40	0.61	2.07	0.60	2.23	0.63
Callous affect	2.52	0.56	1.99	0.55	2.24	0.62
Erratic lifestyle	2.54	0.58	2.14	0.59	2.33	0.62
Antisocial behaviour	1.79	0.63	1.48	0.49	1.63	0.58
Factor 1	2.46	0.54	2.03	0.52	2.24	0.57
Factor 2	2.16	0.55	1.81	0.47	1.98	0.54
Total psychopathy	2.31	0.50	1.92	0.45	2.11	0.51
Overt reactive aggression	0.54	0.36	0.51	0.36	0.53	0.36
Overt proactive aggression	0.14	0.28	0.07	0.16	0.10	0.23
Relational reactive aggression	1.67	0.73	1.50	0.70	1.58	0.72
Relational proactive aggression	1.60	0.78	1.35	0.57	1.47	0.69
RARR	1.71	0.73	1.61	0.62	1.66	0.68
Interpersonal deviance	1.79	1.05	1.36	0.55	1.57	0.85
Organizational deviance	2.19	1.03	1.83	0.74	2.00	0.91
Illegal behaviour	0.22	0.24	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.21
Violent behaviour	0.14	0.22	0.09	0.16	0.11	0.19
Irresponsible behaviour	0.34	0.25	0.30	0.20	0.32	0.23
Deceptive behaviour	0.18	0.26	0.15	0.22	0.16	0.24
Antisocial behaviour	0.24	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.21	0.18

Note. RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

Table A4-2*New HEXACO-100 Items Added to General Proxy Scales (Non-Overlapping)*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2
6 (H: sincerity)	x				x	
36 (H: fairness)	x				x	
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	x					
24r (H: modesty)	x				x	
48r (H: modesty)	x				x	
29 (E: fearfulness)			x			x
65r (E: dependence)		x				
89 (E: dependence)		x				
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
28r (X: social self-esteem)		x			x	
70 (X: liveliness)		x			x	
33r (A: gentleness)	x				x	
87 (A: flexibility)					x	
93 (A: patience)						x
68r (C: prudence)			x			
97r (altruism)		x			x	
98r (altruism)		x			x	
99 (altruism)		x			x	
100 (altruism)		x			x	
# of items	16	15	7	-	27	7
Cronbach's α	.85	.82	.67	-	.87	.64
Convergent r	.75	.80	.68	-	.83	.65
M	2.39	2.45	2.32	-	2.37	2.27
SD	0.67	0.59	0.62	-	0.55	0.63

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness. Psychometric properties and descriptive statistics are for full proxy scales that include previously selected HEXACO-60 items.

Table A4-3

Updated General Proxies' (Non-Overlapping) Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2
Pearson correlations					
Organizational deviance	.40	.30	.34	.43	.40
Overt RA	.34	.24	.19	.39	.30
Relational PA	.47	.37	.36	.52	.44
Relational RA	.53	.39	.32	.57	.42
RARR	.36	.25	.26	.37	.34
Antisocial behaviour	.27	.30	.27	.32	.34
Illegal behaviour	.26	.29	.24	.32	.31
Irresponsible behaviour	.17	.20	.20	.20	.25
Deceptive behaviour	.27	.22	.27	.29	.33
Spearman correlations					
Interpersonal deviance	.34	.36	.30	.44	.33
Overt PA	.38	.31	.27	.43	.32
Violent behaviour	.29	.30	.27	.36	.32

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. All correlations are significant ($p < .05$).

Table A4-4*New HEXACO-100 Items Added to Male-Specific Proxy Scales (Non-Overlapping)*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2
6 (H: sincerity)	x				x	
36 (H: fairness)	x					x
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	x				x	
24r (H: modesty)	x				x	
48r (H: modesty)	x				x	
29 (E: fearfulness)			x			x
59r (E: anxiety)			x			
65r (E: dependence)		x			x	
89 (E: dependence)		x				
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
28r (X: social self-esteem)				x		x
70 (X: liveliness)		x				x
33r (A: gentleness)		x			x	
87 (A: flexibility)					x	
93 (A: patience)						x
56 (C: diligence)				x		x
68r (C: prudence)			x			
73r (O: aesthetic appreciation)		x				
13r (O: creativity)			x			x
97r (altruism)		x			x	
98r (altruism)		x			x	
99 (altruism)		x			x	
100 (altruism)		x			x	
# of items	15	18	10	-	28	13
Cronbach's α	.81	.80	.55	-	.84	.74
Convergent r	.70	.77	.66	-	.77	.66
M	2.58	2.67	2.64	-	2.64	2.45
SD	0.62	0.51	0.51	-	0.48	0.55

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness. Psychometric properties and descriptive statistics are for full proxy scales that include previously selected HEXACO-60 items.

Table A4-5
Updated Male-Specific Proxies' (Non-Overlapping) Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2
Pearson correlations					
Organizational deviance	.34	.29	.39	.36	.50
Overt RA	.27	.32	.27	.36	.41
Relational PA	.45	.30	.33	.43	.53
Relational RA	.43	.37	.22	.48	.46
RARR	.40	.28	.33	.42	.47
Antisocial behaviour	.26	.31	.40	.33	.45
Illegal behaviour	.21	.27	.32	.28	.39
Irresponsible behaviour	.19	.27	.37	.27	.38
Deceptive behaviour	.26	.21	.31	.27	.38
Spearman correlations					
Interpersonal deviance	.22	.31	.24	.32	.37
Overt PA	.31	.35	.30	.35	.44
Violent behaviour	.25	.31	.33	.32	.38

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. All correlations are significant ($p < .05$).

Table A4-6*New HEXACO-100 Items Added to Female-Specific Proxy Scales (Non-Overlapping)*

	IPM	CA	ELS	ASB	F1	F2
6 (H: sincerity)	x				x	
36 (H: fairness)	x				x	
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	x					
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	x					
24r (H: modesty)	x				x	
48r (H: modesty)	x				x	
29 (E: fearfulness)			x			x
65r (E: dependence)		x				
89 (E: dependence)		x				
47r (E: sentimentality)		x			x	
28r (X: social self-esteem)		x			x	
70 (X: liveliness)	x				x	
75 (A: forgiveness)	x				x	
33r (A: gentleness)	x				x	
87 (A: flexibility)	x				x	
93 (A: patience)	x				x	
2r (C: organization)			x			x
50 (C: organization)			x			x
68r (C: prudence)			x			x
25 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	x				x	
73r (O: aesthetic appreciation)	x				x	
67 (O: unconventionality)			x			
97r (altruism)		x			x	
198r (altruism)		x			x	
99 (altruism)		x			x	
100 (altruism)		x			x	
# of items	27	16	12	-	36	10
Cronbach's α	.89	.83	.75	-	.90	.76
Convergent r	.77	.70	.73	-	.82	.62
M	2.33	2.36	2.26	-	2.28	2.17
SD	0.60	0.58	0.57	-	0.54	0.61

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; ASB = Antisocial behaviour; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness. Psychometric properties and descriptive statistics are for full proxy scales that include previously selected HEXACO-60 items.

Table A4-7

Updated Female-Specific Proxies' (Non-Overlapping) Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	IPM	CA	ELS	F1	F2
Pearson correlations					
Organizational deviance	.42	.17	.34	.41	.34
Overt RA	.47	<i>.09</i>	.22	.43	.22
Relational PA	.50	.27	.37	.51	.32
Relational RA	.62	.29	.38	.60	.36
RARR	.33	.16	.21	.32	.20
Antisocial behaviour	.21	.19	.18	.22	.15
Illegal behaviour	.21	.18	.15	.24	.14
Irresponsible behaviour	<i>.08</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.12</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.08</i>
Deceptive behaviour	.26	.18	.24	.28	.22
Spearman correlations					
Interpersonal deviance	.41	.22	.28	.43	.27
Overt PA	.41	.17	.27	.40	.24
Violent behaviour	.32	.23	.22	.35	.21

Note. IPM = Interpersonal manipulation; CA = Callous affect; ELS = Erratic lifestyle; F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships. Correlations are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated in italics.

Table A4-8

Updated General IPM Proxy's and Original General IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.445	.414	.031	2.27	.023
Overt RA	.391	.360	.031	2.21	.027
Relational PA	.532	.474	.058	4.45	<.001
Relational RA	.580	.520	.060	4.78	<.001
RARR	.397	.372	.025	1.77	.077
Antisocial behaviour	.314	.272	.042	2.90	.004
Illegal behaviour	.310	.266	.044	3.03	.002
Irresponsible behaviour	.197	.176	.021	1.41	.159
Deceptive behaviour	.301	.271	.030	2.07	.039
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.404	.352	.052	3.79	<.001
Overt PA	.427	.384	.043	3.17	.002
Violent behaviour	.341	.300	.041	2.91	.004

Note. A = Updated general IPM proxy; B = Original general IPM proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .946$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .948$.

Table A4-9

Updated General CA Proxy's and Original General CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.383	.357	.026	1.46	.143
Overt RA	.270	.224	.046	2.48	.013
Relational PA	.462	.424	.038	2.22	.027
Relational RA	.467	.427	.040	2.34	.019
RARR	.304	.253	.051	2.75	.006
Antisocial behaviour	.333	.295	.038	2.09	.036
Illegal behaviour	.330	.307	.023	1.27	.204
Irresponsible behaviour	.225	.190	.035	1.87	.062
Deceptive behaviour	.273	.232	.041	2.22	.027
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.402	.367	.035	1.92	.055
Overt PA	.368	.335	.033	1.79	.074
Violent behaviour	.342	.310	.032	1.71	.087

Note. A = Updated general CA proxy; B = Original general CA proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .914$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .908$.

Table A4-10

Updated General ELS Proxy's and Original General ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.462	.417	.045	2.83	.005
Overt RA	.317	.228	.089	5.23	<.001
Relational PA	.488	.386	.102	6.45	<.001
Relational RA	.484	.375	.109	6.87	<.001
RARR	.357	.270	.087	5.14	<.001
Antisocial behaviour	.361	.309	.052	3.12	.002
Illegal behaviour	.348	.302	.046	2.75	.006
Irresponsible behaviour	.251	.215	.036	2.09	.037
Deceptive behaviour	.344	.309	.035	2.09	.037
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.396	.304	.092	5.73	<.001
Overt PA	.381	.300	.081	5.02	<.001
Violent behaviour	.364	.285	.079	4.86	<.001

Note. A = Updated general ELS proxy; B = Original general ELS proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .926$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .930$.

Table A4-11

Updated General F1 Proxy's and Original General F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.436	.407	.029	2.11	.035
Overt RA	.395	.355	.040	2.85	.004
Relational PA	.519	.478	.041	3.12	.002
Relational RA	.570	.525	.045	3.56	<.001
RARR	.385	.350	.035	2.46	.014
Antisocial behaviour	.349	.298	.051	3.56	<.001
Illegal behaviour	.341	.300	.041	2.86	.004
Irresponsible behaviour	.235	.192	.043	2.90	.004
Deceptive behaviour	.307	.267	.040	2.76	.006
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.429	.398	.031	2.19	.029
Overt PA	.425	.394	.031	2.19	.029
Violent behaviour	.368	.327	.041	2.81	.005

Note. A = Updated general F1 proxy; B = Original general F1 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .946$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .943$.

Table A4-12

Updated General F2 Proxy's and Original General F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.475	.443	.032	1.82	.069
Overt RA	.383	.322	.061	3.29	.001
Relational PA	.542	.446	.096	5.61	<.001
Relational RA	.549	.446	.103	6.05	<.001
RARR	.396	.326	.070	3.75	<.001
Antisocial behaviour	.379	.327	.052	2.80	.005
Illegal behaviour	.365	.322	.043	2.31	.021
Irresponsible behaviour	.256	.224	.032	1.66	.098
Deceptive behaviour	.356	.323	.033	1.77	.077
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.427	.342	.085	4.71	<.001
Overt PA	.423	.354	.069	3.83	<.001
Violent behaviour	.386	.310	.076	4.14	<.001

Note. A = Updated general F2 proxy; B = Original general F2 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .907$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .909$.

Table A4-13

Updated General Total Psychopathy Proxy's and Original General Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.447	.412	.035	2.41	.016
Overt RA	.376	.323	.053	3.52	<.001
Relational PA	.541	.499	.042	3.06	.002
Relational RA	.564	.503	.061	4.51	<.001
RARR	.391	.358	.033	2.19	.028
Antisocial behaviour	.332	.277	.055	3.59	<.001
Illegal behaviour	.327	.277	.050	3.26	.001
Irresponsible behaviour	.212	.172	.040	2.53	.011
Deceptive behaviour	.308	.269	.039	2.53	.011
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.444	.387	.057	3.79	<.001
Overt PA	.429	.384	.045	2.97	.003
Violent behaviour	.368	.308	.060	3.84	<.001

Note. A = Updated general total psychopathy proxy; B = Original general total psychopathy proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .939$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .935$.

Table A4-14

Updated General IPM Proxy's and Međedović's IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.445	.373	.072	3.83	<.001
Overt RA	.391	.397	-.006	0.32	.752
Relational PA	.532	.443	.089	4.96	<.001
Relational RA	.580	.537	.043	2.52	.012
RARR	.397	.363	.034	1.76	.078
Antisocial behaviour	.314	.254	.060	3.02	.003
Illegal behaviour	.310	.238	.072	3.62	<.001
Irresponsible behaviour	.197	.168	.029	1.42	.155
Deceptive behaviour	.301	.243	.058	2.91	.004
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.404	.309	.095	4.84	<.001
Overt PA	.427	.366	.061	3.16	.002
Violent behaviour	.341	.278	.063	3.14	.002

Note. A = General IPM proxy; B = Međedović's IPM proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .899$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .895$.

Table A4-15

Updated General CA Proxy's and Međedović's CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.383	.197	.186	7.07	<.001
Overt RA	.270	.109	.161	5.93	<.001
Relational PA	.462	.239	.223	8.73	<.001
Relational RA	.467	.244	.223	8.75	<.001
RARR	.304	.138	.166	6.10	<.001
Antisocial behaviour	.333	.221	.112	4.21	<.001
Illegal behaviour	.330	.231	.099	3.72	<.001
Irresponsible behaviour	.225	.166	.059	2.16	.031
Deceptive behaviour	.273	.131	.142	5.24	<.001
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.402	.260	.142	5.22	<.001
Overt PA	.368	.210	.158	5.72	<.001
Violent behaviour	.342	.197	.145	5.20	<.001

Note. A = General CA proxy; B = Međedović's CA proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .818$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .800$.

Table A4-16

Updated General ELS Proxy's and Međedović's ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Total Sample

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.462	.461	.001	0.05	.964
Overt RA	.317	.333	-.016	0.67	.501
Relational PA	.488	.484	.004	0.18	.855
Relational RA	.484	.462	.022	1.00	.319
RARR	.357	.346	.011	0.46	.643
Antisocial behaviour	.361	.348	.013	0.55	.580
Illegal behaviour	.348	.328	.020	0.85	.397
Irresponsible behaviour	.251	.239	.012	0.49	.623
Deceptive behaviour	.344	.334	.010	0.42	.672
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.396	.375	.021	0.89	.375
Overt PA	.381	.358	.023	0.97	.335
Violent behaviour	.364	.347	.017	0.71	.479

Note. A = General ELS proxy; B = Međedović's ELS proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .851$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .844$.

Table A4-17

*Updated Male-Specific IPM Proxy's and Original Male-Specific IPM Proxy's
Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men*

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.423	.367	.056	2.71	.007
Overt RA	.398	.364	.034	1.63	.103
Relational PA	.522	.422	.100	5.08	<.001
Relational RA	.548	.485	.063	3.27	.001
RARR	.482	.427	.055	2.72	.007
Antisocial behaviour	.370	.310	.060	2.83	.005
Illegal behaviour	.313	.264	.049	2.27	.024
Irresponsible behaviour	.294	.254	.040	1.84	.066
Deceptive behaviour	.324	.266	.058	2.69	.007
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.328	.265	.063	2.85	.004
Overt PA	.401	.351	.050	2.33	.020
Violent behaviour	.351	.286	.065	2.96	.003

Note. A = Updated male-specific IPM proxy; B = Original male-specific IPM proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .943$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .940$.

Table A4-18

*Updated Male-Specific CA Proxy's and Original Male-Specific CA Proxy's
Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men*

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.384	.343	.041	1.58	.114
Overt RA	.342	.315	.027	1.02	.306
Relational PA	.427	.350	.077	3.00	.003
Relational RA	.450	.413	.037	1.47	.142
RARR	.362	.324	.038	1.44	.151
Antisocial behaviour	.373	.331	.042	1.61	.108
Illegal behaviour	.311	.294	.017	0.64	.523
Irresponsible behaviour	.312	.278	.034	1.27	.203
Deceptive behaviour	.289	.233	.056	2.08	.038
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.352	.269	.083	2.83	.005
Overt PA	.394	.310	.084	2.91	.004
Violent behaviour	.358	.287	.071	2.43	.015

Note. A = Updated male-specific CA proxy; B = Original male-specific CA proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .913$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .893$.

Table A4-19

Updated Male-Specific ELS Proxy's and Original Male-Specific ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.453	.349	.104	3.40	.001
Overt RA	.355	.212	.143	4.46	<.001
Relational PA	.464	.313	.151	4.91	<.001
Relational RA	.414	.288	.126	4.01	<.001
RARR	.417	.317	.100	3.18	.001
Antisocial behaviour	.428	.308	.120	3.86	<.001
Illegal behaviour	.353	.266	.087	2.72	.006
Irresponsible behaviour	.371	.246	.125	3.92	<.001
Deceptive behaviour	.353	.272	.081	2.54	.011
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.327	.169	.158	5.01	<.001
Overt PA	.390	.266	.124	4.04	<.001
Violent behaviour	.375	.260	.115	3.72	<.001

Note. A = Updated male-specific ELS proxy; B = Original male-specific ELS proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .873$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .880$.

Table A4-20

Updated Male-Specific F1 Proxy's and Original Male-Specific F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.419	.364	.055	2.70	.007
Overt RA	.399	.370	.029	1.42	.157
Relational PA	.490	.414	.076	3.86	<.001
Relational RA	.520	.482	.038	1.98	.048
RARR	.451	.410	.041	2.03	.042
Antisocial behaviour	.391	.330	.061	2.95	.003
Illegal behaviour	.330	.286	.044	2.08	.037
Irresponsible behaviour	.324	.275	.049	2.31	.021
Deceptive behaviour	.317	.259	.058	2.73	.006
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.359	.299	.060	2.56	.010
Overt PA	.401	.347	.054	2.35	.019
Violent behaviour	.361	.290	.071	3.03	.002

Note. A = Updated male-specific F1 proxy; B = Original male-specific F1 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .945$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .931$.

Table A4-21

Updated Male-Specific F2 Proxy's and Original Male-Specific F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.483	.424	.059	2.32	.020
Overt RA	.350	.273	.077	2.83	.005
Relational PA	.544	.453	.091	3.69	<.001
Relational RA	.480	.400	.080	3.12	.002
RARR	.463	.411	.052	2.01	.045
Antisocial behaviour	.423	.350	.073	2.77	.006
Illegal behaviour	.350	.297	.053	1.95	.051
Irresponsible behaviour	.340	.272	.068	2.49	.013
Deceptive behaviour	.365	.309	.056	2.08	.038
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.354	.259	.095	3.47	.001
Overt PA	.429	.378	.051	1.94	.053
Violent behaviour	.392	.331	.061	2.27	.023

Note. A = Updated male-specific F2 proxy; B = Original male-specific F2 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .908$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .907$.

Table A4-22

Updated Male-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's and Original Male-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.449	.369	.080	3.52	<.001
Overt RA	.404	.323	.081	3.49	<.001
Relational PA	.524	.436	.088	4.04	<.001
Relational RA	.524	.452	.072	3.31	.001
RARR	.477	.420	.057	2.54	.011
Antisocial behaviour	.400	.306	.094	4.04	<.001
Illegal behaviour	.333	.260	.073	3.06	.002
Irresponsible behaviour	.329	.242	.087	3.64	<.001
Deceptive behaviour	.335	.267	.068	2.85	.004
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.376	.268	.108	4.46	<.001
Overt PA	.431	.341	.090	3.82	<.001
Violent behaviour	.378	.273	.105	4.34	<.001

Note. A = Updated male-specific total psychopathy proxy; B = Original male-specific total psychopathy proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .930$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .926$.

Table A4-23

Updated Male-Specific IPM Proxy's and Updated General IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.423	.411	.012	1.27	.204
Overt RA	.398	.367	.031	3.24	.001
Relational PA	.522	.514	.008	0.90	.370
Relational RA	.548	.517	.031	3.54	<.001
RARR	.482	.459	.023	2.49	.013
Antisocial behaviour	.370	.366	.004	0.41	.679
Illegal behaviour	.313	.305	.008	0.81	.418
Irresponsible behaviour	.294	.296	-.002	0.20	.840
Deceptive behaviour	.324	.318	.006	0.61	.542
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.328	.319	.009	0.82	.413
Overt PA	.401	.399	.002	0.19	.851
Violent behaviour	.351	.348	.003	0.28	.783

Note. A = Updated male-specific IPM proxy; B = Updated general IPM proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .988$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .985$.

Table A4-24

Updated Male-Specific CA Proxy's and Updated General CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.384	.381	.003	0.23	.821
Overt RA	.342	.317	.025	1.84	.065
Relational PA	.427	.410	.017	1.30	.195
Relational RA	.450	.409	.041	3.16	.002
RARR	.362	.346	.016	1.18	.238
Antisocial behaviour	.373	.393	-.020	1.51	.132
Illegal behaviour	.311	.325	-.014	1.03	.305
Irresponsible behaviour	.312	.340	-.028	2.06	.039
Deceptive behaviour	.289	.290	-.001	0.07	.942
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.352	.363	-.011	0.70	.487
Overt PA	.394	.401	-.007	0.45	.653
Violent behaviour	.358	.356	.002	0.13	.900

Note. A = Updated male-specific CA proxy; B = Updated general CA proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .977$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .968$.

Table A4-25

Updated Male-Specific ELS Proxy's and Updated General ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.453	.405	.048	3.80	<.001
Overt RA	.355	.299	.056	4.23	<.001
Relational PA	.464	.443	.021	1.67	.095
Relational RA	.414	.387	.027	2.09	.037
RARR	.417	.384	.033	2.54	.011
Antisocial behaviour	.428	.395	.033	2.58	.010
Illegal behaviour	.353	.331	.022	1.67	.096
Irresponsible behaviour	.371	.328	.043	3.27	.001
Deceptive behaviour	.353	.331	.022	1.67	.096
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.327	.290	.037	2.91	.004
Overt PA	.390	.354	.036	2.90	.004
Violent behaviour	.375	.362	.013	1.04	.297

Note. A = Updated male-specific ELS proxy; B = Updated general ELS proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .978$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .980$.

Table A4-26

Updated Male-Specific ASB Proxy's and Updated General ASB Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.431	.349	.082	4.33	<.001
Overt RA	.346	.282	.064	3.26	.001
Relational PA	.529	.427	.102	5.68	<.001
Relational RA	.506	.417	.089	4.88	<.001
RARR	.417	.308	.109	5.65	<.001
Antisocial behaviour	.398	.365	.033	1.72	.085
Illegal behaviour	.341	.323	.018	0.92	.358
Irresponsible behaviour	.304	.295	.009	0.45	.650
Deceptive behaviour	.343	.285	.058	2.95	.003
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.342	.273	.069	3.37	.001
Overt PA	.400	.351	.049	2.45	.014
Violent behaviour	.359	.299	.060	2.95	.003

Note. A = Updated male-specific ASB proxy; B = Updated general ASB proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .952$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .948$.

Table A4-27

Updated Male-Specific F1 Proxy's and Updated General F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.419	.413	.006	0.64	.525
Overt RA	.399	.400	-.001	0.11	.916
Relational PA	.490	.485	.005	0.55	.583
Relational RA	.520	.500	.020	2.24	.025
RARR	.451	.441	.010	1.07	.286
Antisocial behaviour	.391	.404	-.013	1.36	.172
Illegal behaviour	.330	.341	-.011	1.12	.261
Irresponsible behaviour	.324	.342	-.018	1.84	.066
Deceptive behaviour	.317	.321	-.004	0.41	.685
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.359	.353	.006	0.57	.567
Overt PA	.401	.412	-.011	1.07	.283
Violent behaviour	.361	.370	-.009	0.86	.389

Note. A = Updated male-specific F1 proxy; B = Updated general F1 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .988$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .986$.

Table A4-28

Updated Male-Specific F2 Proxy's and Updated General F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.483	.454	.029	2.67	.008
Overt RA	.350	.382	-.032	2.79	.005
Relational PA	.544	.523	.021	2.01	.045
Relational RA	.480	.480	.000	0.00	1.000
RARR	.463	.446	.017	1.53	.126
Antisocial behaviour	.423	.433	-.010	0.90	.371
Illegal behaviour	.350	.367	-.017	1.47	.141
Irresponsible behaviour	.340	.350	-.010	0.86	.389
Deceptive behaviour	.365	.366	-.001	0.09	.931
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.354	.358	-.004	0.33	.743
Overt PA	.429	.435	-.006	0.51	.611
Violent behaviour	.392	.404	-.012	1.00	.317

Note. A = Updated male-specific F2 proxy; B = Updated general F2 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .983$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .981$.

Table A4-29

Updated Male-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's and Updated General Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.449	.426	.023	2.14	.033
Overt RA	.404	.364	.040	3.63	<.001
Relational PA	.524	.524	.000	0.00	1.000
Relational RA	.524	.498	.026	2.52	.012
RARR	.477	.452	.025	2.34	.019
Antisocial behaviour	.400	.388	.012	1.09	.276
Illegal behaviour	.333	.320	.013	1.15	.252
Irresponsible behaviour	.329	.321	.008	0.71	.481
Deceptive behaviour	.335	.330	.005	0.44	.659
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.376	.371	.005	0.41	.680
Overt PA	.431	.425	.006	0.51	.611
Violent behaviour	.378	.366	.012	0.99	.323

Note. A = Updated male-specific total psychopathy proxy; B = Updated general total psychopathy proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .984$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .981$.

Table A4-30

Updated Male-Specific IPM Proxy's and Međedović's IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.423	.342	.081	3.01	.003
Overt RA	.398	.369	.029	1.07	.283
Relational PA	.522	.413	.109	4.25	<.001
Relational RA	.548	.459	.089	3.55	<.001
RARR	.482	.410	.072	2.74	.006
Antisocial behaviour	.370	.271	.099	3.58	<.001
Illegal behaviour	.313	.226	.087	3.09	.002
Irresponsible behaviour	.294	.219	.075	2.65	.008
Deceptive behaviour	.324	.245	.079	2.82	.005
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.328	.229	.099	3.34	.001
Overt PA	.401	.327	.074	2.58	.010
Violent behaviour	.351	.259	.092	3.13	.002

Note. A = Male-specific IPM proxy; B = Međedović's IPM proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .904$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .893$.

Table A4-31

Updated Male-Specific CA Proxy's and Međedović's CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.384	.186	.198	4.28	<.001
Overt RA	.342	.151	.191	4.07	<.001
Relational PA	.427	.130	.297	6.46	<.001
Relational RA	.450	.167	.283	6.23	<.001
RARR	.362	.121	.241	5.11	<.001
Antisocial behaviour	.373	.216	.157	3.40	.001
Illegal behaviour	.311	.185	.126	2.67	.007
Irresponsible behaviour	.312	.211	.101	2.15	.032
Deceptive behaviour	.289	.102	.187	3.93	<.001
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.352	.170	.182	3.42	.001
Overt PA	.394	.190	.204	3.89	<.001
Violent behaviour	.358	.172	.186	3.50	<.001

Note. A = Male-specific CA proxy; B = Međedović's CA proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .733$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .653$.

Table A4-32

Updated Male-Specific ELS Proxy's and Međedović's ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Men

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.453	.441	.012	0.33	.743
Overt RA	.355	.327	.028	0.72	.470
Relational PA	.464	.487	-.023	0.64	.524
Relational RA	.414	.414	.000	0.00	1.000
RARR	.417	.415	.002	0.05	.958
Antisocial behaviour	.428	.398	.030	0.80	.422
Illegal behaviour	.353	.332	.021	0.54	.588
Irresponsible behaviour	.371	.313	.058	1.50	.134
Deceptive behaviour	.353	.366	-.013	0.34	.735
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.327	.314	.013	0.31	.757
Overt PA	.390	.379	.011	0.27	.787
Violent behaviour	.375	.367	.008	0.20	.846

Note. A = Male-specific ELS proxy; B = Međedović's ELS proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .809$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .779$.

Table A4-33

Updated Female-Specific IPM Proxy's and Original Female-Specific IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.445	.460	-.015	0.97	.335
Overt RA	.472	.459	.013	0.84	.399
Relational PA	.530	.539	-.009	0.61	.542
Relational RA	.630	.593	.037	2.70	.007
RARR	.347	.351	-.004	0.24	.808
Antisocial behaviour	.226	.241	-.015	0.89	.376
Illegal behaviour	.238	.247	-.009	0.53	.595
Irresponsible behaviour	.089	.108	-.019	1.09	.274
Deceptive behaviour	.282	.296	-.014	0.84	.402
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.429	.426	.003	0.18	.861
Overt PA	.418	.414	.004	0.23	.817
Violent behaviour	.340	.365	-.025	1.41	.159

Note. A = Updated female-specific IPM proxy; B = Original female-specific IPM proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .963$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .956$.

Table A4-34

*Updated Female-Specific CA Proxy's and Original Female-Specific CA Proxy's
Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women*

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.368	.373	-.005	0.29	.775
Overt RA	.318	.274	.044	2.46	.014
Relational PA	.467	.471	-.004	0.24	.810
Relational RA	.531	.497	.034	2.11	.035
RARR	.282	.255	.027	1.48	.140
Antisocial behaviour	.266	.261	.005	0.28	.783
Illegal behaviour	.264	.253	.011	0.61	.545
Irresponsible behaviour	.133	.132	.001	0.05	.957
Deceptive behaviour	.291	.287	.004	0.22	.824
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.381	.380	.001	0.06	.953
Overt PA	.355	.336	.019	1.10	.270
Violent behaviour	.375	.370	.005	0.29	.769

Note. A = Updated female-specific CA proxy; B = Original female-specific CA proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .957$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .959$.

Table A4-35

Updated Female-Specific ELS Proxy's and Original Female-Specific ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.474	.432	.042	2.20	.028
Overt RA	.404	.312	.092	4.63	<.001
Relational PA	.516	.462	.054	2.90	.004
Relational RA	.565	.465	.100	5.54	<.001
RARR	.334	.260	.074	3.59	<.001
Antisocial behaviour	.279	.247	.032	1.55	.122
Illegal behaviour	.274	.252	.022	1.06	.288
Irresponsible behaviour	.142	.119	.023	1.08	.280
Deceptive behaviour	.343	.322	.021	1.04	.299
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.416	.366	.050	2.40	.016
Overt PA	.406	.351	.055	2.62	.009
Violent behaviour	.371	.313	.058	2.72	.006

Note. A = Updated female-specific ELS proxy; B = Original female-specific ELS proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .944$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .937$.

Table A4-36

Updated Female-Specific ASB Proxy's and Original Female-Specific ASB Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.391	.336	.055	2.02	.044
Overt RA	.262	.131	.131	4.57	<.001
Relational PA	.484	.433	.051	1.96	.050
Relational RA	.516	.440	.076	2.97	.003
RARR	.261	.186	.075	2.60	.009
Antisocial behaviour	.142	.084	.058	1.99	.047
Illegal behaviour	.178	.095	.083	2.86	.004
Irresponsible behaviour	.007	-.017	.024	0.82	.414
Deceptive behaviour	.243	.194	.049	1.71	.087
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.355	.281	.074	2.81	.005
Overt PA	.353	.275	.078	2.96	.003
Violent behaviour	.271	.227	.044	1.63	.103

Note. A = Updated female-specific ASB proxy; B = Original female-specific ASB proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .895$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .905$.

Table A4-37

Updated Female-Specific F1 Proxy's and Original Female-Specific F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.434	.439	-.005	0.33	.743
Overt RA	.429	.395	.034	2.21	.027
Relational PA	.522	.531	-.009	0.62	.533
Relational RA	.614	.584	.030	2.22	.027
RARR	.332	.328	.004	0.25	.805
Antisocial behaviour	.240	.252	-.012	0.73	.465
Illegal behaviour	.253	.254	-.001	0.06	.951
Irresponsible behaviour	.096	.118	-.022	1.30	.192
Deceptive behaviour	.295	.299	-.004	0.25	.805
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.446	.428	.018	1.09	.275
Overt PA	.414	.407	.007	0.42	.675
Violent behaviour	.365	.372	-.007	0.41	.681

Note. A = Updated female-specific F1 proxy; B = Original female-specific F1 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .965$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .959$.

Table A4-38

Updated Female-Specific F2 Proxy's and Original Female-Specific F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.467	.421	.046	2.20	.028
Overt RA	.389	.313	.076	3.48	.001
Relational PA	.519	.451	.068	3.34	.001
Relational RA	.581	.484	.097	4.97	<.001
RARR	.321	.250	.071	3.14	.002
Antisocial behaviour	.250	.243	.007	0.31	.758
Illegal behaviour	.259	.249	.010	0.44	.659
Irresponsible behaviour	.103	.113	-.010	0.43	.668
Deceptive behaviour	.324	.321	.003	0.14	.892
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.435	.386	.049	2.18	.030
Overt PA	.396	.319	.077	3.34	.001
Violent behaviour	.367	.329	.038	1.64	.102

Note. A = Updated female-specific F2 proxy; B = Original female-specific F2 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .933$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .925$.

Table A4-39

Updated Female-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's and Original Female-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.452	.450	.002	0.13	.896
Overt RA	.409	.384	.025	1.59	.113
Relational PA	.532	.528	.004	0.27	.784
Relational RA	.597	.567	.030	2.15	.031
RARR	.334	.323	.011	0.67	.503
Antisocial behaviour	.223	.239	-.016	0.96	.339
Illegal behaviour	.240	.241	-.001	0.06	.952
Irresponsible behaviour	.075	.100	-.025	1.46	.145
Deceptive behaviour	.295	.307	-.012	0.73	.464
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.439	.431	.008	0.49	.628
Overt PA	.412	.401	.011	0.66	.511
Violent behaviour	.362	.365	-.003	0.18	.861

Note. A = Updated female-specific total psychopathy proxy; B = Original female-specific total psychopathy proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .964$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .959$.

Table A4-40

Updated Female-Specific IPM Proxy's and Updated General IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.445	.441	.004	0.27	.787
Overt RA	.472	.418	.054	3.69	<.001
Relational PA	.530	.527	.003	0.21	.830
Relational RA	.630	.625	.005	0.39	.696
RARR	.347	.332	.015	0.96	.338
Antisocial behaviour	.226	.208	.018	1.12	.263
Illegal behaviour	.238	.230	.008	0.50	.617
Irresponsible behaviour	.089	.068	.021	1.28	.201
Deceptive behaviour	.282	.275	.007	0.44	.658
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.429	.421	.008	0.52	.602
Overt PA	.418	.424	-.006	0.39	.696
Violent behaviour	.340	.317	.023	1.44	.151

Note. A = Updated female-specific IPM proxy; B = Updated general IPM proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .967$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .965$.

Table A4-41

Updated Female-Specific CA Proxy's and Updated General CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.368	.318	.050	3.29	.001
Overt RA	.318	.242	.076	4.91	<.001
Relational PA	.467	.479	-.012	0.84	.402
Relational RA	.531	.504	.027	1.95	.052
RARR	.282	.257	.025	1.59	.113
Antisocial behaviour	.266	.214	.052	3.31	.001
Illegal behaviour	.264	.226	.038	2.42	.016
Irresponsible behaviour	.133	.085	.048	2.98	.003
Deceptive behaviour	.291	.250	.041	2.63	.009
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.381	.359	.022	1.36	.174
Overt PA	.355	.325	.030	1.83	.067
Violent behaviour	.375	.320	.055	3.38	.001

Note. A = Updated female-specific CA proxy; B = Updated general CA proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .968$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .963$.

Table A4-42

Updated Female-Specific ELS Proxy's and Updated General ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.474	.477	-.003	0.18	.859
Overt RA	.404	.342	.062	3.49	<.001
Relational PA	.516	.499	.017	1.03	.305
Relational RA	.565	.555	.010	0.63	.530
RARR	.334	.325	.009	0.49	.623
Antisocial behaviour	.279	.271	.008	0.43	.665
Illegal behaviour	.274	.265	.009	0.49	.627
Irresponsible behaviour	.142	.144	-.002	0.11	.916
Deceptive behaviour	.343	.355	-.012	0.67	.505
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.416	.414	.002	0.10	.917
Overt PA	.406	.372	.034	1.74	.082
Violent behaviour	.371	.340	.031	1.56	.118

Note. A = Updated female-specific ELS proxy; B = Updated general ELS proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .955$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .945$.

Table A4-43

Updated Female-Specific ASB Proxy's and Updated General ASB Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.391	.366	.025	0.96	.338
Overt RA	.262	.274	-.012	0.44	.659
Relational PA	.484	.420	.064	2.55	.011
Relational RA	.516	.467	.049	2.00	.045
RARR	.261	.222	.039	1.41	.158
Antisocial behaviour	.142	.196	-.054	1.94	.052
Illegal behaviour	.178	.245	-.067	2.43	.015
Irresponsible behaviour	.007	.040	-.033	1.17	.243
Deceptive behaviour	.243	.280	-.037	1.36	.174
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.355	.328	.027	0.98	.327
Overt PA	.353	.322	.031	1.13	.261
Violent behaviour	.271	.286	-.015	0.53	.594

Note. A = Updated female-specific ASB proxy; B = Updated general ASB proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .903$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .895$.

Table A4-44

Updated Female-Specific F1 Proxy's and Updated General F1 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.434	.412	.022	2.00	.046
Overt RA	.429	.409	.020	1.81	.070
Relational PA	.522	.531	-.009	0.87	.385
Relational RA	.614	.627	-.013	1.36	.173
RARR	.332	.335	-.003	0.26	.796
Antisocial behaviour	.240	.242	-.002	0.17	.866
Illegal behaviour	.253	.247	.006	0.51	.611
Irresponsible behaviour	.096	.106	-.010	0.83	.409
Deceptive behaviour	.295	.289	.006	0.52	.606
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.446	.429	.017	1.44	.150
Overt PA	.414	.414	.000	0.00	1.000
Violent behaviour	.365	.354	.011	0.90	.369

Note. A = Updated female-specific F1 proxy; B = Updated general F1 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .982$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .979$.

Table A4-45

Updated Female-Specific F2 Proxy's and Updated General F2 Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.467	.450	.017	1.07	.285
Overt RA	.389	.396	-.007	0.43	.670
Relational PA	.519	.530	-.011	0.72	.471
Relational RA	.581	.601	-.020	1.39	.165
RARR	.321	.338	-.017	1.00	.319
Antisocial behaviour	.250	.265	-.015	0.87	.386
Illegal behaviour	.259	.268	-.009	0.52	.602
Irresponsible behaviour	.103	.127	-.024	1.35	.177
Deceptive behaviour	.324	.340	-.016	0.95	.343
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.435	.423	.012	0.69	.494
Overt PA	.396	.389	.007	0.39	.695
Violent behaviour	.367	.352	.015	0.83	.408

Note. A = Updated female-specific F2 proxy; B = Updated general F2 proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .961$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .954$.

Table A4-46

Updated Female-Specific Total Psychopathy Proxy's and Updated General Total Psychopathy Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.452	.423	.029	1.93	.053
Overt RA	.409	.401	.008	0.52	.600
Relational PA	.532	.539	-.007	0.50	.620
Relational RA	.597	.616	-.019	1.43	.152
RARR	.334	.336	-.002	0.13	.900
Antisocial behaviour	.223	.222	.001	0.06	.951
Illegal behaviour	.240	.238	.002	0.12	.902
Irresponsible behaviour	.075	.077	-.002	0.12	.905
Deceptive behaviour	.295	.284	.011	0.69	.492
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.439	.446	-.007	0.44	.662
Overt PA	.412	.418	-.006	0.37	.712
Violent behaviour	.362	.358	.004	0.24	.811

Note. A = Updated female-specific total psychopathy proxy; B = Updated general total psychopathy proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .966$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .961$.

Table A4-47

Updated Female-Specific IPM Proxy's and Međedović's IPM Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.445	.378	.067	2.67	.008
Overt RA	.472	.419	.053	2.16	.031
Relational PA	.530	.455	.075	3.14	.002
Relational RA	.630	.589	.041	1.89	.058
RARR	.347	.310	.037	1.41	.160
Antisocial behaviour	.226	.197	.029	1.07	.283
Illegal behaviour	.238	.188	.050	1.85	.064
Irresponsible behaviour	.089	.096	-.007	0.25	.799
Deceptive behaviour	.282	.229	.053	1.99	.047
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.429	.328	.101	3.81	<.001
Overt PA	.418	.377	.041	1.55	.121
Violent behaviour	.340	.284	.056	2.04	.041

Note. A = Female-specific IPM proxy; B = Međedović's IPM proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .907$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .898$.

Table A4-48

Updated Female-Specific CA Proxy's and Međedović's CA Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.368	.107	.261	6.45	<.001
Overt RA	.318	.061	.257	6.27	<.001
Relational PA	.467	.274	.193	4.99	<.001
Relational RA	.531	.266	.265	7.06	<.001
RARR	.282	.121	.161	3.87	<.001
Antisocial behaviour	.266	.153	.113	2.74	.006
Illegal behaviour	.264	.164	.100	2.42	.015
Irresponsible behaviour	.133	.085	.048	1.14	.255
Deceptive behaviour	.291	.129	.162	3.94	<.001
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.381	.225	.156	3.84	<.001
Overt PA	.355	.183	.172	4.19	<.001
Violent behaviour	.375	.180	.195	4.77	<.001

Note. A = Female-specific CA proxy; B = Međedović's CA proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .781$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .773$.

Table A4-49

Updated Female-Specific ELS Proxy's and Međedović's ELS Proxy's Correlations with Relevant Variables in Women

	A	B	A-B	z	p
Pearson correlations ^a					
Organizational deviance	.474	.439	.035	1.52	.128
Overt RA	.404	.345	.059	2.46	.014
Relational PA	.516	.444	.072	3.18	.001
Relational RA	.565	.484	.081	3.71	<.001
RARR	.334	.270	.064	2.57	.010
Antisocial behaviour	.279	.245	.034	1.36	.174
Illegal behaviour	.274	.230	.044	1.75	.079
Irresponsible behaviour	.142	.139	.003	0.12	.907
Deceptive behaviour	.343	.298	.045	1.84	.067
Spearman correlations ^b					
Interpersonal deviance	.416	.351	.065	2.55	.011
Overt PA	.406	.314	.092	3.58	<.001
Violent behaviour	.371	.299	.072	2.76	.006

Note. A = Female-specific ELS proxy; B = Međedović's ELS proxy; RA = Reactive aggression; PA = Proactive aggression; RARR = Relational aggression in romantic relationships.

^a $r_{AB} = .918$. ^b $\rho_{AB} = .906$.

Table A4-50
*Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100
 Items and Interpersonal Manipulation*

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	.366	.282	.084
48 (H: modesty)	-.390	-.332	.058
56 (C: diligence)	.260	.206	.054
Women more strongly related			
6 (H: sincerity)	.410	.491	.081
36 (H: fairness)	.350	.504	.154
42 (H: greed-avoidance)	.164	.304	.140
28 (X: social self-esteem)	-.266	-.334	.068
70 (X: liveliness)	.211	.356	.145
75 (A: forgiveness)	.192	.285	.093
33 (A: gentleness)	-.246	-.405	.159
87 (A: flexibility)	.235	.289	.054
93 (A: patience)	.221	.369	.148
68 (C: prudence)	-.246	-.291	.045
25 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	.117	.274	.157
73 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	-.158	-.308	.150
98 (altruism)	-.279	-.434	.155
99 (altruism)	-.351	-.427	.076

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness.

Table A4-51

*Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100
Items and Callous Affect*

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
24 (H: modesty)	-.309	-.169	.140
65 (E: dependence)	-.374	-.268	.106
89 (E: dependence)	.336	.277	.059
73 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	-.272	-.187	.085
97 (altruism)	-.580	-.513	.067
Women more strongly related			
36 (H: fairness)	.238	.327	.089
28 (X: social self-esteem)	-.306	-.355	.049
33 (A: gentleness)	-.263	-.369	.106
93 (A: patience)	.157	.300	.143
99 (altruism)	.424	.586	.162

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; O = Openness.

Table A4-52
*Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100
 Items and Erratic Lifestyle*

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
59 (E: anxiety)	-.267	-.193	.074
28 (X: social self-esteem)	-.322	-.234	.088
13 (O: creativity)	-.286	-.174	.112
97 (altruism)	-.287	-.232	.055
Women more strongly related			
36 (H: fairness)	.305	.400	.095
29 (E: fearfulness)	.400	.530	.130
93 (A: patience)	.227	.276	.049
2 (C: organization)	-.029	-.320	.291
50 (C: organization)	.196	.386	.190
68 (C: prudence)	-.266	-.353	.087
67 (O: unconventionality)	.168	.288	.120
99 (altruism)	.289	.336	.047

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness.

Table A4-53

*Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100
Items and Antisocial Behaviour*

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
28 (X: social self-esteem)	-.353	-.277	.076
56 (C: diligence)	.279	.176	.103
97 (altruism)	-.341	-.266	.075
100 (altruism)	.411	.244	.167
Women more strongly related			
6 (H: sincerity)	.176	.253	.077
36 (H: fairness)	.303	.365	.062
73 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	-.105	-.259	.154

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; X = Extraversion; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness

Table A4-54
*Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100
 Items and Factor 1*

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
66 (H: greed-avoidance)	.286	.198	.088
24 (H: modesty)	-.367	-.298	.069
48 (H: modesty)	-.399	-.351	.048
65 (E: dependence)	-.289	-.208	.081
56 (C: diligence)	.258	.168	.090
Women more strongly related			
6 (H: sincerity)	.313	.413	.100
36 (H: fairness)	.323	.467	.144
28 (X: social self-esteem)	-.311	-.383	.072
70 (X: liveliness)	.262	.358	.096
75 (A: forgiveness)	.237	.309	.072
33 (A: gentleness)	-.277	-.432	.155
93 (A: patience)	.207	.374	.167
68 (C: prudence)	-.184	-.279	.095
25 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	.152	.255	.103
73 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	-.232	-.278	.046
98 (altruism)	-.416	-.530	.114
99 (altruism)	.421	.560	.139

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness.

Table A4-55
*Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100
 Items and Factor 2*

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
28 (X: social self-esteem)	-.372	-.288	.084
13 (O: creativity)	-.264	-.099	.165
97 (altruism)	-.347	-.281	.066
100 (altruism)	.430	.342	.088
Women more strongly related			
6 (H: sincerity)	.255	.303	.048
36 (H: fairness)	.335	.437	.102
29 (E: fearfulness)	.329	.438	.109
2 (C: organization)	.011	-.289	.300
50 (C: organization)	.212	.325	.113
68 (C: prudence)	-.226	-.317	.091

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness.

Table A4-56
*Sex Differences in Correlations Between New HEXACO-100
 Items and Total Psychopathy*

	Men (A)	Women (B)	A-B
Men more strongly related			
56 (C: diligence)	.288	.222	.066
13 (O: creativity)	-.255	-.002	.253
Women more strongly related			
6 (H: sincerity)	.307	.400	.093
36 (H: fairness)	.356	.502	.146
29 (E: fearfulness)	.319	.392	.073
70 (X: liveliness)	.285	.340	.055
33 (A: gentleness)	-.254	-.347	.093
93 (A: patience)	.249	.353	.104
2 (C: organization)	-.017	-.273	.256
50 (C: organization)	.239	.312	.073
68 (C: prudence)	-.223	-.330	.107
25 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	.117	.259	.142
73 (O: aesthetic appreciation)	-.163	-.271	.108
98 (altruism)	-.356	-.442	.086
99 (altruism)	.425	.531	.106

Note. H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness.

Appendix B: Measures

SRP:4

Please rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements about you. You can be honest because your name is not associated with any of your answers.

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree strongly

1. I'm a rebellious person.
2. I'm more tough-minded than other people.
3. I think I could "beat" a lie detector.
4. I have taken illegal drugs (e.g., marijuana, ecstasy).
5. I have never been involved in delinquent gang activity.
6. I have never stolen a truck, car or motorcycle.
7. Most people are wimps.
8. I purposely flatter people to get them on my side.
9. I've often done something dangerous just for the thrill of it.
10. I have tricked someone into giving me money.
11. It tortures me to see an injured animal.
12. I have assaulted a law enforcement official or social worker.
13. I have pretended to be someone else in order to get something.
14. I always plan out my weekly activities.
15. I like to see fist-fights.
16. I'm not tricky or sly.
17. I'd be good at a dangerous job because I would make fast decisions.
18. I have never tried to force someone to have sex.
19. My friends would say that I am a warm person.
20. I would get a kick out of 'scamming' someone.
21. I have never attacked someone with the idea of injuring them.
22. I never miss appointments.
23. I avoid horror movies.
24. I trust other people to be honest.
25. I hate high speed driving.
26. I feel so sorry when I see a homeless person.
27. It's fun to see how far you can push people before they get upset.
28. I enjoy doing wild things.
29. I have broken into a building or vehicle in order to steal something or vandalize.
30. I don't bother to keep in touch with my family any more.
31. I find it difficult to manipulate people.
32. I rarely follow the rules.
33. I never cry at movies.
34. I have never been arrested.
35. You should take advantage of other people before they do it to you.

36. I don't enjoy gambling for real money.
37. People sometimes say that I'm cold-hearted.
38. People can usually tell if I am lying.
39. I like to have sex with people I barely know.
40. I love violent sports and movies.
41. Sometimes you have to pretend you like people to get something out of them.
42. I am an impulsive person.
43. I have taken hard drugs (e.g., heroin, cocaine).
44. I'm a soft-hearted person.
45. I can talk people into anything.
46. I never shoplifted from a store.
47. I don't enjoy taking risks.
48. People are too sensitive when I tell them the truth about themselves.
49. I was convicted of a serious crime.
50. Most people tell lies everyday.
51. I keep getting in trouble for the same things over and over.
52. Every now and then I carry a weapon (knife or gun) for protection.
53. People cry way too much at funerals.
54. You can get what you want by telling people what they want to hear.
55. I easily get bored.
56. I never feel guilty over hurting others.
57. I have threatened people into giving me money, clothes, or makeup.
58. A lot of people are "suckers" and can be easily fooled.
59. I admit that I often "mouth off" without thinking.
60. I sometimes dump friends that I don't need any more.
61. I would never step on others to get what I want.
62. I have close friends who served time in prison.
63. I purposely tried to hit someone with the vehicle I was driving.
64. I have violated my probation from prison.

HEXACO-60

The following are a series of statements about you. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

Please answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)	Agree	Strongly agree

1. I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
2. I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
3. I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.
4. I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
5. I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
6. I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.
7. I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
8. I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.
9. People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
10. I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
11. I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.
12. If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
13. I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.
14. When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details.
15. People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn.
16. I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.
17. When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
18. Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
19. I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
20. I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
21. People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
22. On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
23. I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
24. I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.
25. If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
26. When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
27. My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is "forgive and forget".
28. I feel that I am an unpopular person.
29. When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
30. If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.
31. I've never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
32. I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.

33. I tend to be lenient in judging other people.
34. In social situations, I'm usually the one who makes the first move.
35. I worry a lot less than most people do.
36. I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.
37. People have often told me that I have a good imagination.
38. I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.
39. I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.
40. The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.
41. I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
42. I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.
43. I like people who have unconventional views.
44. I make a lot of mistakes because I don't think before I act.
45. Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.
46. Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.
47. I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.
48. I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.
49. I don't think of myself as the artistic or creative type.
50. People often call me a perfectionist.
51. Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.
52. I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.
53. Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking.
54. I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.
55. I find it boring to discuss philosophy.
56. I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.
57. When people tell me that I'm wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.
58. When I'm in a group of people, I'm often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.
59. I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.
60. I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.

NPI

Choose the one that you most identify with.

1. A. I have a natural talent for influencing people.
B. I am not good at influencing people.
2. A. Modesty doesn't become me.
B. I am essentially a modest person.
3. A. I would do almost anything on a dare.
B. I tend to be a fairly cautious person.
4. A. When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed.
B. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.
5. A. The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me.
B. If I ruled the world it would be a better place.
6. A. I can usually talk my way out of anything.
B. I try to accept the consequences of my behavior.
7. A. I prefer to blend in with the crowd.
B. I like to be the center of attention.
8. A. I will be a success.
B. I am not too concerned about success.
9. A. I am no better or worse than most people.
B. I think I am a special person.
10. A. I am not sure if I would make a good leader.
B. I see myself as a good leader.
11. A. I am assertive.
B. I wish I were more assertive.
12. A. I like to have authority over other people.
B. I don't mind following orders.
13. A. I find it easy to manipulate people.
B. I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people.
14. A. I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
B. I usually get the respect that I deserve.

15. A. I don't particularly like to show off my body.
B. I like to show off my body.
16. A. I can read people like a book.
B. People are sometimes hard to understand.
17. A. If I feel competent I am willing to take responsibility for making decisions.
B. I like to take responsibility for making decisions.
18. A. I just want to be reasonably happy.
B. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.
19. A. My body is nothing special.
B. I like to look at my body.
20. A. I try not to be a show off.
B. I will usually show off if I get the chance.
21. A. I always know what I am doing.
B. Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing.
22. A. I sometimes depend on people to get things done.
B. I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.
23. A. Sometimes I tell good stories.
B. Everybody likes to hear my stories.
24. A. I expect a great deal from other people.
B. I like to do things for other people.
25. A. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
B. I take my satisfactions as they come.
26. A. Compliments embarrass me.
B. I like to be complimented.
27. A. I have a strong will to power.
B. Power for its own sake doesn't interest me.
28. A. I don't care about new fads and fashions.
B. I like to start new fads and fashions.
29. A. I like to look at myself in the mirror.
B. I am not particularly interested in looking at myself in the mirror.
30. A. I really like to be the center of attention.

B. It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention.

31. A. I can live my life in any way I want to.

B. People can't always live their lives in term of what they want.

32. A. Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me.

B. People always seem to recognize my authority.

33. A. I would prefer to be a leader.

B. It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not.

34. A. I am going to be a great person.

B. I hope I am going to be successful.

35. A. People sometimes believe what I tell them.

B. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to.

36. A. I am a born leader.

B. Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop.

37. A. I wish somebody would someday write my biography.

B. I don't like people to pry into my life for any reason.

38. A. I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public.

B. I don't mind blending into the crowd when I go out in public.

39. A. I am more capable than other people.

B. There is a lot that I can learn from other people.

40. A. I am much like everybody else.

B. I am an extraordinary person.

Vengeance Scale

Read each item and decide whether you agree or disagree and to what extent.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree strongly			Neither			Agree strongly

1. It's not worth my time/effort to pay back someone who has wronged me.
2. It is important for me to get back at people who have hurt me.
3. I try to even the score with anyone who hurts me.
4. It is always better not to seek vengeance.
5. I live by the motto "Let bygones be bygones".
6. There is nothing wrong with getting back at someone who has hurt you.
7. I don't just get mad, I get even.
8. I find it easy to forgive those who have hurt me.
9. I am not a vengeful person.
10. I believe in the motto "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth".
11. Revenge is morally wrong.
12. If someone causes me trouble, I'll find a way to make them regret it.
13. People who insist on getting revenge are disgusting.
14. If I am wronged, I can't live with myself unless I get revenge.
15. Honour requires that you get back at someone who hurt you.
16. It is usually better to show mercy than to take revenge.
17. Anyone who provokes me deserves the punishment that I give them.
18. It is always better to "turn the other cheek".
19. To have a desire for vengeance would make me feel ashamed.
20. Revenge is sweet.

SDRT

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

1. I would rather live as an average person in a safe place than live as a rich and powerful person in a dangerous place.
2. I would enjoy being a famous and powerful person, even if it meant a high risk of assassination.
3. If the pay were really high, I would be willing to work with extremely explosive materials.
4. I would risk my life for a good chance of finding a huge amount of buried treasure.
5. If I could become rich and famous by winning a major competition, I would put my life on the line to win it.
6. I would like to live in a country where people who take huge risks have the chance to gain superior social status.
7. No matter how good the pay or “perks”, I would not want to be a spy who takes very dangerous assignments.
8. I would rather live a secure life as an ordinary person than risk everything to be “at the top”.
9. For a very high-status job, I would be willing to live in a place that had an extremely high crime rate.
10. I would take a very high-status job even if I had to live in a place where there are many deadly diseases.
11. I would volunteer for a risky medical experiment if it paid me enough to retire early.
12. Being an organized crime boss would be far too dangerous for me (even apart from any moral issues).
13. To become a billionaire, I would be willing to trade 10 years from my life expectancy.
14. I would not go to a war zone even if the business opportunities were extremely profitable.

EM-SOI

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

1. I can easily imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.
2. I can imagine myself enjoying a brief sexual encounter with someone I find very attractive.
3. I could easily imagine myself enjoying one night of sex with someone I would never see again.
4. Sex without love is OK.
5. I could enjoy sex with someone I find highly desirable even if that person does not have long-term potential.
6. I would consider having sex with a stranger if I could be assured that it was safe and he/she was attractive to me.
7. I would never consider having a brief sexual relationship with someone.
8. Sometimes I would rather have sex with someone I did not care about.
9. I believe in taking sexual opportunities when I find them.
10. I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I could feel comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with him or her.
11. I am interested in maintaining a long-term romantic relationship with someone special.
12. I hope to have a romantic relationship that lasts the rest of my life.
13. I would like to have a romantic relationship that lasts forever.
14. Long-term romantic relationships are not for me.
15. Finding a long-term romantic partner is not important to me.
16. I can easily see myself engaging in a long-term romantic relationship with someone special.
17. I can see myself settling down romantically with one special person.

RPQ

There are times when most of us feel angry or have done things we should not have done. Rate each of the items below by putting a circle around 0 (never), 1 (sometimes), or 2 (often). Do not spend a lot of time thinking about the items—just give your first response. Make sure you answer all the items (see below).

0
Never

1
Sometimes

2
Often

1. How often have you yelled at others when they have annoyed you?
2. How often have you had fights with others to show who was on top?
3. How often have you reacted angrily when provoked others?
4. How often have you taken things from other students?
5. How often have you gotten angry when frustrated?
6. How often have you vandalized something for fun?
7. How often have you had temper tantrums?
8. How often have you damaged things because you felt mad?
9. How often have you had a gang fight to be cool?
10. How often have you hurt others to win a game?
11. How often have you become angry or mad when you don't get your way?
12. How often have you used physical force to get others to do what you want?
13. How often have you gotten angry or mad when you lost a game?
14. How often have you gotten angry when others threatened you?
15. How often have you used force to obtain or things from others?
16. How often have you felt better after hitting or yelling at someone?
17. How often have you threatened and bullied someone?
18. How often have you made obscene phone calls for fun?
19. How often have you hit others to defend yourself?
20. How often have you gotten others to gang up on someone else?
21. How often have you carried a weapon to use in a fight?
22. How often have you gotten angry or mad or hit others when teased?
23. How often have you yelled at others so they would do things for you?

SD3

Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements.

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree strongly	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree strongly

1. It's not wise to tell your secrets.
2. I like to use clever manipulation to get my way.
3. Whatever it takes, you must get the important people on your side.
4. Avoid direct conflict with others because they may be useful in the future.
5. It's wise to keep track of information that you can use against people later.
6. You should wait for the right time to get back at people.
7. There are things you should hide from other people to preserve your reputation.
8. Make sure your plans benefit yourself, not others.
9. Most people can be manipulated.
10. People see me as a natural leader.
11. I hate being the center of attention.
12. Many group activities tend to be dull without me.
13. I know that I am special because everyone keeps telling me so.
14. I like to get acquainted with important people.
15. I feel embarrassed if someone compliments me.
16. I have been compared to famous people.
17. I am an average person.
18. I insist on getting the respect I deserve.
19. I like to get revenge on authorities.
20. I avoid dangerous situations.
21. Payback needs to be quick and nasty.
22. People often say I'm out of control.
23. It's true that I can be mean to others.
24. People who mess with me always regret it.
25. I have never gotten into trouble with the law.
26. I enjoy having sex with people I hardly know
27. I'll say anything to get what I want.

VAST

Please rate your agreement or disagreement.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

1. In video games, I like the realistic blood spurts.
2. I sometimes replay my favorite scenes from gory slasher films.
3. I enjoy watching cage fighting (or MMA), where there is no escape.
4. I sometimes look away in horror movies.
5. In car-racing, it's the accidents that I enjoy most.
6. There's way too much violence in sports.
7. I love the YouTube clips of people fighting.
8. I enjoy physically hurting people.
9. I would never purposely humiliate someone.
10. I was purposely cruel to someone in high school.
11. I enjoy hurting my partner during sex (or pretending to).
12. I can dominate others using fear.
13. No matter what, we shouldn't torture terrorists.
14. I enjoy mocking losers to their face.
15. I never said mean things to my parents.
16. I enjoy tormenting animals – especially the nasty ones.

Lying Habits

1. On average, how often would you say you lie in a typical week?
 - 1 (*never*)
 - 2 (*rarely: 1-3 times per week*)
 - 3 (*sometimes: 4-6 times per week*)
 - 4 (*daily: 7 times per week*)
 - 5 (*frequently: 2-3 times per day*)
 - 6 (*constantly: 4+ times per day*)

 2. Generally, what is the ease of which it takes for you to come up with a typical lie?
 - 1 (*a lot of thinking required*)
 - 2 (*some thinking required*)
 - 3 (*not a lot of thinking required*)
 - 4 (*minimal thinking required*)
 - 5 (*no thinking required – it is thought up on the spot*)

 3. How would you rate the overall severity of the lies you tell? So, would being caught produce any negative consequences?
 - 1 (*none*)
 - 2 (*minimal*)
 - 3 (*somewhat*)
 - 4 (*a lot*)
 - 5 (*extreme*)

 4. On average, how often would you say you get away with the lies you tell?
 - 1 (*never, I always get caught*)
 - 2 (*rarely, I usually get caught*)
 - 3 (*occasionally, I get caught around half of the time*)
 - 4 (*regularly, I get away with most of my lies*)
 - 5 (*always, I never get caught lying*)
-
- | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|-----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Not at all | | | | Extremely |
-
5. On a scale of 1-5, please indicate the level of anxiety felt when you are lying.
 6. On a scale of 1-5, please indicate the level of guilt felt when you are lying.
 7. On a scale of 1-5, please indicate the level of fear felt when you are lying.
 8. On a scale of 1-5, please indicate the level of enjoyment felt when you are lying.
 9. On a scale of 1-5, please indicate the level of pride felt when you are lying.

APSD

Please read each statement and decide how well it describes you. Mark your answer by checking the appropriate number (0-2) for each statement. Do not leave any statement unrated.

0	1	2
Not at all true	Sometimes true	Definitely true

1. You blame others for your mistakes.
2. You engage in illegal activities
3. You care about how well you do at school/work.
4. You act without thinking of the consequences.
5. Your emotions are shallow and fake.
6. You lie easily and skillfully
7. You are good at keeping your promises
8. You brag a lot about your abilities, accomplishments, and possessions.
9. You get bored easily
10. You use or “con” other people to get what you want.
11. You tease or make fun of other people.
12. You feel bad or guilty when you do something wrong.
13. You do risky or dangerous things.
14. You act charming and nice to get things you want.
15. You get angry when corrected or punished.
16. You think you are better or more important than other people.
17. You do not plan ahead or you leave things until the “last minute.”
18. You are concerned about the feelings of others.
19. You hide your feelings or emotions from others.
20. You keep the same friends.

School Bullying Questionnaire

Below are some questions about social relationships at school. Please answer them as honestly as you can. Your answers will be kept completely confidential, and there is no way for anyone to determine your answers about your relationship with them or anyone else.

1	2	3	4	5
That hasn't happened	Once or twice	Once a month	Once a week	Several times a week

1. In school, how often has someone much stronger or more popular made fun of you because of your religion or race last term i.e., the last school term or last 4 months)?
2. In school, how often has someone much stronger or more popular made fun of you because of the way you look or talk last term?
3. In school, how often has someone much stronger or more popular hit, slapped, or pushed you last term?
4. In school, how often has someone much stronger or more popular threatened, yelled at, or verbally insulted you last term?
5. In school, how often has someone much stronger or more popular spread rumours, or told mean lies about you, or actively excluded you last term?
6. In school, how often has someone much stronger or more popular made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures aimed at you last term?
7. In school, how often has someone much stronger or more popular made any of the previous acts against you electronically?
8. In school, how often have you made fun of someone much weaker or less popular because of their religion or race last term?
9. In school, how often have you made fun of someone much weaker or less popular because of the way they looked or talked last term?
10. In school, how often have you hit, slapped, or pushed someone much weaker or less popular last term?
11. In school, how often have you threatened, yelled at, or verbally insulted someone much weaker or less popular last term?
12. In school, how often have you spread rumours, mean lies, or actively excluded someone much weaker or less popular last term?
13. In school, how often have you made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures aimed at someone much weaker or less popular last term?
14. In school, how often have you made any of the acts against someone electronically?

Multidimensional, Integrated, Contextualized Measure of Bullying, Aggression, and Victimization (Aggressive Behaviours Only)

In the PAST YEAR, how often have YOU DONE the following?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once or twice	Several times	Almost every month	Almost every week

Physical

1. Deliberately damaged or broke someone's things
2. Got into a physical fight
3. Hit, kicked, or shoved someone
4. Used a weapon (e.g., sticks, rocks, knife, gun) to fight someone
5. Physically hurt others
6. Used physical force against someone
7. Tripped or threw things at someone
8. Pinched, pulled hair, or scratched others

Verbal

1. Threatened to physically hurt someone
2. Said mean things or made fun of someone in a hurtful way
3. Put others down or called them mean names
4. Teased someone in a hurtful way
5. Embarrassed or made someone look stupid in front of their friends
6. Made unwanted sexual jokes, comments, or gestures
7. Threatened to spread private information about someone
8. Threatened to exclude or leave someone out of a group or activity

Relational

1. Spread negative rumours about someone
2. Gossiped (not in a friendly way) about others
3. Told someone's secrets to others
4. Told my friends to stop liking someone
5. Kept someone out of my group of friends
6. Ignored, stopped talking to, or acted cold toward someone
7. Left out or excluded someone from a group or activity
8. Told others hurtful lies about someone
9. I try to steal others friends from them

Cyber

1. I spread rumours or gossip about someone, using the internet or a cell phone

2. I told hurtful lies about someone, using the internet or a cell phone
3. I used the internet or a cell phone to make fun of and say mean things to someone
4. I used the internet or a cell phone to send or post embarrassing information, pictures, or videos of someone
5. I threatened someone using the internet or a cell phone
6. I pretended to be someone else, in a mean or hurtful way, using the internet or a cell phone
7. Sent unwanted sexual jokes, comments, or pictures, using the internet or a cell phone
8. Ignored or stopped responding to someone, using the internet or a cell phone

Reactive and Proactive Aggression

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Hardly ever	Sometimes	Fairly often	Almost always

1. When I have been teased or threatened I get angry easily and strike back
2. I use physical force (or threaten to use physical force) to dominate other kids
3. When a peer has accidentally hurt me (such as by bumping into me), I assume he or she meant to do it, and react by getting angry and fighting
4. I threaten or bully others in order to get my way
5. I say that other kids are to blame for fights and feel that they started all the trouble
6. I get others to gang up on a peer I don't like

Anger and Hostility Subscales of the Aggression Questionnaire

Please indicate how well each item describes you.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Extremely uncharacteristic of me					Extremely characteristic of me

1. At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life.
2. I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.
3. I have trouble controlling my temper.
4. I flare up quickly but get over it quickly.
5. Other people always seem to get the breaks.
6. Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.

SPPA

Please indicate the degree to which each statement describes you.

1	2	3	4
Describes me very poorly	Describes me quite poorly	Describes me quite well	Describes me very well

1. I am just as smart as others
2. I find it hard to make friends
3. I do very well at all kinds of sports
4. I am not happy with the way I look
5. I feel that if I am romantically interested in someone, that person will like me back
6. I usually do the right thing
7. I am able to make really close friends
8. I am pretty slow in finishing my school work
9. I know how to make classmates like me
10. I think I could do well at just about any new athletic activity
11. I wish my body was different
12. I am not dating the people that I am really attracted to
13. I often get in trouble because of the things I do
14. I don't know how to find a close friend with whom I can share secrets
15. I do very well with my classwork
16. I don't have the social skills to make friends
17. I feel I am better than others my age at sports
18. I wish my physical appearance was different
19. I feel that people my age will be romantically attracted to me
20. I feel really good about the way I act
21. I do know what it takes to develop a close friendship with a peer
22. I have trouble figuring out the answers in school
23. I understand how to get peers to accept me
24. I don't do well at new outdoor games
25. I really like my looks
26. I feel that I am fun and interesting on a date
27. I do things I know I shouldn't do
28. I find it hard to make friends I can really trust
29. I feel that I am pretty intelligent
30. I know how to become popular
31. I do not feel that I am very athletic
32. I really like my looks
33. I don't go out with people I would really like to date
34. I usually act the way I know I am supposed to
35. I don't understand what I should do to have a friend close enough to share personal thoughts with

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Choose the option that best describes your opinion on the following statements.

1	2	3
Not true	Somewhat true	Certainly true

1. I try to be nice to other people. I care about their feelings
2. I am restless. I cannot stay still for long
3. I get a lot of headaches, stomach-aches or sickness
4. I usually share with others (food, games, pens etc.)
5. I get very angry and often lose my temper
6. I am usually on my own. I generally play alone or keep to myself
7. I usually do as I am told
8. I worry a lot
9. I am helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill
10. I am constantly fidgeting or squirming
11. I have one good friend or more
12. I fight a lot. I can make other people do what I want
13. I am often unhappy, down-hearted or tearful
14. Other people my age generally like me
15. I am easily distracted. I find it difficult to concentrate
16. I am nervous in new situations. I easily lose confidence
17. I am kind to younger children
18. I am often accused of lying or cheating
19. Other children or young people pick on me or bully me
20. I often volunteer to help others (parents, teachers, children)
21. I take things that are not mine from home, school or elsewhere
22. I get on better with adults than with people my own age
23. I have many fears. I am easily scared
24. I finish the work I'm doing. My attention is good

Social Dominance and Resource Control

How true are the following statements?

- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|-----------------------|
| Never true | Hardly ever
true | Sometimes true | Often true | Almost always
true |
1. I am good at being able to get what I want from others
 2. I have good ideas or suggestions that others like to follow
 3. I am able to make others do what I want
 4. I am admired by others
 5. I am able to get people to help me
 6. I usually get what I need, even if others don't
 7. Others choose me to lead the group
 8. I usually force others to follow my plans
 9. Others pay attention to me
 10. Others want to be in my group
 11. I am able to get others to do what I say
 12. I influence others by doing something for them in return
 13. I often bully or push others to do what I want to do
 14. People respect me
 15. Others want to be friends or to hang out with me
 16. Others usually side with me
 17. I have a lot of power over others
 18. I influence others by being really nice about it
 19. I often trick others to do what I want
 20. I get a lot of positive attention from others
 21. Most people think I'm pretty cool
 22. People usually want me to join their group
 23. In groups I am usually in charge or in control
 24. I influence others by explaining why it's a good idea
 25. I threaten others to get my way
 26. Others often invite me to do things
 27. People usually approve of the things I do
 28. Others usually stick with me and stick by me
 29. I usually get my way when I deal with others
 30. I cooperate with others so that we all get what we want
 31. I control who's part of my group to make sure I get my way
 32. People want to spend time with me
 33. Others ignore me
 34. People want to have someone like me around
 35. I negotiate with others so everyone gets a fair deal
 36. When someone tries to stop me, I make them look bad to get what I want
 37. Others don't seem to notice me
 38. People often criticize me

39. The people in my group stick together and support each other
40. Others often imitate me or try to be like me
41. Others look up to me

SRDQ

How often have you done the following over the past 12 months?

1	2	3	4
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often

1. Purposely broken or destroyed musical instruments, sports equipment or other school equipment?
2. Taken and kept any school property worth \$10 or more?
3. Purposely broken a part of the school (windows, walls, etc.)?
4. Taken and kept something from a store without paying?
5. Threatened to hit someone or to force them to do something they didn't want to do?
6. Taken part in fights between groups of youth (gangs)?
7. Purposely break or destroy something that didn't belong to you?
8. Taken and kept something worth less than \$10, that didn't belong to you?
9. Taken and kept something worth \$100 or more that didn't belong to you?
10. Bought or sold something you knew was stolen?
11. Purposely destroyed an antenna, tires or some other part of a car?
12. Entered a place where you were not allowed?
13. Taken and kept something worth between \$10 and \$100 that didn't belong to you?
14. Gone without paying to a place where you should have paid (movie theatre, concert, sports event)?
15. Used a weapon (stick, knife, gun, rocks) in fighting with someone else?
16. Purposely broken or destroyed something belonging to your parents or another family member?
17. Taken money from the house without permission, or without the intent of saying anything?
18. Broken open a window or door and entered somewhere to take something?
19. Carried a weapon (chain, knife, gun, etc.)?
20. Started a fire in a store or elsewhere?
21. Thrown rocks, bottles or other objects at someone?
22. Hit someone who hadn't done anything?
23. Taken and kept a bicycle that didn't belong to you?
24. Had a fist fight with anyone?
25. Drank alcohol?
26. Got drunk on beer, wine, or other alcoholic beverages?
27. Used marijuana?

Attitudinal Intolerance of Deviance Scale

How wrong do you think it is to do these things?

1	2	3	4
Very wrong	Wrong	A little bit wrong	Not at all wrong

1. To take little things that don't belong to you
2. To give your teacher a fake excuse for being absent
3. To bother people in a movie theatre even if you have been asked to stop
4. To borrow \$5 or so from a friend without really expecting to pay it back
5. To cheat on a test
6. To skip school without a good excuse
7. To get into fist fights with other people
8. To break something that belongs to another person just to get even
9. To break into a place that is locked just to look around
10. To damage public or private property that does not belong to you just for fun
11. To threaten a teacher because you were angry about something at school

Attitudes Toward Classroom In/Civility Questionnaire

Please choose the option that best describes your belief about each of the following situations.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely wrong	Sort of wrong	Neither wrong nor right	Sort of OK	Definitely OK

1. Packing books up before a lesson is over
2. Making fun of a classmate who answered a question wrong
3. Sending text messaging/notes during class
4. Posting nasty notes on bulletin boards about a classmate
5. Reading, going online, or playing a game during a lesson
6. Calling a classmate names because they did not agree with your opinion
7. Eating lunch during class
8. Spreading rumors about or try to exclude a classmate you dislike
9. Sleeping in class
10. Fighting with another student in class (physical or verbal)

Mini-K

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Disagree slightly	Don't know/not applicable	Agree slightly	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly

1. I can often tell how things will turn out.
2. I try to understand how I got into a situation to figure out how to handle it.
3. I often find the bright side to a bad situation.
4. I don't give up until I solve my problems.
5. I often make plans in advance.
6. I avoid taking risks.
7. I am often in social contact with my blood relatives.
8. I often get emotional support and practical help to my blood relatives.
9. I often give emotional support and practical help to my blood relatives.
10. I am often in social contact with my friends.
11. I often get emotional support and practical help from my friends.
12. I often give emotional support and practical help to my friends.
13. I am closely connected to and involved in my community.
14. I am closely connected to and involved in my religion.

Early Adolescent Questionnaire-Revised

How “true” is each statement for you?

1	2	3	4	5
Almost always untrue	Usually untrue	Sometimes true, sometimes untrue	Usually true	Almost always true

1. It is easy for me to really concentrate on homework problems.
2. I feel pretty happy most of the day.
3. I think it would be exciting to move to a new city.
4. I like to feel a warm breeze blowing on my face.
5. I notice even little changes taking place around me, like lights getting brighter in a room.
6. I have a hard time finishing things on time.
7. I feel shy with kids of the opposite sex.
8. It's hard for me not to open presents before I'm supposed to.
9. My friends seem to enjoy themselves more than I do.
10. I tend to notice little changes that other people do not notice.
11. When someone tells me to stop doing something, it is easy for me to stop.
12. I feel shy about meeting new people.
13. I enjoy listening to the birds sing.
14. I want to be able to share my private thoughts with someone else.
15. I do something fun for awhile before starting my homework, even when I'm not supposed to.
16. I wouldn't like living in a really big city, even if it was safe.
17. It often takes very little to make me feel like crying.
18. I am very aware of noises.
19. I like to look at the pattern of clouds in the sky.
20. I can tell if another person is angry by their expression.
21. It bothers me when I try to make a phone call and the line is busy.
22. The more I try to stop myself from doing something I shouldn't, the more likely I am to do it.
23. I enjoy exchanging hugs with people I like.
24. Skiing fast down a steep slope sounds scary to me.
25. I get sad more than other people realize.
26. If I have a hard assignment to do, I get started right away.
27. I will do most anything to help someone I care about.
28. I get frightened riding with a person who likes to speed.
29. I like to look at trees and walk amongst them.
30. I find it hard to shift gears when I go from one class to another at school.
31. I worry about my family when I'm not with them.
32. I get very upset if I want to do something and my parents won't let me.
33. I get sad when a lot of things are going wrong.

34. When trying to study, I have difficulty tuning out background noise and concentrating.
35. I finish my homework before the due date.
36. I worry about getting into trouble.
37. I am good at keeping track of several different things that are happening around me.
38. I would not be afraid to try a risky sport, like deep-sea diving.
39. It's easy for me to keep a secret.
40. It is important to me to have close relationships with other people.
41. I am shy.
42. I am nervous of some of the kids at school who push people into lockers and throw your books around.
43. I get irritated when I have to stop doing something that I am enjoying.
44. I wouldn't be afraid to try something like mountain climbing.
45. I put off working on projects until right before they're due.
46. I worry about my parent(s) dying or leaving me.
47. I enjoy going places where there are big crowds and lots of excitement.
48. I am not shy.
49. I am quite a warm and friendly person.
50. I feel sad even when I should be enjoying myself, like at Christmas or on a trip.
51. It really annoys me to wait in long lines.
52. I feel scared when I enter a darkened room at home.
53. I pay close attention when someone tells me how to do something.
54. I get very frustrated when I make a mistake in my school work.
55. I tend to get in the middle of one thing, then go off and do something else.
56. It frustrates me if people interrupt me when I'm talking.
57. I can stick with my plans and goals.
58. I get upset if I'm not able to do a task really well.
59. I like the crunching sound of autumn leaves.

Peer-Valued Characteristics

Rate how true the following statements are of you.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very untrue of me	Untrue of me	Somewhat untrue of me	Neither true nor untrue of me	Somewhat true of me	True of me	Very true of me

1. I dress well and I'm in style
2. I am good looking and attractive
3. I am tough
4. I have a lot of cool things or possessions
5. I have a good sense of humour and can make people laugh
6. Compared to others, I am rich
7. I have special talents and skills
8. I do well at sports
9. People think I'm cool

HEXACO-200

The following are a series of statements about you. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

Please answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)	Agree	Strongly agree

1. If I want something from a person I dislike, I will act very nicely toward that person in order to get it.
2. I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
3. I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
4. I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.
5. I like to keep all my belongings stored in their proper place.
6. I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
7. If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
8. I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.
9. I feel comfortable when introducing myself to strangers.
10. I rarely, if ever, make critical remarks about others.
11. When working, I often set ambitious goals for myself.
12. I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
13. Having a high level of social status is not very important to me.
14. I rely a great deal on other people when I feel depressed.
15. I enjoy chatting with people, even when there's nothing important to discuss.
16. People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn.
17. I often check my work over repeatedly to find any mistakes.
18. I prefer doing things the way I've always done them, rather than waste time looking for a new way.
19. I deserve more influence and authority than most other people do.
20. I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
21. I tend to have less energy than most other people do.
22. It doesn't take much to make me angry.
23. People say that I am good at controlling my impulses.
24. I like hearing about opinions that are very different from those of most people.
25. I don't see anything wrong with using flattery to get ahead in life.
26. Where physical pain is involved, I'm a very tough person.
27. I feel that I have some likable qualities.
28. If someone who has been unkind to me starts being nice, I remain suspicious of that person for a long time.
29. I clean my office or home quite frequently.
30. I tend to appreciate the beauty of nature more than most people do.
31. I wouldn't cheat a person even if he or she was a real "sucker".

32. I often find myself lying awake in bed and worrying about something.
33. I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
34. I am a gentle and mild person.
35. I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.
36. I find TV nature programs to be very boring.
37. Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
38. Without the emotional support of other people, I sometimes feel helpless.
39. I avoid making "small talk" with people.
40. I often cooperate with other people even when I don't really agree with them.
41. When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details.
42. I would like a job that requires following a routine rather than being creative.
43. I am an ordinary person who is no better than others.
44. When someone I know well is unhappy, I can almost feel that person's pain myself.
45. I am energetic nearly all the time.
46. People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
47. I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
48. I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
49. I sometimes try to make people feel guilty so that they will do what I want.
50. It doesn't bother me to get some bumps and bruises.
51. I think that most people like some aspects of my personality.
52. My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is "forgive and forget".
53. I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
54. I wouldn't spend my time reading a book of poetry.
55. I wouldn't feel bad about deceiving people who allow themselves to be deceived.
56. If I were a parent, I would probably tend to worry a lot about my children.
57. In social situations, I'm usually the one who makes the first move.
58. People sometimes say that I'm a person who "wouldn't hurt a fly".
59. I often achieve things by trying harder than other people do.
60. I enjoy looking at maps of different places.
61. I prefer to have high-status, successful people as my friends.
62. When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
63. I enjoy having lots of people around to talk with.
64. Some people have complained that I always want to have things my own way.
65. I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.
66. I think I could develop some good ideas for television commercials.
67. I wouldn't want people to treat me as though I were superior to them.
68. I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.
69. On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
70. I rarely feel anger, even when people treat me quite badly.
71. I make a lot of mistakes because I don't think before I act.
72. People sometimes describe me as unconventional.
73. I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.
74. I don't mind doing jobs that involve dangerous work.
75. I think that most people prefer not to talk to me

76. I can forgive things that would cause most people to remain bitter for a long time.
77. I could let my room get very messy before I would clean it.
78. If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
79. I would be tempted to buy stolen property if I were financially tight.
80. I worry a lot less than most people do.
81. When I'm in a group of people, I'm often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.
82. People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
83. People sometimes call me a "workaholic".
84. I know the capital cities of many countries.
85. I would like to live in a very expensive, high-class neighborhood.
86. I can "tough it out" on my own through any kind of personal hardship.
87. When travelling, I prefer to sit by myself rather than with other people.
88. When I know what I want, I won't agree to anything less.
89. People often call me a perfectionist.
90. I would like the job of drawing a comic strip or an editorial cartoon.
91. I am special and superior in many ways.
92. I don't understand why some people get so emotional at weddings.
93. People often tell me that I should try to cheer up.
94. Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.
95. I don't allow my impulses to govern my behavior.
96. I would avoid hanging around with people who have unusual opinions.
97. If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.
98. People say that I am a fearless person.
99. I feel that I am an unpopular person.
100. I can still be friends with someone who has treated me badly in the past.
101. When I am finished using an object, I put it back in its place right away.
102. I don't really enjoy looking at sculptures.
103. I would still pay my taxes even if I would not get caught for avoiding them.
104. Sometimes I feel nervous without really knowing why.
105. In a large group discussion, I would only make comments if someone asked me directly.
106. I generally accept people's faults without complaining about them.
107. Often when I set a goal, I end up quitting without having reached it.
108. I would like to visit the ruins of ancient civilizations.
109. I would like to be seen driving around in a very expensive car.
110. When I have a problem, I like to get advice from others.
111. I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.
112. I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.
113. I don't like to spend time perfecting work that is already good enough.
114. I have often solved problems by using new ideas that other people had not imagined.
115. Sometimes I feel that laws should not apply to someone like me.
116. When someone close to me is concerned about something, I feel concerned too.
117. People have described me as a very lively or spirited person.
118. Some people say that they have never seen me angry.
119. I think carefully before doing anything that might be unsafe or unhealthy.

120. I like people who have unconventional views.
121. I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.
122. I would avoid any sport that involves a high risk of physical injury.
123. I think that most people dislike me.
124. I can get along with someone even if that person has betrayed my trust.
125. People often joke with me about the messiness of my room or desk.
126. Attending a play is not something that I would enjoy.
127. I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.
128. I rarely, if ever, have trouble sleeping due to stress or anxiety.
129. I can handle embarrassing social situations better than most people can.
130. I tend to be lenient in judging other people.
131. I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.
132. I would be very bored by a book about the history of science and technology.
133. I would enjoy being a member of a fancy, high-class casino.
134. I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
135. The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.
136. I can get a bit defensive when people try to change my mind about an issue.
137. I don't mind if my writing has some errors in spelling or punctuation.
138. I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.
139. I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.
140. People sometimes say that I am not sensitive to others' feelings.
141. I tend to look on the bright side of a situation more than other people do.
142. I find it hard to keep my temper when people insult me.
143. I usually stop myself before doing anything that I might later regret.
144. I think of myself as a somewhat eccentric person.
145. If I want something from someone, I ask for it directly, instead of manipulating them into giving it.
146. When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
147. I sometimes think that I am pretty useless.
148. If someone has cheated me once, I will always feel suspicious of that person.
149. I am not good at getting my files or desk drawers organized.
150. Sometimes I like to just watch the wind as it blows through the trees.
151. I would like to know how to smuggle things across the border.
152. I tend to remain calm even when other people get stressed out.
153. I feel confident when leading a group of people.
154. Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.
155. I tend to give up on a task if it seems very difficult.
156. I like to keep up with news about scientific discoveries.
157. I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.
158. Whenever I feel worried about something, I want to share my concern with another person.
159. I don't especially enjoy going to parties.
160. When people tell me that I'm wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.
161. When calculating numbers, I check carefully to make sure there are no mistakes.
162. People have often told me that I have a good imagination.

163. Some people would say that I have an over-inflated ego.
164. I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.
165. Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.
166. I react very angrily if I find that someone is trying to cheat me.
167. Sometimes I do things on impulse that turn out later to be unwise.
168. Most people would consider some of my beliefs to be quite strange.
169. I often get people to do favors for me by making them feel that they owe me.
170. Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking.
171. I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.
172. I find it hard to fully forgive someone who has done something mean to me.
173. When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
174. I can spend a long time studying a painting that I like.
175. I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.
176. I get very anxious when waiting to hear about an important decision.
177. I tend to feel quite self-conscious when speaking in front of a group of people.
178. I tend to be judgmental of people who do stupid things.
179. I tend to procrastinate a lot before really getting to work on a project.
180. I've never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
181. If there is some chance of improving my social status, I take big risks.
182. I rarely discuss my problems with other people.
183. I enjoy flirting.
184. I find it hard to compromise with people when I really think I'm right.
185. Even when writing a personal letter, I read it over to make sure there are no errors.
186. I don't think of myself as the artistic or creative type.
187. I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.
188. I sometimes get quite sentimental when thinking about people and places I used to know.
189. I rarely feel much enthusiasm about things.
190. People can approach me without having to worry about the mood I'm in.
191. I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.
192. I find it boring to discuss philosophy.
193. I am a soft-hearted person.
194. I would feel very badly if I were to hurt someone.
195. I have sympathy for people who are less fortunate than I am.
196. I try to give generously to those in need.
197. I try to respect other people's feelings.
198. I like the idea that only the strong should survive.
199. It wouldn't bother me to harm someone I didn't like.
200. People see me as a hard-hearted person.

SRASBM

Please read each statement and indicate how often each is true for you using the scale below.

IMPORTANT: The items marked with asterisks (*) ask about experiences in a current romantic relationship. If you are not currently in a romantic relationship, you may respond based on your most recent romantic relationship. If you have never been in a romantic relationship, please leave these items blank.

1	2	3	4	5
Never				Very often

1. My friends know that I will think less of them if they do not do what I want them to do.
2. When I want something from a friend of mine, I act “cold” or indifferent towards them until I get what I want.
3. I have threatened to share private information about my friends with other people in order to get them to comply with my wishes.
4. I have intentionally ignored a person until they gave me my way about something.
5. When I am not invited to do something with a group of people, I will exclude those people from future activities.
6. When I have been angry at, or jealous of someone, I have tried to damage that person’s reputation by gossiping about him or her or by passing on negative information about him/her to other people.
7. When someone does something that makes me angry, I try to embarrass that person or make them look stupid in front of his/her friends.
8. When I am mad at a person, I try to make sure she/he is excluded from group activities (going to the movies or to a bar).
9. I have spread rumors about a person just to be mean.
- *10. I have threatened to break up with a romantic partner in order to get him/her to do what I wanted.
- *11. I have tried to make my romantic partner jealous when mad at him/her.
- *12. I have cheated on my romantic partner because I was angry at him/her.
- *13. I have given my romantic partner the silent treatment when my feelings were hurt in some way by him or her.
- *14. If my romantic partner makes me mad, I will flirt with another person in front of him/her.

WDQ

How often have you...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never	Once a year	Twice a year	Several times a year	Monthly	Weekly	Daily

1. Worked on a personal matter instead of work for your employer
2. Taken property from work without permission
3. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working
4. Made fun of someone at work
5. Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses
6. Said something hurtful to someone at work
7. Taken an additional or a longer break than is acceptable at your workplace
8. Repeated a rumor or gossip about your company
9. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark or joke at work
10. Come in late to work without permission
11. Littered your work environment
12. Cursed at someone at work
13. Called in sick when you were not
14. Told someone about the lousy place where you work
15. Lost your temper while at work
16. Neglected to follow your boss's instructions
17. Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked
18. Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person
19. Left work early without permission
20. Played a mean prank on someone at work
21. Left your work for someone else to finish
22. Acted rudely toward someone at work
23. Repeated a rumor or gossip about your boss or coworkers
24. Made an obscene comment at work
25. Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job
26. Put little effort into your work
27. Publicly embarrassed someone at work
28. Dragged out work in order to get overtime

Antisocial Behaviours

Please indicate whether or not you have engaged in any of the following behaviours **at any point** throughout your life.

Remember, your answers are completely anonymous and confidential so please try to answer honestly.

No

Yes

1. Cut class or left school/work without permission
2. Stayed out late at night during childhood/adolescence
3. Bullied people
4. Ran away from home overnight
5. Were absent from work/school a lot
6. Quit a job without knowing where to find another
7. Quit a school program without knowing what to do next
8. Travelled around more than 1 month without having any plans
9. Did not have a regular place to live for at least 1 month
10. Lied a lot
11. Used a false or made-up name/alias
12. Scammed/conned someone for money
13. Did things that could have easily hurt you and/or others
14. Got 3 or more traffic tickets for reckless driving/causing accidents
15. Got your driver's license suspended or revoked
16. Destroyed someone's property
17. Started a fire on purpose
18. Failed to pay off your debts
19. Stole something from another person
20. Forged someone's signature
21. Shoplifted
22. Robbed/mugged someone or snatched a purse/wallet/etc.
23. Made money illegally
24. Did something that you could have been arrested for
25. Gotten into several fights that you started
26. Gotten into a physical fight with a romantic partner
27. Used a weapon in a fight
28. Hit someone so hard that you injured them
29. Harassed or threatened someone
30. Blackmailed someone
31. Physically hurt someone on purpose
32. Hurt an animal on purpose