

Bond University  
Research Repository



## Factorial and Convergent Validity of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version in Ghana

Adjorlolo, S; Watt, Bruce D.

*Published in:*  
International Journal of Psychology

*DOI:*  
[10.1002/ijop.12468](https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12468)

Published: 01/06/2019

*Document Version:*  
Early version, also known as pre-print

*Licence:*  
Other

[Link to publication in Bond University research repository.](#)

*Recommended citation(APA):*  
Adjorlolo, S., & Watt, B. D. (2019). Factorial and Convergent Validity of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version in Ghana. *International Journal of Psychology*, 54(3), 388-396. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12468>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

Factorial and Convergent Validity of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version in  
Ghana

Abstract

Studies have shown that across cultures there are individuals displaying personality traits similar to psychopathic traits; however, research is needed to determine their existence. Consequently, this study investigated the factorial and convergent validity of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version (YPI-S) in 327 adolescents in Ghana. Confirmatory factor analysis supported a three-factor structure (interpersonal, behavioral, and affective) of psychopathy that was invariant across gender. These results were replicated in a cross-validation sample comprising 363 adolescents. The YPI-S factors correlated significantly and positively with reactive and proactive aggression, thus bolstering its construct validity. Relatedly, the YPI-S and Big-Five domains were related differently, and where significant correlations were observed, their directions generally confirmed and extended previous studies. The findings supported the hypothesis that psychopathy can be discussed in relation to general personality traits. All in all, the result generally suggested the existence of psychopathic traits among Ghanaian youth which can be described along interpersonal, affective and behavioral domains. However, the alterations made to the YPI-S, and the relatively low factor loadings and internal consistency largely indicate cultural influences on the assessment of cross-cultural traits, further illuminating the problem of exporting Western-based measures and their findings to non-Western contexts.

*Keywords:* Psychopathy, youth psychopathic inventory, adolescents, cross-culture, Africa-Ghana

1  
2  
3 Factorial and Convergent Validity of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version in  
4  
5  
6 Ghana

7 The preponderance of factor analytic studies suggest that psychopathy can be described  
8  
9 in terms of three latent factors; affective (e.g., callous-unemotional), interpersonal (e.g.,  
10  
11 manipulative), and behavioral (e.g., impulsive; Sellbom, 2011), although antisocial behavior  
12  
13 dimension has been reported (Neumann, Schmitt, Carter, Embley, & Hare, 2012). Individuals  
14  
15 with psychopathic traits are believed to form a small segment of the population (i.e., 1-3%), and  
16  
17 come from any social class or racial group (Pitchford, 2001). However, relatively little is known  
18  
19 about this construct and importantly its assessment in non-Western countries, leading others to  
20  
21 ask “how applicable are criminogenic factors to various cultures”, and “does variance or  
22  
23 invariance characterize criminogenic factors across different groups?” (Haag, Boyes, Cheng,  
24  
25 MacNeil, and Wirove, 2016, page 72). The study investigated the utility of the Youth  
26  
27 Psychopathic Traits Inventory: Short (YPI-S) in Ghana, a Western African state.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Cross-cultural assessment issues have been substantiated over the years mainly because  
34  
35 differences in societal structures and other sociocultural factors are capable of impacting the  
36  
37 assessment of psycholegal traits. Notably, the overt differences between Western African and  
38  
39 Western cultures may induce variations in psychopathic behaviors between these cultures (see  
40  
41 Huntington, 1996). Western cultures are inherently individualistic where people are primarily  
42  
43 socialized to launch individualistic goals. These goals can be pursued successfully by drawing on  
44  
45 some personality traits such as the ability to convince people through charms and smiles,  
46  
47 manipulate people and situations to one’s advantage, and elevate one’s talent above others in a  
48  
49 bid to exude high self-confidence and self-esteem (i.e., interpersonal psychopathy). In contrast,  
50  
51 Ghanaian societies are predominantly collectivistic where attributes such as social support and  
52  
53 interdependent living are celebrated and generationally transmitted. Individual independence is  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 often suppressed and sacrificed to facilitate the attainment of collectivist interest, particularly  
4 those pertaining to the family. Additionally, the socialization process for boys and girls in Ghana  
5 seems to vary significantly. Illustrating, as a patriarchal society where males are traditionally the  
6 head and breadwinners of the family, their socializations tend to emphasize attributes such as  
7 “hardiness” “toughness”, and personal courage as part of the process of developing resilient  
8 personalities to withstand adverse life events (Adjorlolo, Adu-Poku, Andoh-Arthur, Botchway,  
9 & Mlyakado, 2015). Child abuse and its associated psychological and emotional consequences  
10 may be experienced as part of the process which, in turn, may have adverse influences on  
11 personality formation. This could contribute to within-culture (e.g., gender) and between-culture  
12 differences in the acquisition and display of personality traits. Moreover, the Ghanaian society is  
13 heterogeneous, with over 46 different ethnic groups and over 50 languages and dialects. The  
14 probably slight differences in the parent-child socialization process across the various ethnic  
15 groups could induce variations in the representation of psychopathic behaviors.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Granted that psychopathic traits are among the outcomes of the parent-child socialization  
35 process, their expressions may differ between individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Needless  
36 to say, attributes that epitomized the socialization of persons in Western cultures are not  
37 necessarily absent in Ghanaian societies; however, their magnitudes and influences on the  
38 behavioral repertoire of the average Ghanaian may differ from their counterparts in Western  
39 countries. This presumption raises profound concern with respect to the structural and  
40 measurement equivalence of psychopathy in Ghana. Importing and subsequently using Western-  
41 based measures in Ghanaian societies could raise assessment issues pertaining prominently to  
42 test bias which could substantially diminish the accuracy of cross-cultural comparisons. While  
43 developing a culture-specific test is desirable, resource and logistic constraints have made it  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 extremely difficult to undertake this important exercise, thus necessitating the use of measures  
4 constructed in different cultural settings. Even though this could contribute to cross-cultural  
5 discussions on psychopathy, the previous commentaries suggest the need to elucidate their  
6 structural and measurement equivalence in new settings.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 One Western-based measure of psychopathy favored by several reviews is the YPI-S  
13 (e.g., Walters, 2015). The 18-item YPI-S is a shorter version of the 50 item Youth Psychopathic  
14 Traits Inventory developed purposely to minimize socially desirable response bias by ensuring  
15 that feelings and opinions are regarded as desirable competencies, rather than as deficiencies  
16 (van Baardewijk et al., 2010). The YPI-S reportedly map onto the interpersonal, affective, and  
17 behavioral domains of psychopathy across several countries such as Belgium (Colins, Noom, &  
18 Vanderplasschen, 2012), Italy (Fossati et al., 2015), Sweden (Colins & Andershed, 2016), and  
19 the United States (Gillen, MacDougall, Forth, Barry, & Salekin, 2017). Additionally, the factors  
20 were invariant across gender (e.g., see Colins et al., 2012; van Baardewijk et al., 2010) and  
21 correlated with variables such as aggression, and delinquency (Fossati et al., 2015; Ray, Pechoro,  
22 & Gonçalves, 2016) and other self-report measures of psychopathy (Gillen et al., 2017). Others  
23 have suggested that the YPI-S has the potential to be used for clinical assessment of psychopathy  
24 beyond research context (Gillen et al., 2017), as well as for conducting longitudinal  
25 investigations to ascertain changes in psychopathic features during the transition from  
26 adolescence into emerging adulthood (Hawes, Mulvey, Schubert, & Pardini, 2014). The  
27 superiority of the YPI-S over other psychopathic-like measures such as the Antisocial Process  
28 Screening Device–Self-Report has been reported (Colins, Bijttebier, Broekaert, & Andershed,  
29 2014a). However, because the psychometric properties of the YPI-S could be altered  
30 substantially when administered in entirely different populations, examining the underlying  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 factor structure will help to determine whether this measure taps into the same construct in  
4  
5  
6 Ghana.

7  
8 Additionally, within a general framework of personality, researchers have argued that  
9  
10 psychopathy can be described as representing an extreme variant of normal personality styles,  
11  
12 rendering the examination of the relationship between the Big-Five personality model and  
13  
14 psychopathy particularly pertinent (Widiger, & Lynam, 1998). A recent study (Hawes et al.,  
15  
16 2014), confirming earlier findings, found in general that psychopathy was related negatively to  
17  
18 agreeableness and conscientiousness and positively to neuroticism. Examination of the domains  
19  
20 of psychopathy, however, revealed that interpersonal psychopathy was related positively to  
21  
22 extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness but negatively to neuroticism and agreeableness.  
23  
24 Affective psychopathy showed positive correlation with neuroticism but negative correlations  
25  
26 with the remaining Big-Five factors, whereas behavioral psychopathy was related negatively to  
27  
28 agreeableness and conscientiousness but positively to neuroticism. Following the  
29  
30 recommendation by Hawes et al. (2014), the present study also examined the psychopathy-Big-  
31  
32 Five relationship to generate more information about their associations. Similarly, because  
33  
34 psychopathy has been robustly linked to or characterized by violations of cultural norms and  
35  
36 societal expectations, it is also important to investigate its convergent relationship with  
37  
38 aggression (Borroni, Somma, Andershed, Maffei, & Fossati, 2014).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 In summary, the study was primarily aimed at investigating the psychometric properties  
47  
48 of the YPI-S in Ghana, as well as the relationship between the YPI-S, aggression, and Big-Five  
49  
50 Finally, to contribute to the literature on gender differences, stratified data analyses by gender  
51  
52 were conducted. By undertaking this study, the authors are interested in addressing Haag et al.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(2016) question posed above regarding the applicability of psychopathy and other criminogenic factors across cultures.

## Methods

### Participants

**Initial sample.** A total of 327 out of 1400 eligible adolescents were recruited from two randomly selected senior high schools in Ghana's capital city, Accra. The male participants numbered 141 (43%), whereas 186 (57%) were females, with an average age of 17 years (range: 12-18 years;  $SD = 2.08$ ). The participants from the two schools do not differ significantly on demographic variables and study measures.

### Measures

The study utilized the YPI-S, the Big Five Inventory (BFI; Johns & Srivastava, 1999), and Reactive-Proactive Aggression Questionnaire (RPAQ; Raine et al., 2006). The YPI-S's 18 items are rated on a 4-point scale (1 = *does not apply at all* to 4 = *applies very well*). The BFI is a widely used 44-item metric of the hierarchical model of personality traits with five broad factors: openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion, and neuroticism. The BFI items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). The RPAQ was developed to measure reactive and proactive aggression. The items are rated on a three-point Likert scale from 0 (*never*) to 2 (*often*) for the frequency of occurrence. See Table 3 for information on the means, standard deviations and internal consistencies of the measures.

### Procedure

Data were gathered using a cross-sectional self-report methodology. The participants were recruited from their respective campuses. The announcement and the invitation to participate in the study were made in the classrooms. The participants were given the opportunity

1  
2  
3 to ask questions, if any, for clarification and possibly to allay any fear and anxiety. Those who  
4 expressed willingness and consented to be part of the study were handed a pack of questionnaires  
5 containing the measures described above which were filled in the classroom and handed over to  
6 a member of the research team. Out of the 350 packs of questionnaires, 327 were returned  
7 representing a response rate of 93%.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 **Cross-validation sample.** This sample comprised 363 out of 1,073 senior high school  
16 adolescents recruited from the two randomly selected senior high schools noted above. The  
17 average age was 17 years (range: 11 to 19 years:  $SD = 1.65$ ), with 41% ( $n = 149$ ) males and 59%  
18 ( $n = 214$ ) females. They were administered the same YPI-S measure. The response rate was 91%.

#### 24 **Data analytic strategy**

25  
26  
27 Missing data analysis showed that 14 (4% cases), 20 (7.5% cases), and 13 (4% cases)  
28 data points for the YPI-S, BFI and aggression questionnaires, respectively, were missing  
29 completely at random (MCAR,  $p > .05$ ). The expectation maximization algorithm was used to  
30 impute the missing data points. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), employing the weighted  
31 least squares (WLS) estimation method with Analysis of Moment (AMOS) version 22 software,  
32 was used to examine the latent structure of the YPI-S. Multigroup CFA was used to test the  
33 invariance of the associations among the observed items across gender to determine possible  
34 differences in the interpretation of the latent factors. A model is invariant provided that the  
35 relationship between the factors and the observed variables are equal across the groups. To  
36 establish a configural measurement invariance, an unconstrained model that allowed the model  
37 parameters to be freely determined for males and females was estimated. This was followed by a  
38 constrained model in which the factor loadings were fixed to be equal across the group. The fit of  
39 the constrained/restricted (i.e., invariant) was compared to the fit of the unconstrained (i.e.,  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 baseline) model using Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$ ), with a non-significant  $\chi^2$  result indicating metric  
4  
5 invariance. In the event where the modification indices (MI) of the constrained model suggest an  
6  
7 improvement in the model by allowing some residuals to freely correlate, a partially constrained  
8  
9 model was estimated. However, only the residuals of items sharing systematic variance and  
10  
11 appearing on the same factor were correlated (Sellbom, 2011).  
12  
13

14  
15 Indicators commonly used to determine model fit in the literature were considered:  
16  
17 Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and a noncentrality-based index- the  
18  
19 Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The  $\chi^2$  test of the model was reported.  
20  
21 However, due to its sensitivity to sample size and distribution of the items, the study also  
22  
23 followed Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, and Müller (2003) recommendation where  $\chi^2/df \leq 2$   
24  
25 indicates goodness of fit was achieved and  $\chi^2/df \leq 3$  suggest an acceptable fit. The Akaike  
26  
27 information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC) were used as comparative  
28  
29 fit indices to determine the superiority of non-nested models.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The groups were compared on the study measures using independent sample t-test. Zero-  
35  
36 order correlation was computed using Pearson product moment correlation, whereas partial  
37  
38 correlation (controlling for the other psychopathy factors) was used to estimate the relationship  
39  
40 between the psychopathy factors and criterion measures. Internal consistency was evaluated  
41  
42 using Cronbach's Alpha and the mean inter-item correlation (MIC). The MIC is considered less  
43  
44 dependent on item size and a straightforward measure of internal consistency, with values in the  
45  
46 range of .15 to .50 considered adequate (Clarck & Watson, 1995).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Results

### Factor Structure

**Initial sample:** As shown in Table 1 containing the CFA results, the YPI-S's 18 items did not provide a good model fit to the data even after several respecifications. The data were subsequently explored and five items were deleted due to low factor loadings. The result following this adjustment showed that the fit indices were within the threshold for acceptable model fit. A multigroup CFA showed that the unconstrained model based on the 13 items provided an acceptable fit to the data. The constrained model also showed acceptable fit indices; however, correlating the residuals of items 8 and 5 based on the MI (12.40) for the male only constrained model revealed good model fit indices. In terms of best model fit, constraining the factor loadings to be equal across the groups did not worsen the model fit,  $\chi^2(13) = 13.64, p = .400$ . The standard estimates of the 13-item YPI-S for each group were significant ( $p < .001$ ), ranging from .32 to .71 for males, and .32 to .72 for females. The YPI-s three factors evinced significant but moderate inter-correlations (all  $ps < .01$ );  $r = .23$  for interpersonal and affective,  $r = .26$  for interpersonal and behavior, and  $r = .27$  for behavioral and affective. The YPI-S total score correlated significantly with the interpersonal domain  $r = .78$ , affective  $r = .69$ , and behavioral  $r = .64$  (all  $ps < .01$ ). Table 2 showed the squared multiple correlations ( $R^2$ ) and standardized factor loadings of the individual items of the three-factor model based on the full sample.

**Cross-validation of the YPI-S:** Consistent with the previous result, the model comprising the YPI-S 18 items did not provide good model fit to the data. However, a 13-item model in which correlation between the residuals of item 2 and 11 were permitted yielded satisfactory fit indices. Measurement invariance testing results revealed that the fit indices for the

1  
2  
3 unconstrained model were good although the TLI did not reach the minimum threshold. A  
4  
5 similar result was obtained for the constrained model. However, respecifying the constrained  
6  
7 model by allowing correlations between the residuals of items 5 and 8 for males produced an  
8  
9 improved model. Comparing the unconstrained to constrained models indicated that constraining  
10  
11 the model,  $\chi^2(13) = 14.32, p = .352$ , and respecifying the constrained model  $\chi^2(11) = 3.08, p$   
12  
13  $= .989$  did not worsen the model fit. The standardized factors loadings ranged from .37 to .66  
14  
15 and .36 and .66 for males and females, respectively. They were significant ( $p < .001$ ) and  
16  
17 acceptable by conventional standards. The internal consistencies ( $\alpha$ ) of the factors were .71  
18  
19 (interpersonal), .59 (affective), and .58 (behavioral), with intercorrelations as followed (all  $ps$   
20  
21  $< .01$ ):  $r = .40$  for interpersonal and affective,  $r = .35$  for interpersonal and behavioral,  $r = .38$  for  
22  
23 affective and behavioral,  $r = .81$  for interpersonal and total score,  $r = .76$  for affective and total  
24  
25 score, and  $r = .71$  for behavioral and total score.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 [INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

33  
34 [INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

### 35 36 37 **Internal Consistency and Gender Difference**

38  
39 The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of the YPI-S for the initial samples and gender  
40  
41 effect on psychopathy are shown in Table 3. The internal consistency of the psychopathy factors  
42  
43 for the total sample ranged from .44 (behavioral) to .77 (interpersonal). The internal  
44  
45 consistencies of the affective (.37 versus .64) and behavioral (.46 versus .42) domains for males  
46  
47 and females, respectively, were poor relative to the interpersonal factor (.77 for males, .78 for  
48  
49 females). Nevertheless, the MIC for the total and female samples were all in the recommended  
50  
51 ranges to be considered adequate (i.e., .16 to .41). The MIC for males, however, ranged from .13  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to .40. With respect to gender difference, males scored significantly high in the YPI-S affective  
4 domain, YPI-S total score, proactive and total aggression than their female counterparts.  
5  
6

### 7 8 **Convergent and Divergent Validity** 9

10 The results of the zero-order and partial correlations between the YPI-S, aggression, and  
11 Big-Five personality are shown in Table 4. First, at the zero-order level, positive and significant  
12 low to moderate correlations (i.e.,  $r = .15$  to  $r = .39$ ) were observed between the YPI-S and  
13 aggression factors (except for the relationship between behavioral psychopathy and aggression in  
14 males which was insignificant). At the partial correlation level, a marginal reduction in the  
15 magnitudes of the correlation coefficients between the YPI-S and aggression factors were  
16 observed. In some instances, the correlation coefficients mostly in the female sample were  
17 statistically insignificant.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 The YPI-S and Big-Five factors were not consistently related at the zero-order level. In  
30 the male sample, for instance, interpersonal psychopathy was related significantly to extraversion  
31 ( $r = .20$ ), conscientiousness ( $r = .16$ ), neuroticism ( $r = -.24$ ), and openness ( $r = .27$ ), whereas in  
32 the female sample, behavioral psychopathy correlated significantly with conscientiousness ( $r = -$   
33  $.32$ ) and neuroticism ( $r = .38$ ). Partial correlation analysis either resulted in improvements in the  
34 previously significant coefficients or rendered insignificant coefficients significant. For example,  
35 in the total sample, the hitherto insignificant relationship between interpersonal psychopathy and  
36 neuroticism ( $r = -.09$ ) became significant ( $r = -.17$ ).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 **[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]**  
49

50 **[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]**  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Discussion

This study contributed to the repertoire of empirical knowledge regarding cross-cultural assessment of psychopathy. This was the first study to elucidate the factor structure of the YPI-S in a sub-Saharan African nation, specifically Ghana. Consistent with previous studies (Colins & Andershed, 2016; Colins et al., 2014a; van Baarderwijk et al., 2010), the study showed that psychopathy in male and female Ghanaian youth can be described using a three-factor model (i.e., interpersonal, affective, and behavioral) that was invariant across gender. The standardized loadings of the YPI-S items on the three-factor model ranged from .33 to .72. According to Cronbach's Alpha, the internal consistencies of the affective and behavioral factors were generally poor (i.e., .37 to .64) for the total sample, as well as in male and female samples. This could be due partly to the small number of items (i.e., 4 items) forming these scales. Indeed, the MIC, which does not penalize shorter scales as it is largely independent of scale length (Colins & Andershed, 2015), revealed acceptable internal consistencies of the YPI-S for the total and female samples. For males, however, only the interpersonal and YPI-S total were considered acceptable according to the MIC while the affective and behavioral were not, thus casting doubt on the stability of these factors. Gender differences were consistent with previous findings demonstrating that males endorsed significantly more psychopathic traits (Hawes et al., 2014). All in all, the result generally suggests that the existence of psychopathy among Ghanaian youth which can be described along interpersonal, affective and behavioral domains. The study, therefore, provides evidence from non-Western context directly addressing Haag et al. (2016) question regarding the cross-cultural applicability of psychopathic behaviors.

Confirming and extending previous studies (Borroni et al., 2014), psychopathy dimensions were correlated with reactive and proactive aggression in both males and females at

1  
2  
3 the zero-order level. Although the correlations were small to moderate, importantly, they were  
4  
5 mainly in line with expectations or previous findings. That is, participants displaying  
6  
7 psychopathic tendencies are more likely to engage in both reactive and proactive aggressive  
8  
9 tendencies; an observation that has bolstered the construct validity of the YPI-S. In addition,  
10  
11 partial correlations indicated that several of the YPI-S factors demonstrated significant  
12  
13 correlations with aggression in the total and male samples. In contrast, the coefficients were not  
14  
15 statistically significant for the interpersonal and affective domains in the female sample. This  
16  
17 female-specific finding partly supports and partly contradict the previous suggestion that the  
18  
19 relationships between interpersonal and affective psychopathic dimensions and criterion  
20  
21 variables depend on other psychopathic factors, in both males and females (e.g., Colins &  
22  
23 Andershed, 2015). Moreover, the significant partial correlations of the behavioral psychopathy in  
24  
25 females partly support and partly contradict previous findings that the behavioral domain of  
26  
27 psychopathy is less dependent on other psychopathic factors (Colins et al., 2014b) and it is  
28  
29 highly correlated with criterion measures than other psychopathic domains (Hawes et al., 2014)  
30  
31 in males and females.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 At the zero-order level, affective psychopathy was not significantly related to the Big-  
40  
41 Five domains, in both males and female. Yet, where significant correlations were observed, their  
42  
43 directions generally confirmed and extended previous studies (Borroni et al., 2014; Hawes et al.,  
44  
45 2014). Specifically, in males and females, interpersonal psychopathy correlated positively with  
46  
47 extraversion and openness, whereas behavioral psychopathy was significantly and positively  
48  
49 related to neuroticism. In the male sample, interpersonal psychopathy was negatively related to  
50  
51 neuroticism. Importantly and interestingly, the partial correlations revealed a marginal increment  
52  
53 in the coefficients that were significant at zero-order level, whereas a few (4) of the insignificant  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 zero-order correlations became significant. For instance, the correlation between affective  
4  
5 psychopathy and openness in the female sample was statistically significant after controlling for  
6  
7 the effects of other psychopathic domains. The above vividly illustrates the concept of  
8  
9 suppressor effects of psychopathic domain(s) on other domain(s) such that removing these  
10  
11 effects increases the amount of residuals available to be correlated with the Big-Five domains.  
12  
13 Within a general framework of personality, the findings supported the hypothesis that  
14  
15 psychopathy can be discussed in relation to general personality traits (Borroni et al., 2014,  
16  
17 Hawes et al., 2014).  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Notwithstanding the above, this study has shown that comparison between the YPI-S in  
23  
24 Ghana and Western nations is limited owing to the alterations made to the scale in this study.  
25  
26 Notably, the three-factor model was obtained following the deletion of five items and free  
27  
28 correlation of two residuals. Modifications based on empirical criteria (e.g., factor loadings) can  
29  
30 be sensitive to sample specific variation, thus questioning the stability of the model. In addition  
31  
32 to the fit indices not meeting the fitness threshold proposed by others (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1999)  
33  
34 although they appear generally acceptable, the behavioral factor loadings were relatively low,  
35  
36 ranging from .33 to .38. Likewise, the internal consistency of the YPI-S was low and only a few  
37  
38 of the Big Five personality and psychopathy domains were correlated. These observations caused  
39  
40 the present study to somewhat deviate from previous studies (see Fassoati et al., 2016; van  
41  
42 Baarderwijk et al., 2010). The exclusion of the YPI-S items raised several questions relating to  
43  
44 whether (1) they constitute cultural appropriate markers of psychopathic tendencies or their  
45  
46 meanings are reflective of indicators of psychopathy in Ghana, (2) their expressions are yet to  
47  
48 reach the threshold to be detected as psychopathic traits, and (3) self-report is the appropriate  
49  
50 method to measure them. In a supposedly collectivist society like Ghana, the endorsement of the  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 item indicating abandoning people to solve their own problems (item 6) certainly undermines the  
4  
5 ethos of the socialization process, but as to whether it reflects psychopathic tendencies is  
6  
7  
8 unknown since behaviors contradicting cultural expectations are not necessarily  
9  
10 psychopathological. Moreover, because one's feelings can affect a broader network of people in  
11  
12 collectivist societies, it seems important that individual-level feelings should be well monitored  
13  
14 and controlled. On the other hand, because of the support system available to those expressing  
15  
16 negative and unhealthy feelings, the motivation to curtail and suppress the feelings may be  
17  
18 minimal. Thus, whether the item (18) indicating the ability to regulate and control one's feelings  
19  
20 than others reflects psychopathic tendencies remains debatable.  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 It also seem that the collectivistic nature of Ghanaian society is under threat from  
26  
27 globalization and the subsequent importation of Western practices. That is, although Ghanaian  
28  
29 cultures are theoretically collectivist, practically, the socialization process tends to lean toward  
30  
31 individualistic tendencies (XXX, under review). While this may contribute to the identification  
32  
33 of the three-factor psychopathy model, it could also account for the limited comparability of this  
34  
35 and previous studies. Children from families experiencing this sort of acculturation may  
36  
37 encounter unique challenges pertaining to which value system to adopt and adhere to as they  
38  
39 vacillate between the principles of collectivism and individualism. Importantly, because this style  
40  
41 of acculturation may not manifest on the same magnitude and scale across the various ethnic  
42  
43 groups and families, it could serve as another source of variation relating to the usefulness of test  
44  
45 items in Ghana. Likewise, inherent in the staggering amount of ethnic diversity, which was noted  
46  
47 previously as a hallmark of the Ghanaian society, is the differences in the usefulness of some of  
48  
49 the supposed indicators of psychopathy. Although the socialization goal may be similar, the  
50  
51 seemingly (subtle) inter-ethnic differences that exist because of the motivation to uphold and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 perpetuate the unique practices, beliefs, and value systems of the various ethnic groups could  
4  
5 introduce inter-ethnic differences in the endorsement of the YPI-S. Although this was not  
6  
7 empirically tested due to data constraint, it influences could not be discounted. Lastly, even  
8  
9 though English is the official language of instruction in Ghanaian schools, as non-native speakers,  
10  
11 there is a possibility that the participants translated the items from English to their native  
12  
13 language for a better comprehension and back to English before registering their responses. This  
14  
15 sort of “self-back-to-back” translation could cause their responses to deviate from those of native  
16  
17 speakers or Western samples.  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 The study should be evaluated given the following limitations. Because the participants  
23  
24 were conveniently sampled from academic settings, there is the possibility that those who did not  
25  
26 participate will respond differently to the YPI-S items. Self-report measures provide no  
27  
28 mechanism to verify the accuracy of participants’ response, thus inaccurate responses are  
29  
30 possibilities. The small to moderate or differential correlations between the YPI-S and the Big-  
31  
32 Five and aggression measures could be due to the fact the latter were not validated in Ghana. The  
33  
34 generalizability of the study findings to adolescents with dissimilar background characteristics  
35  
36 (e.g., those out of school) may be limited. In conclusion, the study partly demonstrated the utility  
37  
38 of the YPI-S in Ghana, thereby contributing to the accumulating literature on the universality and  
39  
40 assessment of psychopathic tendencies. Importantly, it highlights cultural influences on the  
41  
42 assessment of cross-cultural traits and the problem of exporting Western-based findings to non-  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Western context.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Borroni, S., Somma, A., Andershed, H., Maffei, C., & Fossati, A. (2014). Psychopathy dimensions, Big Five traits, and dispositional aggression in adolescence: Issues of gender consistency. *Personality and Individual Differences, 66*, 199-203.
- Clark, L., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*, 309-319.
- Colins, O. F., & Andershed, H. (2016). The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version in a general population sample of emerging adults. *Psychological Assessment, 28*(5), 449-457.
- Colins, O. F., Andershed, H., Frogner, L., Lopez-Romero, L., Veen, V., & Andershed, A. K. (2014b). A new measure to assess psychopathic personality in children: The Child Problematic Traits Inventory. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 36*, 4-21.
- Colins, O. F., Bijttebier, P., Broekaert, E., & Andershed, H. (2014). Psychopathic-like traits among detained female adolescents: Reliability and validity of the Antisocial Process Screening Device and the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory. *Assessment, 21*(2), 195-209.
- Colins, O. F., Noom, M., & Vanderplasschen, W. (2012). Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version: A further test of the internal consistency and criterion validity. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 34*(4), 476-486.
- Fossati, A., Somma, A., Borroni, S., Frera, F., Maffei, C., & Andershed, H. (2016). The factor structure and construct validity of the short version of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory in two independent samples of nonreferred adolescents. *Assessment, 23*(6), 683-697.
- Gillen, C. T., MacDougall, E. A., Forth, A. E., Barry, C. T., & Salekin, R. T. (2017). Validity of the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version in justice-involved and at-risk adolescents. *Assessment*. doi:1073191117700723(published ahead of print).
- Haag, A. M., Boyes, A., Cheng, J., MacNeil, A., & Wirove, R. (2016). An introduction to the issues of cross-cultural assessment inspired by Ewert v. Canada. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management, 3*(2), 65-75.
- Hare, R. D. (1998). The Hare PCL-R: Some issues concerning its use and misuse. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 3*(1), 99-119.
- Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2005). Structural models of psychopathy. *Current Psychiatry Reports, 7*(1), 57-64.

- 1  
2  
3 Hawes, S. W., Mulvey, E. P., Schubert, C. A., & Pardini, D. A. (2014). Structural coherence and  
4 temporal stability of psychopathic personality features during emerging  
5 adulthood. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 123*(3), 623-633.  
6  
7  
8 Hu, L. t., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:  
9 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*  
10 *Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55.  
11  
12 Huntington, S. P. (1996) *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York:  
13 Simon & Schuster.  
14  
15 John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and  
16 theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin, & O. P. John (Eds.). *Handbook of personality:*  
17 *Theory and research* (pp.102-138). New York: Guilford Press.  
18  
19  
20 Neumann, C. S., Schmitt, D. S., Carter, R., Embley, I., & Hare, R. D. (2012). Psychopathic traits  
21 in females and males across the globe. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 30*(5), 557-574.  
22  
23  
24 Müller, J. L. (2010). Psychopathy—an approach to neuroscientific research in forensic  
25 psychiatry. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 28*(2), 129-147.  
26  
27  
28 Pitchford, I. (2001). The origins of violence: Is psychopathy an adaptation. *The Human Nature*  
29 *Review, 1*, 28-36.  
30  
31 Raine, A., Dodge, K., Loeber, R., Gatzke-Kopp, L., Lynam, D., Reynolds, C., . . . Liu, J. (2006).  
32 The Reactive-Proactive Aggression Questionnaire: Differential correlates of reactive and  
33 proactive aggression in adolescent boys. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*(2), 159-171.  
34  
35  
36 Ray, J. V., Pechorro, P., & Gonçalves, R. A. (2016). A Comparison of self-report measures of  
37 callous-unemotional traits among incarcerated youth: associations with aggression,  
38 conduct disorder, and offending behavior. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 43*(10), 1293-  
39 1309.  
40  
41  
42 Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural  
43 equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods*  
44 *of Psychological Research Online, 8*(2), 23-74.  
45  
46  
47 Sellbom, M. (2011). Elaborating on the construct validity of the Levenson Self-Report  
48 Psychopathy Scale in incarcerated and non-incarcerated samples. *Law and Human*  
49 *Behavior, 35*(6), 440-451.  
50  
51  
52 van Baardewijk, Y., Andershed, H., Stegge, H., Nilsson, K. W., Scholte, E., & Vermeiren, R.  
53 (2010). Development and tests of short versions of the youth psychopathic traits  
54 inventory and the youth psychopathic traits inventory-child version. *European Journal of*  
55 *Psychological Assessment, 26*(2), 122-128.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Walters, G. D. (2015). A multi-wave cross-lagged regression analysis of the Youth Psychopathic  
4 Traits Inventory and self-reported offending. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(4), 327-336.  
5

6  
7 Widiger, T. A., & Lynam, D. R. (1998). Psychopathy and the five-factor model of personality. In  
8 T. Millon (Ed.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal, and violent behaviors* (pp. 171–187).  
9 New York: Guilford.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

Table 1

*Confirmatory factor analysis model fit indices for tested models of the Youth Psychopathic Inventory (YPI)*

Model/Fit Indices	$\chi^2$	df	<i>p</i>	$\chi^2/df$	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	AIC	BIC
<b>YPI</b>									
<b>3-Factor (18 items)</b>									
Full sample	326.42	132	.001	2.47	.79	.76	.07	404.42	552.23
Respecified	301.94	130	.001	2.32	.82	.78	.06	-	-
<b>Invariance test</b>									
Unconstrained	466.08	264	.001	1.77	.79	.75	.049	-	-
Constrained	487.62	282	.001	1.73	.78	.77	.047	-	-
Constrained respeci.	440.88	276	.001	1.60	.83	.81	.04	-	-
<b>3-Factor (13 items)</b>									
Full sample	108.67	62	.001	1.75	.90	.92	.05	166.67	276.58
<b>Invariance test</b>									
Unconstrained	172.12	124	.003	1.39	.92	.90	.04	-	-
Constrained	185.76	137	.004	1.36	.92	.91	.03	-	-
Constrained respecified	171.79	135	.017	1.27	.94	.93	.03	-	-
<b>Cross-Validation</b>									
<b>3-Factor (18 items)</b>									
Full sample	293.88	132	.001	2.23	.85	.83	.06	371.88	523.76
<b>3-Factor (13 items)</b>									
Full sample	113.44	61	.001	1.86	.93	.91	.05	173.44	290.28
<b>Invariance test</b>									
Unconstrained	195.83	122	.001	1.61	.90	.87	.04	-	-
Constrained	210.15	135	.001	1.56	.90	.88	.04	-	-
Constrained respecified	198.91	133	.001	1.50	.91	.90	.04	-	-

Table 2

*Standardized Factor Loadings of the Three-factor Model of the Youth Psychopathy Traits Inventory-Short Version in High School Sample (N = 327)*

	ID	AD	BD	R <sup>2</sup>
I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile (4)	.72			.47
When I need to, I use my smile and my charm to use others (14)	.71			.48
It's easy for me to manipulate people (9)	.67			.46
I am good at getting people to believe me when I make something (5)	.54			.39
I have talents that go far beyond other people's (8)	.39			.23
I think that crying is a sign of weakness even if no one sees you (3)		.69		.43
To be nervous and worried is a sign of weakness (10)		.58		.34
To feel guilty and remorseful about things you have done that have hurt other people is a sign of weakness (17)		.44		.18
I don't understand how people can be touched enough to cry by watching things on TV or movie (15)		.33		.10
I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person (2)			.38	.18
It has happened several times that I've borrowed something and then lost it (13)			.38	.21
It often happens that I talk first and think later (7)			.33	.15
I get bored quickly by doing the same thing over and over (11)			.33	.13
I have probably skipped school or work more than most other people (1)*				
When other people have problems, it is often their own fault. therefore one should not help them (6)*				
It often happens that I do things without thinking ahead (12)*				
I am destined to become a well-known, important and influential person (16)*				
I don't let my feelings affect me as much as other people's feelings seem to affect them (18)*				

ID = Interpersonal domain; AD = Affective domain; BD = Behavioral domain; R<sup>2</sup> = Squared multiple correlations

\*items not forming part of the three factor model investigated in this study

Table 3

*Descriptive Data, Internal Consistency and Differences Between Male and Female Sample*

	<u>Total sample (n = 327)</u>				<u>Male (n = 141)</u>				<u>Female (n = 186)</u>				<i>t</i> test
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>MIC</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>MIC</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>MIC</i>	
<b>Psychopathy</b>													
Interpersonal	7.47	3.43	.77	.40	7.56	3.40	.77	.40	7.41	3.47	.78	.41	.40
Affective	4.90	2.72	.56	.24	5.44	2.43	.37	.13	4.48	2.87	.64	.31	3.26**
Behavioral	4.23	2.14	.44	.17	4.39	2.21	.46	.13	4.10	2.08	.42	.16	1.18
Total	16.60	5.92	.71	.16	17.39	5.82	.70	.15	16.00	5.94	.72	.17	2.12*
<b>Aggression</b>													
Reactive	6.93	3.59	.80	.34	7.32	3.83	.82	.22	6.62	3.38	.78	.18	1.77
Proactive	5.06	5.23	.91	.40	5.99	5.48	.91	.27	4.36	4.93	.91	.31	2.83**
Total	11.99	8.24	.92	.47	13.32	8.78	.93	.36	10.98	7.69	.93	.34	2.56*
<b>Big-Five</b>													
Extraversion	24.79	4.90	.79	.29	24.89	4.73	.74	.19	24.71	5.04	.68	.15	.33
Agreeableness	28.70	4.16	.73	.25	28.33	4.09	.71	.16	28.98	4.20	.73	.17	1.42
Conscientiousness	32.93	5.07	.80	.38	32.15	4.88	.68	.15	33.52	5.15	.80	.18	2.43*
Neuroticism	22.36	3.80	.77	.35	22.05	3.65	.87	.20	22.59	3.90	.75	.16	1.27
Openness	35.48	4.54	.69	.20	35.96	4.28	.79	.21	35.12	4.71	.83	.20	1.66

*Note.*  $\alpha$  = Cronbach's Alpha, MIC = Mean inter-item correlation\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ 

Table 4

*Bivariate and Partial Correlations Between Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory-Short Version (YPI-S) Scores and External Criterion*

	Type of correlation	Total sample (n = 327)				Male (n = 141)				Female (n = 186)			
		ID <sup>a</sup>	AD <sup>b</sup>	BD <sup>c</sup>	Total	ID <sup>a</sup>	AD <sup>b</sup>	BD <sup>c</sup>	Total	ID <sup>a</sup>	AD <sup>b</sup>	BD <sup>c</sup>	Total
<b>Aggression</b>													
Reactive	Zero-order	.15**	.21**	.23**	.26**	.13	.20*	.04	.17*	.16*	.19*	.39**	.32**
	Partial	.07	.14*	.16**	—	.07	.17*	-.03	—	.03	.11	.34***	—
Proactive	Zero-order	.20**	.18**	.11	.24**	.25**	.19*	.09	.19*	.16*	.15*	.26**	.26**
	Partial	.16**	.13*	.03	—	.21*	.15	-.17*	—	.08	.08	.21**	—
Total	Zero-order	.19**	.21**	.17**	.27**	.21*	.20*	.04	.19*	.18*	.18*	.34**	.31**
	Partial	.13*	.15**	.09	—	.16*	.17*	-.12	—	.06	.10	.28***	—
<b>Big-Five</b>													
Extraversion	Zero-order	.21**	-.01	-.09	.11*	.20*	.09	.05	.17*	.23*	-.07	-.09	.07
	Partial	.23***	-.04	-.08	—	.18*	.02	.01	—	.27***	-.07	-.16*	—
Agreeableness	Zero-order	.05	-.13*	-.03	-.04	.12	-.10	.01	.03	.03	-.13	.04	-.08
	Partial	.08	-.14*	-.01	—	.16	-.15	.02	—	.03	-.13	-.01	—
Conscientiousness	Zero-order	.06	-.08	-.24**	-.09	.16*	-.02	-.13	.03	-.01	.08	-.32**	-.15*
	Partial	.13*	-.04	-.25***	—	.18*	-.03	-.15	—	.11	-.02	-.32***	—
Neuroticism	Zero-order	-.09	.02	.29**	.05	-.24**	.11	.17*	-.03	.02	-.04	.38**	.13
	Partial	-.17**	-.05	.32***	—	-.31***	-.16	.17*	—	-.12	-.14	.42***	—
Openness	Zero-order	.21**	-.08	-.01	.08	.27**	-.05	.01	.14	.18*	-.13	-.03	.03
	Partial	.24**	-.13*	-.04	—	.30***	-.16	.01	—	.21**	-.15*	-.07	—

Note. ID = Interpersonal dimension, AD = Affective dimension, BD = Behavioral dimension

The partial correlations control for AD and BD. The partial correlations control for ID and BD. The partial correlations control for ID and AD

\*p< .05, \*\*p< .01, \*\*\*p< .001



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only