 doi:10.20944/preprints201706.0065.v1

Using the HEXACO Model of Personality to Test the Validity of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire

Guillaume Durand[1*]

[1] Department of Psychiatry and Neuropsychology, Faculty of Health, Medicine, and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, 6211 ER, Maastricht, The Netherlands

* Corresponding author: gdura061@uottawa.ca

Abstract

Multiple studies reported a negative relationship between the Honesty-Humility factor of the HEXACO model and psychopathy. The Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ), which was developed to assess adaptive traits known to be related to psychopathic traits, has previously demonstrate positive relationships with all factors of the Big Five Model, at the exception of a negative relationship with neuroticism. The current study aims to validate the previously reported association between the DAPTQ and the five major components of the personality, while also examining its relationship with the Honesty-Humility factor as defined by the HEXACO model. The results (N = 171) support the good internal consistency, two weeks test-retest validity and inter-correlation of the DAPTQ. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis further supports the nine-factor model of the DAPTQ. When compared to the HEXACO, the DAPTQ did not display any relationship with the Honesty-Humility factor, nor the Agreeableness and Openness factors, but kept its similar association to Emotionality, Extroversion, and Conscientiousness as initially reported in its development phase. Overall, the results support the discriminant validity of the DAPTQ to assess adaptive traits related to the psychopathic personality without overlapping with psychopathic personality traits. Results are discussed in terms of implications and further improvements to validate the DAPTQ.

Keywords: DAPTQ; adaptive personality; psychometric properties; HEXACO; psychopathic personality traits; confirmatory factor analysis; test-retest validity

1. Introduction

Psychopathy is defined in numerous studies as a pervasive personality disorder characterized by traits such as egocentricity, callousness, Machiavellianistic tendencies, and impulsivity (Berg et al., 2013). However, despite this highly negative connotation, several models of psychopathy include an adaptive component, such as fearless dominance or boldness (Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005; Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger, 2009). For instance, the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI) divides 8 psychopathic traits into two major factors, namely PPI-I (Fearless Dominance) and PPI-II (Impulsive Antisociality) (Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005). While PPI-II assesses negative personality traits as enumerated previously, PPI-I focuses on adaptive characteristics, such as social charm, stress and anxiety immunity, and fearlessness. Although the relationship between PPI-I and the concept of psychopathy is highly debated (Berg et al., 2013; Blonigen, 2013; Lilienfeld et al., 2012; Lynam & Miller, 2012), a vast amount of research support the benefits of high PPI-I traits due to its relation with adaptive personality traits, such as superior attentional control (Baskin-Sommers, Zeier, & Newman, 2009), lower provoked violence (Camp, Skeem, Barchard, Lilienfeld, & Poythress, 2013), higher levels of self-esteem and stable happiness (Durand, 2016a, 2016b), stress, fear, and anxiety resilience (Dindo & Fowles, 2011), and emotional stability (Uzieblo, Verschuere, Van den Bussche, & Crombez, 2010).

While the PPI and other instruments such as the Triarchic Psychopathy Measurement (TriPM; Patrick, 2010) focus on both adaptive and maladaptive traits, these instruments solely assess core traits of the psychopathic personality. The Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ, Durand, *in press*) is a self-reported instrument assessing nine adaptive personality traits which have shown previous association with the psychopathic personality. The DAPTQ does not assesses psychopathy or any core psychopathic personality traits, but rather focuses on a

wider range of adaptive traits individuals high on fearless dominance or boldness from the PPI and the TriPM might relate to.

During its development phase, the DAPTQ was compared to the Five Factor Model (FFM), as assessed by the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). The big five refers to the five major components of personality: Extroversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness. The results supported a positive correlation with all factors (r = .29 to .51), at the exception of a negative correlation with Neuroticism (r = -.67). Although the FFM is one of the most commonly used model to validate new instruments to personality traits, a recent model of personality, the HEXACO, has been investigated thoroughly in the field of psychopathy due to its addition of a sixth factor, assessing honesty and humility (Jonason & McCain, 2012; Lee & Ashton, 2004; Witt, Donnellan, Blonigen, Krueger, & Conger, 2009). Multiple studies confirm a strong negative correlation between the presence of psychopathic traits and the honesty-humility factor of the HEXACO model (Jonason & McCain, 2012; Lee & Ashton, 2005).

Dishonesty and a lack of humility can arguably be considered as maladaptive personality traits. Considering this factor strong association with psychopathy, and considering that the DAPTQ was developed by investigating traits known to correlate with psychopathic traits, it is of importance to validate the DAPTQ against the HEXACO in order to examine if a negative relationship exist between the DAPTQ and the honesty-humility factor. Therefore, this study sought to examine the relationship between the DAPTQ and its subscales against the HEXACO, and specifically the honesty-humility factor.

 doi:10.20944/preprints201706.0065.v1

Based on previous investigations between the DAPTQ and the FFM, we expect a positive correlation between all factors of the HEXACO model and the DAPTQ, at the exception of an expected negative association with the Emotionality factor, which correspond to the Neuroticism factor of the FFM. The HEXACO factors being sub-divided into 4 facets each, we will further explore the relationship between the DAPTQ and the HEXACO factor's facets displaying a significant correlation to the DAPTQ. These results should further increase the validity of the DAPTQ as a reliable instrument assessing adaptive personality traits.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

One hundred eighty-seven (N = 187) participants were recruited online on social media and websites dedicated to research in psychology. There was no missing data for any of the responses. Inclusion criteria to the study were to be over 18 years old and be fluent in English. Examination of potential outliers was done by analyzing the Stem-and-Leaf plot for each subscale of both the DAPTQ and the HEXACO, leading to the removal of 16 participants. The remaining 171 participants consisted of 74 males and 97 females. Most participants reported being located in Europe (43%), followed by North America (42%), Africa (5%), South America (4%) and Asia (4%), or Oceania (2%). In terms of ethnicity, the majority of participants reported being Caucasian (86%). Almost half of the participants were currently enrolled as full-time university students (46%). Regarding the current marital status, most participants reported being single (45%), followed by in a relationship (19%), married (18%), common law partner (15%), or other (3%). Participants age ranged from 18 to 65 years old, with a mean age of 28.7 (SD = 10.99).

2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ; Durand, *in press*).

The DAPTQ is a 41-item self-reported questionnaire assessing adaptive traits known to correlate with psychopathic personality traits. The DAPTQ uses a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 6 (*Strongly Agree*). The questionnaire is divided in 9 subscales, namely; Leadership, Logical Thinking, Composure, Creativity, Fearlessness, Money Smart, Focus, Extroversion, and Management. In the present study, the internal consistency reliability ranged from $\alpha = .69$ to .91.

2.2.2 HEXACO-PI-R (Lee & Ashton, 2004).

The 100-item version of the HEXACO is a self-reported questionnaire using a 5-point Likert scale, evaluating six domains of personality: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness. Each domain is subdivided in four facets, each related to specific constructs. For the current study, internal consistency reliability was satisfactory, ranging from $\alpha = .78$ to .89.

3. Results

3.1 Confirmatory factor analysis

In order to confirm the nine factors structure proposed by Durand (in press) for the DAPTQ, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed using AMOS 4.0. Since the number of participants in the present study was considered too low to compute a reliable model, the data of the DAPTQ were merged with the data obtained from two community samples of Durand (unpublished manuscript 1; unpublished manuscript 2). The CFA was then perform on the results

of N = 460 participants. We used the following indices to establish the fitness of the model: (1) χ^2/df ratio (≤ 3 indicates acceptable fit), (2) Normed Fit Index ([NFI] > 0.90 indicates acceptable fit), (3) Non-Normed Fit Index ([NNFI] > 0.90 indicates acceptable fit), (4) Comparative Fit Index ([CFI] > 0.90 indicates acceptable fit), (5) Standardized Root Mean Residual ([SRMR] ≤ 0.09 indicates acceptable fit), and (6) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation ([RMSEA] ≤ 0.08 indicates acceptable fit).

The nine-factor structure of the DAPTQ was supported. The fit statistics were as follows: χ^2 = 1786.66, df = 741, χ^2 / df = 2.41, NFI = 0.84, NNFI = 0.89, CFI = 0.90, SRMR = 0.07, RMSEA = 0.06. The items loading for each scale was as follow: Leadership = 0.97 to 1.11, Logical Thinking = 0.50 to 1.01, Composure = 1.00 to 1.84, Creativity = 0.86 to 1.43, Fearlessness = 0.50 to 1.00, Money Smart = 1.00 to 1.30, Focus = 0.96 to 1.18, Extroversion = 0.86 to 1.23, and Management = 0.92 to 1.02.

3.2 Test-retest validity

All participants were invited to complete the DAPTQ a second time 14 days after the day they completed the study. A total of 58 participants completed the retest phase (25 males, 33 females). The DAPTQ total showed a strong test-retest correlation (r = .94). The test-retest correlation of the DAPTQ subscales are as followed: Leadership (r = .89), Logical Thinking (r = .89), Composure (r = .94), Creativity (r = .89), Fearlessness (r = .93), Money Smart (r = .92), Focus (r = .86), Extroversion (r = .91), and Management (r = .82). Overall, the results support the test-retest validity of the DAPTQ in a community sample.

3.3 Gender differences

Examination of the DAPTQ total score did not reveal any difference between males and females ($F(1, 170) = 1.92$, $p = .168$, $d = .21$). Further analysis of the DAPTQ subscales identified four subscales with a significant gender difference, whereas a higher score was observed in males for Logical Thinking ($F(1, 170) = 15.51$, $p < .001$, $d = .61$), Composure ($F(1, 170) = 9.17$, $p = .003$. $d = .47$), and Fearlessness ($F(1, 170) = 5.29$, $p = .023$, $d = .35$), and whereas a higher score was observed in females for Creativity ($F(1, 170) = 6.89$, $p = .009$, $d = .41$). Similarly to the DAPTQ, the HEXACO also showed a significant gender difference in three scales: Emotionality ($F(1, 170) = 32.61$, $p < .001$, $d = .80$), Agreeableness ($F(1, 170) = 12.04$, $p = .001$, $d = .54$), and Conscientiousness ($F(1, 170) = 4.53$, $p = .035$, $d = .33$), whereas males scored higher in Agreeableness, while females scored higher in Emotionality and Conscientiousness.

3.4 Correlations between the DAPTQ and the HEXACO factors

In order to account for multiple testing and potential type I error, the criterion of $p < .001$ was used to establish statistical significance for all correlational analysis. As shown in Table 1, the DAPTQ displayed moderate to strong inter-correlation between the total score and all its subscales, supporting the homogeneity of the constructs ($r = .33$ to $.74$).

Examination of the DAPTQ total score with the HEXACO identified two strong correlations with Emotionality ($r = -.57$) and Extraversion ($r = .64$), alongside one weak correlation with Conscientiousness ($r = .29$). No correlation was observed between the DAPTQ and the three other factors. Closer examination of the DAPTQ subscales with the HEXACO factors support several strong correlations. First, Leadership correlates positively with Extroversion ($r = .56$). Second, Logical Thinking is negatively associated with Emotionality ($r = -.45$). Third, Composure is positively associated with Extroversion ($r = .46$), and negatively associated with

Emotionality (r = -.74). Fourth, Creativity showed a correlation with Openness (r = .55). Fifth, Fearlessness was negatively associated with Emotionality (r = -.58). Sixth, the Extroversion scale of both instruments were positively associated (r = .76). Lastly, Management showed positive associations with Extroversion (r = .53) and Conscientiousness (r = .54).

3.5 Correlations between the DAPTQ and the HEXACO facets

Due to the significant correlations of the DAPTQ with three of the six HEXACO factors, we correlated the DAPTQ to all facets of the three aforementioned factors. As shown in Table 2, analyses revealed a number of strong correlations between the two instruments. First, the DAPTQ total score was negatively associated with Fearfulness (r = -.53), Anxiety (r = -.63), and Dependence (r = -.38), and positively associated with all four facets of the Extroversion factor (r = .28 to .64). Second, Leadership showed particularly strong correlations with Social Boldness (r = .68) and Diligence (r = .41). Third, Logical Thinking showed a positive association with Prudence (r = .64), and negative association with Anxiety, Dependence, and Sentimentality (r = -.33 to -.47). Fourth, Composure correlated negatively with all facets of Emotionality (r = -.44 to -.86), and positively with three facets of Extraversion: Social Self-Esteem, Social Boldness, and Liveliness (r = .30 to .49). Fifth, Fearlessness showed a strong negative correlation with Fearfulness (r = -.81). Sixth, Extroversion showed a positive association with all facets of the HEXACO's Extraversion factor (r = .41 to .80). Seventh, Management was positively associated with all facets of the HEXACO's Extraversion factor (r = .37 to .51), as well as with three of the four Conscientiousness facets; Organization (r = .53), Diligence (r = .50), and Prudence (r = .35). Lastly, although the Openness factor was not correlated to the DAPTQ total score, we performed analysis with the DAPTQ creativity subscale, due to the strong association between Creativity and Openness (r = .55). The results show a strong association between the Creativity subscale of

the two instruments (r = .82), as well as a moderate association between DAPTQ's Creativity subscale and the Unconventionality facet (r = .31).

3.6 Regression analysis of the DAPTQ and the HEXACO factors and facets

Two regression analyses were computed in order to identify the role of each factor and facet on the DAPTQ total score. First, the three significant HEXACO factors on the DAPTQ total score were added in a regression model. As displayed in Table 3A, Emotionality, Extraversion, and Conscientiousness, produced a significant prediction model ($F(3, 170) = 129.37$, $p < .001$), accounting for 84% of the variance ($R^2 = .70$, *Adjusted* $R^2 = .69$). All predictors were significant.

A second regression analysis was computed, including all the facets which showed a statistically significant correlation with the DAPTQ total score. As shown in Table 3B, six of the 9 facets produced a significant prediction model ($F(9, 170) = 66.27$, $p < .001$), accounting for 89% of the variance ($R^2 = .79$, *Adjusted* $R^2 = .78$).

4. Discussion

As previously reported, the DAPTQ and its subscales' internal consistency reliability were satisfactory. All subscales were moderately to strongly correlated with the DAPTQ total score, supporting the homogeneity of the construct assessed by the DAPTQ. The results obtained from the CFA support the 9-factor model of the DAPTQ. Although the NFI and NNFI were under their respective critical values, the χ^2 / df value, the CFI, the SRMR, and the RMSEA values support the fitness of the model. Additionally, no items loaded less than 0.50 on any of the subscale, further supporting the results. Additionally, test-retest results for the DAPTQ and its subscales support the temporal validity of the construct assessed by the DAPTQ.

Examination of gender differences did not find any influence of the gender on the DAPTQ total score, and only a difference in four out of the nine subscales: Logical Thinking, Composure, Fearlessness and Creativity. These results are surprising as the DAPTQ was largely developed on the theoretical concepts associated to PPI-I. Indeed, several studies reported a gender difference in favor of males for scores on PPI-I (Cale & Lilienfeld, 2002; Durand, 2016b; Lee & Salekin, 2010). It is possible that the gender difference stems from core psychopathic traits. Since the DAPTQ does not assesses psychopathic traits, but rather adaptive traits which have shown associations to the psychopathic personality in past research, the DAPTQ total score might be gender neutral due to constructs assessing adaptive traits rather than psychopathic traits. Furthermore, the higher scores observed in males on the Logical Thinking, Composure, and Fearlessness subscales are in line with previous findings, whereas multiple studies report higher levels of psychological distress, stress, fear, and anxiety in females (Dambrun, 2007; Kudielka & Kirschbaum, 2005). Overall, the DAPTQ psychometric properties appear satisfactory to assess adaptive traits in both genders.

Examination of the association between the DAPTQ and the HEXACO reveals a few unexpected results. First, despite multiple studies supporting a strong negative correlation between psychopathy and Honesty-Humility, the DAPTQ total score, as well as 8 of its factors, did not show any correlation with the aforementioned construct (Jonason & McCain, 2012; Lee & Ashton, 2005; Visser, Ashton, & Pozzebon, 2012). This absence of correlation might be once again due to the discriminant validity between the DAPTQ and psychopathy or core psychopathic traits. Despite the correlation observed between the DAPTQ and the PPI total score during its development phase (r = .46), as well as the correlation previously observed between the Honesty-Humility and PPI total score (r = -.35), DAPTQ and Honesty-Humility do not share

any variance with one another (Durand, *in press*; Visser et al., 2012). The five other factors assessed in the HEXACO gave similar results to the correlations observed between the DAPTQ and the BFI during its development phase, at the exception of a lack of correlation between DAPTQ and Agreeableness, alongside Openness in the present study (Durand, *in press*). This lack of significant correlation could be due to the conservative criterion for statistical significance in the present study, which was set at $p < .001$. A subsequent regression analysis support the influence of the three significant HEXACO factor in predicting DAPTQ total score, with low emotionality and high extroversion being the two determining components.

In order to further examine the role between the DAPTQ and the HEXACO, correlation analyses were performed between the DAPTQ and each facets of the three significant factor of the HEXACO: Emotionality, Extroversion, and Conscientiousness. Related to the Emotionality factor, Fearfulness, Anxiety, and Dependence facets were negatively correlated to the DAPTQ, but not sentimentality. Multiple studies identified a link between PPI-I and resilience to fear and anxiety, alongside low emotional reactivity (López, Poy, Patrick, & Moltó, 2013; Uzieblo et al., 2010). Considering the strong association between PPI-I and the DAPTQ, these results support the capacity of the DAPTQ to assess adaptive traits closely related to the psychopathic personality (Durand, *in press*). Related to the HEXACO subscale of Extroversion, all facets (Social Self-Esteem, Social Boldness, Sociability, and Liveliness), were positively correlated with the DAPTQ. Interestingly, the DAPTQ subscales Leadership, Extroversion, and Management were also positively correlated on all four facets, and Composure correlated positively on all facets but Sociability. These results could be explained by the efficiency of the four aforementioned DAPTQ subscales to assess their respective construct in a social point of view. While the results pertaining to Leadership and Extroversion were expected, the findings on

the Management and Composure subscales indicate a strong influence of social potency on these subscales, which is in opposition to the common idea that composure and management are related to introversion. Related to Conscientiousness, only the Organization and Diligence facets were significantly associated with the DAPTQ total score. Subscale examination reveals that the DAPTQ's Management subscale is strongly correlated to both these facets, while Focus plays a role in Organization, and Leadership plays a role in Diligence. Lastly, examination of the DAPTQ's Creativity subscale support a strong correlation with the HEXACO's Creativity facet, further supporting the construct validity of the Creativity subscale. A regression analysis confirmed that all but three (Dependence, Sociability, and Liveliness) of the 9 significant facets explained the variance in the DAPTQ total score, with a lack of fear and social anxiety, alongside high social boldness, being the predominant predictor of the DAPTQ total score.

4.1 Limitations and conclusion

While we believe that this work offers an important contribution to the field by detailing the psychometric properties of the DAPTQ, there are several limitations to consider. First, the participants were excessively heterogeneous. Recruitment was performed online, and no eligibility criteria were set regarding location, education, and current status. While this type of community sample offers a broader view of individuals in general, difference might be observable in specific population, such as college graduate, children, or forensic populations. Second, while self-reported questionnaires are commonly used in the field of personality, experimental evidences are necessary to support the validity of the DAPTQ as a valid instrument to assess adaptive traits. For instance, future work should focus on DAPTQ measurements and stress resilience in an experimental task as measured by physiological factors, such as galvanic skin response and temperature.

 doi:10.20944/preprints201706.0065.v1

Nevertheless, the present study gave several insights regarding the validity of the DAPTQ in a community sample. The previously reported association between the DAPTQ and PPI-I, and the current lack of correlation between the DAPTQ and the Honesty-Humility factor support the discriminant validity of the DAPTQ to investigate adaptive traits without overlapping in psychopathic traits.

5. References

Baskin-Sommers, A. R., Zeier, J. D., & Newman, J. P. (2009). Self-reported attentional control differentiates the major factors of psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*(6), 626–630. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.05.027

Berg, J. M., Smith, S. F., Watts, A. L., Ammirati, R., Green, S. E., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2013). Misconceptions regarding psychopathic personality: implications for clinical practice and research. *Neuropsychiatry*, *3*, 63–74. http://doi.org/10.2217/npy.12.69

Blonigen, D. M. (2013). Is fearless dominance relevant to the construct of psychopathy? Reconciling the dual roles of theory and clinical utility. *Personality Disorders*, *4*(1), 87–8. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0027152

Cale, E. M., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2002). Sex differences in psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder: A review and integration. *Clinical Psychology Review*. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(01)00125-8

Camp, J. P., Skeem, J. L., Barchard, K., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Poythress, N. G. (2013). Psychopathic predators? Getting specific about the relation between psychopathy and violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *81*(3), 467–480. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0031349

Dambrun, M. (2007). Gender differences in mental health: The mediating role of perceived personal discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *37*(5), 1118–1129. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00202.x

Dindo, L., & Fowles, D. (2011). Dual temperamental risk factors for psychopathic personality:

evidence from self-report and skin conductance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(3), 557–566. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0021848

Durand, G. (2016a). A Replication of " Using self-esteem to disaggregate psychopathy, narcissism, and aggression (2013) ." *The Qantitative Methods for Psychology*, *12*(2), r1–r5. http://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.12.2.r001

Durand, G. (2016b). Demystification of the Relationship Between Psychopathy and Happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-016-9823-0

Durand, G. (*in press*). The Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire: Development and Validation. *Journal of Personality Assessment*.

Durand, G. A French translation and validation of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire: An investigation with community samples from France and Canada. (*Unpublished manuscript*).

Durand, G. Examining the validity and reliability of the Durand Adaptive Psychopathic Traits Questionnaire (DAPTQ) in a clinical and a community sample. (*Unpublished manuscript*).

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). The Big Five Inventory - Versions 4a and 54. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

Jonason, P. K., & McCain, J. (2012). Using the HEXACO model to test the validity of the Dirty Dozen measure of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*(7), 935–938. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.07.010

Kudielka, B. M., & Kirschbaum, C. (2005). Sex differences in HPA axis responses to stress: A review. *Biological Psychology*, *69*(1 SPEC. ISS.), 113–132. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2004.11.009

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric Properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*(2), 329–358. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism in the Five-Factor Model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*(7), 1571–1582. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.016

Lee, Z., & Salekin, R. T. (2010). Psychopathy in a noninstitutional sample: Differences in primary and secondary subtypes. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *1*(3), 153–169. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0019269

Lilienfeld, S. O., Patrick, C. J., Benning, S. D., Berg, J., Sellbom, M., & Edens, J. F. (2012). The role of fearless dominance in psychopathy: Confusions, controversies, and clarifications. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *3*(3), 327–340. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0026987

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Widows, M. (2005). Psychopathic personality inventory–revised: Professional manual. *Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources*.

López, R., Poy, R., Patrick, C. J., & Moltó, J. (2013). Deficient fear conditioning and self-reported psychopathy: The role of fearless dominance. *Psychophysiology*, *50*(2), 210–218. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2012.01493.x

Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2012). Fearless dominance and psychopathy: A response to Lilienfeld et al. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *3*(3), 341–353. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0028296

Patrick, C. (2010). Triarchic psychopathy measure (TriPM). *PhenX Toolkit Online Assessment Catalog*.

Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Development and Psychopathology*, *21*(3), 913. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579409000492

Uzieblo, K., Verschuere, B., Van den Bussche, E., & Crombez, G. (2010). The validity of the psychopathic personality inventory--revised in a community sample. *Assessment*, *17*(3), 334–346. http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191109356544

Visser, B. a., Ashton, M. C., & Pozzebon, J. a. (2012). Is Low Anxiety Part of the Psychopathy Construct? *Journal of Personality*, *80*(3), 725–747. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00745.x

Witt, E. a, Donnellan, M. B., Blonigen, D. M., Krueger, R. F., & Conger, R. D. (2009). Assessment of Fearless Dominance and Impulsive Antisociality via normal personality measures: convergent validity, criterion validity, and developmental change. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *91*(3), 265–276. http://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902794317

Table 1
Correlations between the DAPTQ and the HEXACO by their respective subscales ($N = 171$)

Scales	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean (SD)	α
DAPTQ												
1. Leadership											14.01 (3.97)	.82
2. Logical Thinking	.01										22.13 (4.28)	.82
3. Composure	**.25**	**.34**									18.78 (7.44)	.91
4. Creativity	.16	.01	.02								16.05 (4.62)	.86
5. Fearlessness	**.34**	.14	**.39**	-.03							19.39 (6.21)	.84
6. Money Smart	-.16	**.38**	.20	.21	-.10						12.58 (3.64)	.84
7. Focus	.24	**.25**	**.30**	.11	.17	**.27**					12.24 (4.16)	.88
8. Extroversion	**.58**	-.17	**.30**	.19	.15	-.13	.17				19.15 (6.72)	.86
9. Management	**.35**	**.29**	**.40**	.12	.05	**.34**	**.52**	**.35**			11.30 (3.01)	.69
10. DAPTQ Total	**.59**	**.42**	**.74**	**.34**	**.52**	**.33**	**.57**	**.58**	**.64**		145.71 (23.83)	.89
HEXACO												
11. Honesty Humility	-.18	.08	-.03	.08	-.20	**.25**	.04	-.09	.03	-.04	55.78 (9.50)	.82
12. Emotionality	-.19	**-.46**	**-.74**	.12	**-.58**	-.12	-.23	-.06	-.19	**-.57**	49.12 (11.87)	.89
13. Extraversion	**.56**	.02	**.46**	.20	.10	.03	**.28**	**.76**	**.53**	**.64**	46.81 (10.41)	.87
14. Agreeableness	-.08	.15	**.33**	.05	.02	.04	.14	.08	.10	.20	47.97 (9.90)	.86
15. Conscientiousness	.21	**.35**	.01	.20	-.08	**.31**	**.37**	-.04	**.54**	**.29**	54.68 (8.76)	.80
16. Openness	.14	.08	-.01	**.55**	-.03	.05	-.04	.16	.07	.19	59.69 (8.42)	.78

Note. Bold indicates $p < .001$, two-tailed.

doi:10.20944/preprints201706.0065.v1

Table 2
Correlations between the DAPTQ and the HEXACO subscales ($N = 171$)

Scales	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean (SD)	α
Emotionality												
Fearfulness	**-.30**	-.19	**-.44**	.04	**-.81**	.02	-.21	-.19	-.11	**-.53**	11.23 (3.52)	.72
Anxiety	-.19	**-.33**	**-.86**	.03	**-.33**	-.21	**-.31**	-.24	**-.32**	**-.63**	13.80 (3.98)	.80
Dependence	-.13	**-.47**	**-.51**	.03	**-.41**	-.10	-.12	.10	-.12	**-.38**	11.36 (4.14)	.86
Sentimentality	.03	**-.42**	**-.44**	.22	**-.26**	-.08	-.08	.15	-.01	-.22	12.71 (3.72)	.78
Extraversion												
Social Self-Esteem	**.31**	**.29**	**.49**	.20	-.02	**.25**	**.25**	**.41**	**.51**	**.55**	13.21 (3.42)	.77
Social Boldness	**.68**	.02	**.30**	.23	.20	-.01	**.29**	**.80**	**.41**	**.64**	11.36 (3.31)	.71
Sociability	**.34**	-.23	.14	.06	-.01	-.20	.12	**.65**	**.34**	**.28**	10.52 (3.33)	.73
Liveliness	**.38**	-.01	**.46**	.13	.13	.04	.19	**.50**	**.37**	**.49**	11.71 (3.52)	.80
Conscientiousness												
Organization	.09	.14	.10	.09	-.10	**.25**	**.42**	.09	**.53**	**.27**	12.83 (3.34)	.64
Diligence	**.41**	.11	-.01	**.24**	.05	.19	**.29**	.15	**.50**	**.33**	13.86 (3.09)	.69
Perfectionism	.13	.13	-.17	.15	-.02	.08	.08	-.15	.11	.01	13.99 (3.10)	.71
Prudence	-.04	**.64**	.10	.08	-.14	**.35**	.24	-.21	**.35**	.20	13.99 (2.97)	.72

Note. Bold indicates $p < .001$, two-tailed.

doi:10.20944/preprints201706.0065.v1

Table 3A
Regression model predicting adaptive traits

Scale	*Standard error*	*β*	*t*	*Significance*
Emotionality	.09	-.51	-11.77	.000
Extraversion	.10	.54	12.49	.000
Conscientiousness	.12	.22	5.14	.000

Table 3B
Regression model predicting adaptive traits

Scale	*Standard error*	*B*	*t*	*Significance*
Fearfulness	.30	-.28	-6.22	.000
Anxiety	.32	-.31	-5.70	.000
Dependence	.28	-.09	-1.85	.066
Social Self-Esteem	.35	.16	3.10	.002
Social Boldness	.35	.37	7.63	.000
Sociability	.33	.01	0.22	.825
Liveliness	.34	.01	0.22	.829
Organization	.29	.16	4.03	.000
Diligence	.33	.12	2.81	.006

doi:10.20944/preprints201706.0065.v1