

INTRODUCTION

❖ There is ongoing debate about the role of Antisocial Behavior in psychopathy. Cleckley (1976) did not feel that criminality and aggression were a necessary part of the construct, more so as “the exception rather than as the rule.”

❖ While Hare’s two-factor definition has been the “gold standard” (Cooke & Michie, 2001; Hall & Benning, 2006; Hare & Neumann, 2010) used in assessing psychopathy, and includes several items pertaining to criminal activity, Hare also argues that not all psychopaths are criminal (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Babiak, Neumann & Hare, 2010; Hare, 1993). Some research has even looked at how psychopathic traits can predict success in certain settings (Babiak 2007; Babiak & Hare, 2006; Babiak, Neumann & Hare, 2010; Hare, 1993). Other authors agree that psychopaths may have an evolutionary advantage (Book & Quinsey, 2004; Glenn, Kurzban, & Raine, 2011; Mealey, 1995; Krupp, Sewall, Lalumiere, Sheriff, & Harris, 2013; Smith, 1999).

❖ It is logical that those high in certain personality (and psychopathic) traits might be more likely to end up in criminal settings, or to behave antisocially, based on their sensation seeking and lack of fear of consequences. One who lacked empathy would more easily be able to take advantage of or mistreat others, as is suggested by Hare (1993, 2006) and Hare and Neumann (2009). Factor 1 traits (such as lack of empathy or remorse) may predispose a person to behave in an antisocial manner, but it is likely dependent on the quality of their early environment.

❖ In individuals scoring higher in psychopathic traits, family history and social environment, such as childhood abuse or neglect, contribute to their antisocial behavior (Brieman et al., 2011; Farrington, 2006; McCord & McCord, 1964; Swogger, Walsh, Kosson, Cashman-Brown & Caine, 2012).

❖ Furthermore, there has been some research that has looked at the protective quality of parental warmth (Kochanska, Kim, Boldt & Yoon, 2013; McCord and McCord, 1964; Pardini, Lochman & Powell, 2007; Salekin and Lochman, 2008).

Purpose of Present Study:

❖ To examine the possible moderators of the relationship between psychopathic traits and antisocial behavior, in order to better understand the variability in “success” in individuals high in psychopathy.

Predictions:

❖ Abuse and neglect will have a greater impact on individuals who score higher on Factor 1, predicting higher Antisocial Behavior scores.

❖ The positive effect of parental warmth to have compensatory effect against Factor 1 traits, reducing Antisocial Behavior.

METHODS

Participants:

❖ $N = 368$, recruited from Amazon Mturk & Facebook (56% female; $M_{age} = 36.01$, $SD = 51.55$)

Measures:

❖ **Psychopathy**- The Self-Report Psychopathy Scale: Version III (SRP III; Paulhus, Hemphill, & Hare, in press).

❖ **Childhood Trauma/Abuse**- The abbreviated version of the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-SF; Bernstein & Fink, 1998; Bernstein et al., 2003).

❖ **Parental Warmth and Neglect**- Parental Warmth and Rejection were measured with the Adult Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ, Rohner & Khaleque, 2005), for each participant’s mother and father (Warmth/Acceptance subscale used to measure parental warmth).

Covariates

❖ **Demographics**- Participants were given a demographics questionnaire to determine information about their age, sex, education level, nationality, and race.

❖ **Childhood Socio Economic Status**- Family Affluence Scale (Currie et al., 2008), which asks indirect questions about their family income growing up.

❖ **Head Injury**- Scale from *Mild Head Injury* lab at Brock University (Baker & Good, 2014).

DISCUSSION

❖ Sex was a significant predictor of antisocial behavior in all cases, with men having higher AB scores across all of our analyses. Some research has also argued that psychopathic traits will be manifested differently in women than men, which has implications for research measuring psychopathy in women (Cale & Lilienfeld, 2002; Dolan & Völlm, 2009; Kreis & Cooke, 2011). It has been suggested that women use less overt aggression in general, and instead are higher in relational aggression (Vaillancourt, 2005). These findings have also been found in women high in psychopathic traits (Dolan & Völlm, 2009; Kreis & Cooke, 2011).

❖ Childhood Abuse interacted with some of the psychopathic personality traits, but often the effect of Childhood Abuse was only additive.

❖ Maternal Neglect and Warmth were significant moderators of the relationship between F1 psychopathic traits and Antisocial Behavior in men. These effects held constant even after controlling for the relationship with Paternal Neglect and Warmth. This is consistent with past research demonstrating that maternal neglect was a much stronger predictor of antisocial behavior in psychopathy than the effects of poor paternal care (Enns, Cox, & Clara, 2002; Gao, Raine, Chan, Venables, & Mednick, 2009). The quality of maternal care was more influential in our sample than the effects of childhood abuse, which is consistent with some research in at-risk adolescents (Gao, Raine, Chan, Venables, & Mednick, 2009; Kimonis, Cross, Howard, & Donoghue, 2013).

RESULTS

❖ SES and Head Injury were not correlated with Antisocial Behavior, and thus were omitted from analyses.

❖ **Childhood Abuse/Neglect**: While the overall model was significant, predicting 38.4% of the variance in Antisocial Behavior ($R^2 = .38$, $F(7, 359) = 31.94$, $p < .001$) Childhood Abuse Neglect did not interact with Factor 1 scores in predicting Antisocial Behavior.

❖ **Paternal Neglect**- While the overall model was significant ($R^2 = .38$, $F(7, 356) = 30.64$, $p < .001$), Paternal Neglect did not interact with F1 scores in predicting Antisocial Behavior.

❖ **Maternal Neglect**- Analyses were conducted separately for women and men. **In women**, while the model was significant, only Factor 1 scores were a significant predictor of Antisocial Behavior scores ($\beta = .53$, $t = 8.71$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .26$). No significant interaction was found. **In men**, the overall model was significant, accounting for 41.1% of the variance in Antisocial Behavior, $R^2 = .41$, $F(3, 155) = 36.08$, $p < .001$. Results of the regression analysis are presented below.

Results of Hierarchical Regression: Parental Rejection/Neglect for Mother, Factor 1 scores, and Interaction in predicting Antisocial Behaviour scores (in Men)

Predictors	Step 1			Step 2		
	β	t	sr^2	β	t	sr^2
SRP III Factor 1	.43**	6.37**	.09	-.17	-.96	.00
PARQ-Mother	.32**	4.81**	.17	-1.02*	-2.71*	.03
PARQ-Mother by Factor 1 Interaction				1.63**	3.62**	.05

Note. $N = 160$. Correlation from regression analysis: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$, one-tailed.

❖ **Paternal Warmth** - While the overall model was significant ($R^2 = .37$, $F(7, 356) = 29.31$, $p < .001$), Paternal Warmth did not interact with Factor 1 scores in predicting Antisocial Behavior.

❖ **Maternal Warmth** - Analyses were conducted separately for women and men. **In women**, while the model was significant, only Factor 1 scores were a significant predictor of Antisocial Behavior scores ($\beta = .55$, $t = 9.10$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .28$). No significant interaction was found. **In men**, the overall model was significant, accounting for 37.5% of the variance in Antisocial Behavior, $R^2 = .38$, $F(3, 155) = 31.02$, $p < .001$. Results of the regression analysis are presented below.

Results of Hierarchical Regression: Maternal Warmth, Factor 1 scores, and Interaction in predicting Antisocial Behaviour scores (in Men)

Predictors	Step 1			Step 2		
	B	t	sr^2	β	t	sr^2
SRP III Factor 1	.47**	7.06**	.22	1.46**	5.14**	.11
Maternal Warmth	-.24**	-3.62**	.06	.99*	2.82*	.03
Maternal Warmth by Factor 1				-1.45**	-3.57**	.05

Note. $N = 159$. Correlation from regression analysis: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$, one-tailed.