
A Prospective Comparison of Two Measures of Psychopathy in the Prediction of Institutional Misconduct

John F. Edens, Ph.D.,*
Norman G. Poythress Jr, Ph.D.,†
Scott O. Lilienfeld, Ph.D.‡
and Christopher J. Patrick, Ph.D.§

This study examined the predictive validity of two widely used measures of psychopathic traits, the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003) and the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996). Records of institutional infractions were obtained for a young adult sample of prison inmates ($N = 46$), who were followed for approximately two years following administration of these two scales. The PPI total and two factor scores predicted the total number of infractions committed (r ranging from .28 to .36). PPI Factor I showed some evidence of stronger associations with non-aggressive infractions ($r = .36$), whereas PPI Factor II was the strongest correlate of aggressive misconduct ($r = .24$). The total and facet scores of the PCL-R were not significantly predictive of any form of institutional misconduct, with effect sizes ranging from negligible to small (median $r = .14$, r ranging from $-.01$ to $.21$). Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Psychopathic personality disorder (psychopathy) represents a distinct constellation of interpersonal, affective, and behavioral traits that may occur in the context of significant antisocial conduct (Cleckley, 1941/1988; Hare, 2003). Not surprisingly, this disorder is of considerable interest to the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems (DeMatteo & Edens, 2006; Edens, 2006; Edens & Petrila, 2006; Edens & Vincent, 2008; Ogloff & Lyon, 1998; Walsh & Walsh, 2006; Zinger & Forth, 1998). Although effect sizes vary substantially from one study to the next, adults and adolescents who obtain higher scores on the most widely studied measures of psychopathy, the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003) and Psycho-

*Correspondence to: John F. Edens, Ph.D., Texas A&M University, College of Liberal Arts, Department of Psychology, College Station, TX 77843-4235, U.S.A. E-mail: jedens@psych.tamu.edu

†University of South Florida.

‡Emory University.

§University of Minnesota.

pathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003), generally are more prone to engaging in crime and violence following release into the community than are those with lower scores (Edens, Campbell, & Weir, 2007; Walters, 2003a, 2003b). Moreover, psychopathy in isolation has performed as well as more elaborate risk assessment devices in some meta-analyses and other large-scale studies (Cooke, Michie, & Ryan, 2001; Edens *et al.*, 2007; Edens, Skeem, & Douglas, 2006; Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 2002; see also Kroner & Mills, 2001), reflecting its prominent role in the assessment of violence risk.

Although the PCL-R can be a useful clinical tool, as with any measure there are both theoretical and practical limitations regarding its utility. Among the practical limitations are its labor intensiveness, need for a well trained examiner, and reliance on access to extensive file data concerning examinees—all of which limit its utility as a screening tool in applied settings (Poythress, Edens, & Lilienfeld, 1998). As such, there has been considerable interest in alternative measures of psychopathy, particularly those relying on self-report rather than interviews and collateral data. The assessment of psychopathic features by means of self-report is controversial (for overviews, see Edens, Hart, Johnson, Johnson, & Olver, 2000; Hare, 1985; Hart, Forth, & Hare, 1991; Lilienfeld & Fowler, 2006), given that most older instruments (e.g. MMPI Pd and CPI Socialization scales) did not correlate particularly highly with each other or with the PCL-R (Hare, 2003).

One self-report instrument that has shown significant promise as an index of psychopathic traits is the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996). Heavily, although not exclusively, grounded in the work of Cleckley (1941/1988), the PPI focuses on personality traits, attitudes, and dispositions, but—unlike the PCL-R—not explicitly antisocial behavior. The PPI yields a total score and scores on eight factor analytically derived subscales (described below) representing narrower facets of psychopathy. Although early studies tended to focus primarily on the convergent and discriminant correlates of the PPI total score (e.g. Edens, Poythress, & Watkins, 2001; Sandoval, Hancock, Poythress, Edens, & Lilienfeld, 2000), Benning, Patrick, Hicks, Blonigen, and Krueger (2003) reported that most of the subscales of the PPI coalesce around two higher-order factors that are largely orthogonal to each other. PPI-I, which subsequently was labeled “Fearless Dominance” by Benning, Patrick, Blonigen, Hicks, and Iacono (2005), is underpinned by the Social Potency, Fearlessness, and Stress Immunity subscales. PPI-II, termed “Impulsive Antisociality,” is underpinned by the Carefree Nonplanfulness, Impulsive Nonconformity, Machiavellian Egocentricity, and Blame Externalization subscales. One other PPI subscale, Coldheartedness, does not load appreciably on either higher-order factor.

Running somewhat parallel to refinements in the PPI’s factor structure, advances in the factor structure of the PCL-R have been evident over the past several years. In contrast to the early two-factor models, in both the adult and juvenile literatures there is growing support for three- and four-factor structures (e.g. Cooke, Michie, Hart, & Clark, 2004; Forth *et al.*, 2003; Hare, 2003; Jones, Cauffman, Miller, & Mulvey, 2006; Neumann, Kosson, Forth, & Hare, 2006; Weaver, Meyer, & Van Nort, 2006) that parse out the affective–interpersonal and lifestyle–behavioral features identified in earlier studies (e.g. Harpur, Hare, & Hakstian, 1989). Although in principle these facets should demonstrate a differential pattern of correlates in support of their construct validity, research in this area is for the most part in its infancy.

Factor analytic debates notwithstanding, much of the applied work on psychopathy has focused on the ability of the total scores of these instruments to predict various socially undesirable outcomes. In addition to the prediction of community crime and violence noted earlier, some researchers have argued that the PCL-R is a potent correlate of institutional misconduct, with early studies in this area (Hare & McPherson, 1984; Hill, Rogers, & Bickford, 1996) reporting relatively large effect sizes. Subsequent research on the relationship between psychopathy and institutional misbehavior has been much more equivocal, however, especially in relation to the prediction of violent acts in institutional settings (for reviews, see Edens, Petrila, & Buffington-Vollum, 2001; Guy, Edens, Anthony, & Douglas, 2005; Walters, 2003b). The "old" Factor 1 of the PCL-R (affective and interpersonal features) in particular has been only weakly associated with misconduct in these settings. The older Factor 2 of the PCL-R (behavioral and antisocial features) typically has been a stronger correlate of misbehavior, although the difference in magnitude across these two factors typically has not been statistically significant. Research on the predictive validity of the three- and four-factor models is limited.

In contrast to the PCL-R, the relationship between PPI scores and institutional adjustment has not been the focus of much research, although the few retrospective studies examining this association have been somewhat supportive of its postdictive validity (Edens, Poythress, & Lilienfeld, 1999; Edens, Poythress, & Watkins, 2001; Kruh et al., 2005). Edens et al. (1999) reported the earliest direct comparison of the PPI and PCL-R in relation to institutional misconduct in a sample of 50 incarcerated youthful offenders. Both instruments showed some significant, albeit inconsistent, associations with various types of disciplinary problem evidenced during the first year of incarceration. More recently, in a re-analysis of data from an earlier postdictive study (Edens et al., 2000), Patrick et al. (2006) reported the first comparison of PPI-I and PPI-II in relation to adjustment difficulties among prisoners ($N=89$). PPI-II was related to a history of physically violent, verbally aggressive, and non-aggressive forms of institutional misconduct (biserial r ranging from .21 to .27, all p values $< .05$), whereas PPI-I only correlated significantly with a history of non-aggressive infractions (biserial $r = .26$).

In terms of demonstrating the clinical utility of a scale, such retrospective studies are obviously limited due to the intrinsic problems with postdictive research designs (e.g. predicting behavior that has already occurred rather than predicting future misconduct). As such, the goal of the present study was to compare the predictive validity of the PCL-R and the PPI, using new longitudinal disciplinary infraction data that were collected for those inmates who had previously participated in the retrospective prison misconduct study conducted by Edens et al. (1999). In addition to improving on earlier research by using a truly prospective design, the present study also allows for a comparison of the more recently derived factor analytic subscales of the PCL-R and PPI, which have not been studied to any great extent in relation to institutional misbehavior (although see Skeem & Cauffman, 2003; Spain, Douglas, Poythress, & Epstein, 2004; Vitacco, Neumann, Caldwell, Leistico, & Van Rybroek, 2006).

Given previous findings, we tested the hypotheses that the PPI and PCL-R total scores would predict various forms of institutional misconduct. In relation to factor scores, we hypothesized that PPI-I and PPI-II would prospectively predict non-aggressive institutional misbehavior and that PPI-II would be a stronger correlate of

misconduct that was aggressive or violent in nature. Although prior research typically has found that the old Factor 1 features of the PCL-R are less strongly associated with institutional adjustment than are the old Factor 2 features, given the relatively limited research on the predictive validity of the three- and four-factor models, we did not advance any *a priori* hypotheses concerning incremental validity among these narrower facets. In exploratory analyses, we also examined the incremental validity of the PPI total score above and beyond the PCL-R total score, and vice versa, for predicting institutional misconduct.

METHOD

Participants

Fifty male participants were recruited from a youthful offender prison in west central Florida. This facility housed individuals whose crimes were committed as juveniles, but who subsequently were adjudicated through the adult criminal justice system and incarcerated in the adult prison system (see Poythress *et al.*, 1998, for a more extensive description of the sample). They ranged in age from 17 to 21 years ($M = 18.60$, $SD = 0.78$) and nearly all (98%) were single. The mean education level reported was 9.00 years ($SD = 1.01$). The breakdown of self-reported racial and ethnic background was African American 54%, Caucasian 32%, Hispanic 12%, and "other" 2%.

Predictor Variables

PCL—R

Because of the relatively young age of the inmates, we chose not to score four PCL-R items identified by Forth, Hart, and Hare (1990) as being of questionable applicability to youthful offenders (parasitic lifestyle, many short-term marital relationships, revocation of conditional release, criminal versatility). Results reported here are therefore based on prorated scores (the PCL—R may be prorated for up to five missing items). To establish interrater reliability in this study, 20 interviews were observed by one of the co-authors, who also completed a file review of each participant. An intraclass correlation of .94 was obtained for these 20 cases. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for the total score was .87.

As noted earlier, recent factor analytic work on the PCL-R (e.g. Cooke *et al.*, 2004; Hare, 2003) has raised the question of whether three or four factors underlie the broader construct assessed by this instrument. Because the four-factor model incorporates the same three factors as the Cooke model, with the addition of a fourth factor that might be disproportionately likely to predict socially deviant behavior (i.e., the Antisocial facet), we chose to examine this model in the present study. However, given our original decision to omit certain items of questionable appropriateness for young adult offenders, only three of the five items that load on the *Antisocial* factor were available for analysis. Additionally, one item from the *Behavioral* facet was not scored, resulting in only four items for this facet. Alphas for the four facet subscales in this sample were .79 (*Interpersonal*), .76 (*Affective*), .57 (*Behavioral*), and .62

(*Antisocial*). Although the alphas for the *Behavioral* and *Antisocial* subscales were low, mean inter-item correlations were in an acceptable range (.26 and .29, respectively), suggesting this was more an issue of abbreviated scale length than lack of homogeneity within these subscales (see Clark & Watson, 1995; Schmitt, 1996).

PPI

Respondents rated themselves on each of the 187 PPI items using a scale from 1 (false) to 4 (true). As noted earlier, the PPI provides a total score as well as eight factor-analytically derived subscales that assess narrower traits of psychopathy. Lilienfeld and Andrews (1996) reported satisfactory psychometric properties for the PPI among several undergraduate samples. In the present study, the internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of the total score was .91; alpha values for the PPI subscales ranged from .91 to .72. (For a more extensive summary of literature concerning the reliability and validity of the PPI, see Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005).

We computed PPI-I and PPI-II scores in a manner similar to that described by Benning et al. (2003) in their derivation sample. "Fearless Dominance" (PPI-I) scores were created by summing standardized scores for the *Social Potency*, *Fearlessness*, and *Stress Immunity* subscales. *Social Potency* consists of 24 items and assesses one's perceived ability to influence and manipulate others. *Fearlessness* is composed of 19 items and taps an absence of anticipatory anxiety concerning harm and a willingness to participate in risky activities. *Stress Immunity* consists of 11 items and assesses an absence of marked reactions to anxiety-provoking events.

Four subscales combine to form the "Impulsive Antisociality" factor (PPI-II) identified by Benning et al. (2003). *Machiavellian Egocentricity* consists of 30 items and taps narcissistic and ruthless attitudes in interpersonal functioning. *Carefree Nonplanfulness* is composed of 20 items and reflects an attitude of indifference in planning one's actions. The 18 items comprising *Blame Externalization* assess a tendency to blame others for one's problems and to rationalize one's misbehavior. *Impulsive Nonconformity* consists of 17 items and measures a reckless lack of concern regarding social mores.

Finally, the PPI subscale *Coldheartedness* consists of 21 items and measures a propensity toward callousness, guiltlessness, and a lack of sentimentality. Unlike the other seven PPI subscales, *Coldheartedness* does not load on either PPI factor.

Criterion Measures

The Florida Department of Corrections (FDOC) Inmate Discipline Procedure Manual contains the "Rules of Prohibited Conduct," which denotes various infraction types within 10 major subdivisions. Edens et al. (1999), in conjunction with a member of the FDOC inmate classification division, developed an *a priori* scheme that assigned each unique infraction code into one of three broader (but non-overlapping) categories: Physical Aggression (PA; e.g. "Assault or battery with a deadly weapon," "Unarmed assault"), Verbal Aggression/Acts of Defiance (VA; e.g. "Spoken or written threats," "Disrespect to officials"), and Non-aggressive (NA; e.g. "Possession of contraband," "Theft") infractions.

To maintain consistency with disciplinary classifications used in recent meta-analyses of the psychopathy/institutional misconduct literature (e.g. Edens & Campbell, 2007; Guy *et al.*, 2005), we used the three categories described above to create a hierarchy of outcome measures. At the broadest level of misconduct, the numbers of PA, VA, and NA infractions were summed to create a *total* infractions category. Next, to examine more narrowly the relationship between PPI-II scores and aggression (verbal and physical), the total number of PA and VA infractions was aggregated to create an *aggressive* infractions (combined PA and VA) category. Finally, given our specific hypothesis concerning the relationship between PPI-I and *non-aggressive* (NA) infractions, we report analyses examining this narrower criterion measure as well.

Procedure

Inmates were selected randomly from the institutional population and then were approached by either the first or second author, engaged in an informed consent disclosure and discussion, and invited to participate. Only four inmates declined to participate in the original study. Additionally, one non-English-speaking inmate was excluded. The PCL-R was administered first, followed by the PPI. While the inmate completed the PPI, the interviewer(s) reviewed his institutional file to complete the PCL-R items. Inmates were paid \$10 on completion of the protocol.

A printout for study participants summarizing each disciplinary infraction received subsequent to their completion of the research protocols was downloaded from the FDOC central office computer and provided to the investigators. Each infraction was coded according to the scheme described earlier (i.e. PA, VA, or NA). As noted above, the *total* infraction category was created by summing across all three categories, whereas the *aggressive* criterion measure was created by summing the total number of PA and VA infractions.

Four of the 50 inmates who participated in the original study (Poythress *et al.*, 1998) were within two weeks of their release dates at the time of recruitment and were subsequently dropped from the prospective analyses, resulting in a final *N* of 46.¹ The average follow-up period for this group was 2.09 years (*SD* = 1.87). Because the total number of infractions accrued was strongly correlated with length of follow-up period ($r = .56$, $p < .01$), we converted the frequency counts for the criterion measures to ratio variables (i.e. number of infractions per year).

RESULTS

Inter-relations between PPI and PCL-R Factors/Facets

Although the primary focus of the present research is the predictive utility of the two psychopathy measures, we first examined the intercorrelations for the PPI and PCL-

¹ Use of a more restrictive inclusion criterion (i.e. at least 3 months remaining prior to release) resulted in a smaller follow-up sample ($n = 41$) but correlational values that were on average slightly higher in magnitude compared with the findings reported below. Further detail regarding these analyses is available from the first author upon request.

Table 1. Intercorrelations among PCL-R and PPI total and factor scores

Scale/subscale	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. PCL-R total	.78	.82	.78	.81	.54	.24	.50
2. Interpersonal		.50	.47	.54	.46	.24	.42
3. Affective			.49	.54	.47	.27	.40
4. Behavioral				.63	.32	.16	.34
5. Antisocial					.39	.05	.40
6. PPI total						.24	.50
7. PPI-I							.31
8. PPI-II							

PCL-R = Psychopathy Checklist—Revised. PPI = Psychopathic Personality Inventory.
 For all correlations $>.28$ $p < .05$, and for all correlations $>.35$ $p < .01$ (two tailed).

R total and subscale scores (see Table 1). As can be seen, PPI-I and PPI-II were moderately correlated with each other in this sample, and the PCL-R facet scores were moderately to highly intercorrelated (r between .49 and .63), using Cohen's (1988) widely cited guidelines for interpreting the magnitude of effect sizes (e.g. Pearson correlations $\geq .50$ being considered "large" effects). As noted in the original Poythress et al. (1998) paper, the correlation between the PCL-R and PPI total scores was quite high, at least relative to the typical correlations obtained between the PCL-R and self-report measures of psychopathy (Hare, 2003). As would be expected, there were positive correlations between PPI-I and the PCL-R *Interpersonal* and *Affective* facet scores, although these were modest in magnitude.² Associations between PPI-I and the *Behavioral* and *Antisocial* facets of the PCL-R were negligible. PPI-II, in contrast, was relatively strongly related to the PCL-R total and all the facet scores. Although in theory one might expect PPI-II to be more strongly associated with the *Behavioral* and *Antisocial* facets of the PCL-R, the correlations were all of comparable magnitude (r between .34 and .42).³

Comparison of Predictive Validity across Total and Factor/Facet Scores

Table 2 summarizes the correlations of the PCL-R and PPI total and factor scores with the criterion measures. As can be seen, at the most general level of misconduct (*total* infractions), the PPI total and both subscale scores significantly predicted these outcomes, with comparable effect sizes. When examining the narrower infraction categories, however, a somewhat different pattern of effects emerged. As hypothesized, PPI-II scores significantly predicted aggressive misconduct, whereas PPI-I

² These results are somewhat inconsistent with an earlier study examining the relationship between the PCL-R factors and PPI factor score estimates derived from the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ; Tellegen, in press). In a sample of 218 male prisoners, Benning et al. (2005a) reported an association between MPQ-estimated PPI-I and the PCL-R interpersonal facet ($r = .30$) comparable to our results, but a notably weaker correlation with the affective dimension ($r = .09$).

³ Although not the primary focus of the present study, it is worth noting that the Coldheartedness subscale of the PPI, which does not load on PPI-I or PPI-II, did evince some statistically significant and theoretically interesting correlations with the PCL-R facets: Interpersonal $r = .27$, $p = .06$; Affective $r = .36$, $p < .05$; Behavioral $r = .00$, $p = ns$; Antisocial $r = .36$, $p < .01$.

Table 2. Comparison of psychopathy measures as predictors of institutional misconduct categories ($N = 46$)

Psychopathy scale/subscale	Infraction type		
	Total	Aggressive	Non-aggressive
PPI total	.29*	.18	.20
PPI-I	.36**	.15	.39**
PPI-II	.28*	.24*	.11
PCL-R total	.17	.08	.15
Interpersonal	.14	.04	.16
Affective	.05	-.01	.06
Behavioral	.20	.09	.21
Antisocial	.19	.16	.08

PCL-R = Psychopathy Checklist—Revised. PPI = Psychopathic Personality Inventory.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ (one tailed).

scores did not. However, a test of the magnitude of the difference (.09) between these two dependent correlations indicated that this difference was not significant, $t(43) = .55$, $p = ns$.

Our hypothesis that PPI-I would predict non-aggressive infractions was also supported (see Table 2), but the correlation between PPI-II and non-aggressive infractions was non-significant. Although the magnitude of the difference between these two dependent correlations was relatively large (.28), this difference only approached statistical significance, $t(43) = 1.72$, $p = .09$ (two tailed).⁴

In contrast to the results for the PPI total and factor scores, neither the PCL-R total score nor any of the facet scores significantly predicted subsequent misconduct, with all effect sizes in the negligible to small range (median $r = .14$, r ranging from $-.01$ to $.21$). We note however that, although the PPI total score/total infraction correlation was statistically significant and the PCL-R total score/total infraction correlation was not, the magnitude of the difference between these correlations (.12) was not significant, $t(43) = .82$, $p = ns$.

To examine these relationships further, we next conducted exploratory incremental validity analyses in which the order of entry of the PPI and PCL-R total scores was reversed in the prediction of the total infraction category. When PPI-I was entered on the first step of a linear regression, it explained a significant amount of variance in this outcome ($R^2 = .09$, $p = .05$), consistent with the bivariate correlational results. Inclusion of the PCL-R total score on the second step of this regression analysis did not result in any increase in the amount of variance explained, however ($\Delta R^2 = .00$, $p = ns$). When reversing the order of entry, introduction of the PCL-R on the first step did not result in a significant model ($R^2 = .03$, $p = ns$), consistent with the correlational findings. Including the PPI on the second step increased the total amount of variance explained ($R^2 = .09$), but neither the change in R^2 nor the overall model was statistically significant. As such, similar to the results of the test of dependent correlations reported above, the PPI total score could not explain a statistically significant amount of variance in total infractions beyond

⁴ Exploratory analyses of the relationship between Coldheartedness and infractions revealed the following associations: total $r = -.29$, $p < .05$; aggressive $r = -.21$, $p = ns$; non-aggressive $r = -.25$, $p = .09$.

that attributable to the PCL-R total score, even though (a) the PPI was a significant bivariate predictor and (b) the PCL-R was not itself a statistically significant correlate of this outcome.⁵

DISCUSSION

The results of the current study suggest a number of practical and theoretical implications. In terms of practice issues, the PPI is meaningfully associated with future institutional behavior problems, with effect sizes in the small to medium range of magnitude (Cohen, 1988). This finding is consistent with earlier retrospective studies indicating an association with a history of misconduct (Edens et al., 1999; Kruh et al., 2005). Moreover, the fact that PPI-I and II appear to be predictive of different forms of behavior problems suggests that a consideration *only* of total scores may obscure a more nuanced assessment of the types of institutional disruption in which inmates engage. Those high on PPI-II may be more predisposed to overt forms of confrontation (verbal and/or physical) than are those inmates who obtain lower scores. Inmates high on PPI-I may be more prone to surreptitious or clandestine forms of misconduct, insofar as non-aggressive infractions in this study reflected more covert activities, such as lying to staff, theft, and possession of contraband (e.g. “prison economy”-type activities).

The differential relations of PPI-I and PPI-II with aggressive and non-aggressive infractions are generally consistent with notions of how these measures relate to “primary” and “secondary” psychopathy, respectively. PPI-I subscales (e.g. fearlessness; stress immunity) capture features attributed by Lykken (1995) to primary psychopathy, namely fearless temperament and low anxiety. PPI-II, in contrast, is perhaps a better proxy for secondary psychopathy in that its subscales capture features likely to lead to increased interpersonal conflict, such as blaming others, impulsivity, oppositionalism, and ruthless attitudes. Indeed, PPI-II has much stronger associations than PPI-I with indicators of emotional maladjustment and turmoil (Patrick et al., 2006; also see Benning, Patrick, Salekin, & Leistico, 2005). Both Blackburn (1987) and Lykken (1995) suggested that secondary psychopaths would have greater problems than primary psychopaths in adjusting to prison life. The preferential association of PPI-II, as a proxy for secondary psychopathy, with aggressive infractions is in accord with this prediction.

The meager effect sizes reported for the PCL-R in relation to predicting infractions, although perhaps surprising to some, are generally consistent with the aggregated literature concerning the relationship between PCL-defined psychopathy and misconduct in U.S. institutions. In a recent meta-analysis of this literature, Guy et al. (2005) reported PCL-R total score weighted correlations of .13 for general misconduct (combined $n = 902$) and .10 for aggressive misconduct (combined $n = 902$) in U.S. prisons. As such, although a study with only 46 participants obviously has insufficient power to determine the statistical significance of small

⁵ Despite this conclusion, it is worth noting that use of a more restrictive inclusion criterion (i.e. at least three months remaining prior to release) to define the follow-up sample ($n = 41$) did result in significant incremental validity analyses, with the PPI total score explaining significant variance in total infractions ($\Delta R^2 = .10$, $p < .05$) after controlling for PCL-R scores.

effect sizes (i.e. $r = .10$; Cohen, 1988) such as those noted for the PCL-R, the correlations of .17 (total infractions) and .08 (aggressive infractions) reported here should be interpreted in terms of their convergence with the larger body of literature examining the magnitude of these effects.

The negligible effect sizes for the PCL-R *Interpersonal* and *Affective* subscales are particularly noteworthy in relation to the use of psychopathy assessments to inform expert testimony on institutional violence risk. Such testimony has appeared in capital murder trials in the U.S. to support prosecution arguments that defendants are “continuing threats to society” who—if not executed—will be likely to engage in violent behavior in institutional settings (Edens, Petrila, & Buffington-Vollum, 2001, 2005). Our findings, along with other recent studies (e.g. McDermott, Edens, Quanbeck, Busse, & Scott, 2008), contradict claims that remorselessness, callousness, and egocentricity are valid indicators of the likelihood of subsequent violence in institutional settings. In fact, to the extent that the negative associations between PPI Coldheartedness and institutional misconduct (see Footnote 4) prove to be replicable in future investigations, our results raise the possibility that emotional detachment (at least as assessed by the PPI) may even be a protective factor against certain forms of institutional misconduct (cf. Vitacco *et al.*, 2006).

It should be noted that stronger effects have been noted between institutional misconduct and PCL-based assessments of psychopathy among youths. Edens and Campbell (2007) recently reported weighted correlations of .24 ($n = 1,310$) and .25 ($n = 1,188$) for total and aggressive infractions, respectively, among juveniles in institutional settings. Why PCL-based assessments are more robust predictors of institutional aggression among youths is unclear and could be attributable to any number of individual or contextual factors (e.g. differing security standards, inconsistent informal norms for “writing up” transgressions) across adult and juvenile settings. Regardless of the cause(s) of these differences, the fact that our “youthful” offenders were incarcerated in an adult prison system suggests that the adult prison literature is the more appropriate focus of comparison.

Several limitations of this research should be noted. First, although generally consistent with earlier findings, the results are based on a small sample of youthful offenders and warrant replication with a larger group of inmates that represent a broader age range of offenders. Second, we relied on official records of infractions, which could be argued to underestimate the amount of “true” misconduct that occurs in these facilities. Although it seems relatively unlikely that many severe acts of violence (e.g. murder) go undocumented, it seems equally likely that some forms of misconduct may not be adequately represented in official institutional records.

Third, our self-report measure was completed with assurances of confidentiality, which may have resulted in greater self-disclosure and veracity in endorsing psychopathic tendencies relative to most real-world prison settings. As such, it should not be assumed that the positive findings noted here would necessarily replicate in settings in which test results would have an impact on offender management (e.g. if the PPI were adopted as part of inmate screening and classification procedures). Although the PPI was designed to minimize the effects of social desirability, analogue studies demonstrate that it is possible to obtain artificially lowered scores when examinees are instructed to “fake good” (Edens, Buffington, Tomicic, & Riley, 2001). Although the PPI does contain validity scales, research on their efficacy for detecting aberrant response sets is in a nascent state.

Such concerns notwithstanding, the results of the current study are consistent with a growing body of literature supporting (a) the potential clinical utility of self-report measures of psychopathy, particularly the PPI, and (b) the differential correlates of Fearless Dominance and Impulsive Antisociality in offender samples.

REFERENCES

- Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Blonigen, D. M., Hicks, B. M., & Iacono, W. G. (2005a). Estimating facets of psychopathy from normal personality traits: A step toward community-epidemiological investigations. *Assessment, 12*, 3–18.
- Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Hicks, B. M., Blonigen, D. M., & Krueger, R. (2003). Factor structure of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Validity and implications for clinical assessment. *Psychological Assessment, 15*, 340–350.
- Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Salekin, R., & Leistico, A. (2005b). Convergent and discriminant validity of psychopathy factors assessed via self-report: A comparison of three instruments. *Assessment, 12*, 270–289.
- Blackburn, R. (1987). Two scales for the assessment of personality disorder in antisocial populations. *Personality and Individual Differences, 8*, 81–93.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*, 309–319.
- Cleckley, H. (1941/1988). *The mask of sanity* (5th ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment, 13*, 171–188.
- Cooke, D. J., Michie, C., Hart, S. D., & Clark, D. A. (2004). Reconstructing psychopathy: Clarifying the significance of antisocial and socially deviant behavior in the diagnosis of psychopathic personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 18*, 337–357.
- Cooke, D. J., Michie, C., & Ryan, J. (2001). Evaluating risk for violence: *A preliminary study of the HCR-20, PCL-R and VRAG*. Report prepared for the Scottish Prison Service.
- DeMatteo, D., & Edens, J. F. (2006). The role and relevance of the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised in court: A case law survey of U.S. courts (1991–2004). *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 12*, 214–241.
- Edens, J. F. (2006). Unresolved controversies concerning psychopathy: Implications for clinical and forensic decision-making. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 37*, 59–65.
- Edens, J. F., Buffington, J. K., Tomicic, T. L., & Riley, B. D. (2001). Effects of positive impression management on the Psychopathic Personality Inventory. *Law and Human Behavior, 25*, 235–256.
- Edens, J. F., & Campbell, J. S. (2007). Identifying youths at risk for institutional misconduct: A meta-analytic investigation of the Psychopathy Checklist measures. *Psychological Services, 4*, 13–27.
- Edens, J. F., Campbell, J. S., & Weir, J. M. (2007). Youth psychopathy and criminal recidivism: A meta-analysis of the Psychopathy Checklist measures. *Law and Human Behavior, 31*, 53–75.
- Edens, J. F., Hart, S. D., Johnson, D. W., Johnson, J., & Olver, M. E. (2000). Use of the Personality Assessment Inventory to assess psychopathy in offender populations. *Psychological Assessment, 12*, 132–139.
- Edens, J. F., & Petrila, J. (2006). Legal and ethical issues in the assessment and treatment of psychopathy. In C. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 573–588). New York: Guilford.
- Edens, J. F., Petrila, J., & Buffington-Vollum, J. K. (2001). Psychopathy and the death penalty: Can the Psychopathy Checklist—Revised identify offenders who represent “a continuing threat to society?” *Journal of Psychiatry and Law, 29*, 433–481.
- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (1999). Identifying inmates at risk for disciplinary infractions: A comparison of two measures of psychopathy. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 17*, 435–443.
- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Watkins, M. M. (2001). Further validation of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory among offenders: Personality and behavioral correlates. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 15*, 403–415.
- Edens, J. F., Skeem, J. L., & Douglas, K. S. (2006). Incremental validity analyses of the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide and the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version in a civil psychiatric sample. *Assessment, 13*, 368–374.
- Edens, J. F., & Vincent, G. M. (2008). Juvenile psychopathy: A clinical construct in need of restraint? *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice, 8*, 186–197.
- Forth, A. E., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1990). Assessment of psychopathy in male young offenders. *Psychological Assessment, 2*, 342–344.

- Forth, A., Kosson, D., & Hare, R. (2003). *Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version*. Toronto: MHS.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Smith, P. (2002). Is the PCL-R really the “unparalleled” measure of offender risk? A lesson in knowledge accumulation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 397–426.
- Guy, L. S., Edens, J. F., Anthony, C., & Douglas, K. S. (2005). Does psychopathy predict institutional misconduct among adults? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 1056–1064.
- Hare, R. D. (1985). Comparison of procedures for the assessment of psychopathy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 7–16.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Hare Psychopathy Checklist—Revised manual* (2nd ed.). Toronto: MHS.
- Hare, R. D., & McPherson, L. (1984). Violent and aggressive behavior by criminal psychopaths. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 7, 35–50.
- Harpur, T. J., Hare, R. D., & Hakstian, A. R. (1989). Two-factor conceptualization of psychopathy: Construct validity and assessment implications. *Psychological Assessment*, 1, 6–17.
- Hart, S. D., Forth, A. E., & Hare, R. D. (1991). The MCMI-II and psychopathy. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 5, 318–327.
- Hill, C., Rogers, R., & Bickford, M. (1996). Predicting aggressive and socially disruptive behavior in a maximum security forensic psychiatric hospital. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 41, 56–59.
- Jones, S., Cauffman, E., Miller, J. D., & Mulvey, E. (2006). Investigating different factor structures of the psychopathy checklist: youth version: Confirmatory factor analytic findings. *Psychological Assessment*, 18, 33–48.
- Kroner, D., & Mills, J. (2001). The accuracy of five risk appraisal instruments in predicting institutional misconduct and new convictions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28, 471–489.
- Kruh, I. P., Whittemore, K., Arnaut, G., Manley, J., Gage, B., & Gagliardi, G. (2005). The concurrent validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory and its relative association with past violence in a sample of insanity acquittees. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 4, 135–145.
- 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.
- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Fowler, K. (2006). The self-report assessment of psychopathy: Problems, pitfalls, and promises. In C. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 107–132). New York: Guilford.
- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Widows, M. (2005). *Psychopathic Personality Inventory—Revised professional manual*. Odessa, FL: PAR.
- Lykken, D. T. (1995). *The antisocial personalities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McDermott, B. E., Edens, J. F., Quanbeck, C., Busse, D., & Scott, C. (2008). Examining the role of static and dynamic risk factors in the prediction of inpatient violence: Variable- and person-focused analyses. *Law and Human Behavior*, 32, 325–338.
- Neumann, C., Kosson, D., Forth, A., & Hare, R. (2006). Factor structure of the Hare Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version (PCL: YV) in incarcerated adolescents. *Psychological Assessment*, 18, 142–154.
- Ogloff, J. R. P., & Lyon, D. R. (1998). Legal issues associated with the concept of psychopathy. In D. J. Cooke et al. (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Theory, research and implications for society* (pp. 401–422). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Patrick, C. J., Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Benning, S. (2006). Construct validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory two-factor model with offenders. *Psychological Assessment*, 18, 204–208.
- Poythress, N. G., Edens, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (1998). Criterion-related validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory in a prison sample. *Psychological Assessment*, 10, 426–430.
- Sandoval, A. R., Hancock, D., Poythress, N. G., Edens, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2000). Construct validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory in a correctional sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 74, 262–281.
- Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Assessment*, 8, 350–353.
- Skeem, J. L., & Cauffman, E. (2003). Views of the downward extension: Comparing the youth version of the Psychopathy Checklist with the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 21, 737–770.
- Spain, S. E., Douglas, K. S., Poythress, N. G., & Epstein, M. (2004). The relation between psychopathic features, violence and treatment outcomes: The comparison of three measures of psychopathic features. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 22, 85–102.
- Tellegen, A. (in press) *Manual for the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Vitacco, M., Neumann, C., Caldwell, M., Leistico, A., & Van Rybroek, G. (2006). Testing factor models of the Psychopathy Checklist: Youth Version and their association with instrumental aggression. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 87, 74–83.
- Walsh, T., & Walsh, Z. (2006). The evidentiary introduction of Psychopathy Checklist—Revised assessed psychopathy in U.S. Courts: Extent and appropriateness. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30, 493–507.

- Walters, G. (2003a). Predicting criminal justice outcomes with the Psychopathy Checklist and Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 21, 89–102.
- Walters, G. (2003b). Predicting institutional adjustment and recidivism with the Psychopathy Checklist factor scores: A meta-analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*, 27, 541–558.
- Weaver, C., Meyer, R., & Van Nort, J. (2006). Two-, three-, and four-factor PCL-R models in applied sex offender risk assessments. *Assessment*, 13, 208–216.
- Zinger, I., & Forth, A. E. (1998). Psychopathy and Canadian criminal proceedings: The potential for human rights abuses. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 40, 237–277.