Running Head: Psychopathy and persuasion

Psychopathy and ratings of persuasiveness: Examining their relations in weaker and stronger contexts

Brandon Weiss

University of Georgia

Donald R. Lynam

Purdue University

Joshua D. Miller

University of Georgia

Correspondence to Brandon Weiss or Josh Miller, 125 Baldwin Street, Department of Psychology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602. Emails: bw64357@uga.edu or jdmiller@uga.edu.

Supplemental Materials

For supplemental analyses, we first conducted bivariate correlations between trait predictors, Gender, IQ, Attractiveness, and correlations between persuasiveness and trust across conditions (Table 1). Male gender was generally positively correlated with self-report psychopathy scores, while IQ generally manifested null to small negative correlations with psychopathy scores. Objective ratings of attractiveness manifested null to small positive correlations with psychopathy scores. The psychopathy scores manifested a wide range of correlations with one another ranging from -.28 (EPA Disinhibition - EPA Emotional Stability) to .81 (TriPM meanness – EPA antagonism). Finally, as expected, robust but varied correlations were found between the psychopathy scores and the Big Five personality domains.

Second, we conducted bivariate correlations between persuasiveness and trust criteria across conditions (Table 1). Ratings of persuasiveness and trust evinced correlations with one another ranging from .27 (Improvised Trust – Scripted Trust) to .70 (Scripted Persuasiveness – Scripted Trust). In general, there was some evidence of cross video stability in these ratings, particularly for persuasiveness (r = .45).

Third, we applied semi-partial correlation to examine unique relations between psychopathic traits and outcomes, controlling for other person-level variables whose variance may be overlapping with our trait predictors (e.g., Gender, IQ, Attractiveness, Video Length) (Table 2) Results exhibited the same general pattern of relations compared to when covariates were not included. However, there was one exception: In the improvised condition, semi-partial correlations between TriPM Boldness, EPA Narcissism, and BFI Extraversion, separately, and persuasiveness, controlling for Attractiveness, were nonsignificant. These findings suggest that Attractiveness overlaps sufficiently with TriPM Boldness, EPA Narcissism, and BFI

Extraversion, such that these trait predictors were no longer associated with persuasiveness.

Fourth, we conducted correlation analyses in which counts of pros, cons, and additional pros were separately regressed onto trait predictors. Counts of pros, cons, and additional pros were separately regressed onto each psychopathic and FFM traits, gender, IQ, attractiveness, persuasiveness, and trust (Table 3).

Measurement of Pros, Cons, and Additional Pros. Videos in the improvised condition were coded for the number of pros and cons included in pitches (see Appendix A for full list). In addition, videos were coded for the number of additional pros that participants included, i.e., pros that were not specified in the list of allowable pros. On average, participants presented 5.01 pros (*SD* = 1.92), 2.06 cons (*SD* = .94), and .45 additional pros (*SD* = .82).

Results - Pros and Cons. With respect to pros and cons, no psychopathic nor FFM traits showed a significant linear effect when predicting counts of presented pros or cons. Among the other predictors, only IQ evinced a significant association with count of the number of positive features mentioned.

Results - Additional Pros. No psychopathic or FFM traits showed a significant effect when predicting a count of additional pros. However, persuasiveness and additional pros were significantly associated.

Fifth, a set of moderation analyses were conducted in which persuasiveness, trust, and counts of pros, cons, and additional pros were separately regressed onto two psychopathic trait predictors and their product terms (Table 4). Results revealed one significant interaction effect occurring in the *improvised* video condition (i.e., TriPM Boldness x TriPM Meanness in the prediction of additional pros). TriPM Boldness was unrelated at low levels of TriPM Meanness (*b* = -.11, *ns*), but positively related at high levels (*b* = .21).

Sixth, in view of suboptimal inter-rater reliabilities for our ratings of persuasiveness and trust, we disattenuated our bivariate associations between traits and persuasiveness and trust for unreliability (i.e., we conducted correlations between traits and outcomes as if each variable possessed perfect reliability), while acknowledging that that these associations overestimate the magnitude of true statistical effects (Table 5). Results showed stronger magnitudes of associations between traits and persuasiveness and trust, but the same pattern. Original bivariate associations can be found in Table 2 from the main text for comparison.

Supplemental Table 1

Results of Bivariate Correlations among Predictors and Criteria

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Gender	-													
IQ	-.07	-												
Attractiveness	-.02	-.01	-											
TriPM Bold	.08	-.05	.14	-										
TriPM Disinhibition	.17*	-.16*	.01	-.23*	-									
TriPM Mean	.32*	-.15*	.14	.10	.49*	-								
EPA Antagonism	.19*	-.12	.16*	.02	.50*	.81*	-							
EPA Disinhibition	.15*	-.09	.10	-.09	.78*	.53*	.52*	-						
EPA EmoStability	.19*	-.05	.03	.74*	-.34*	.14	.00	-.28*	-					
EPA Narcissism	.12	-.14	.10	.56*	.24*	.43*	.36*	.35*	.32*	-				
BFI N	.19*	.09	.03	-.70*	.32*	-.06	.07	.34*	-.91*	-.26*	-			
BFI E	-.07	-.07	.09	.62*	-.08	-.07	-.19*	-.03	.38*	.57*	-.42*	-		
BFI O	-.09	.08	-.01	.39*	-.22*	-.33*	-.31*	-.17*	.14	.07	-.19*	.29*	-	
BFI A	-.13	.04	-.09	.17*	-.38*	-.64*	-.71*	-.48*	.22*	-.27*	-.32*	.27*	.33*	-
BFI C	-.07	.00	-.04	.37*	-.62*	-.27*	-.25*	-.70*	.46*	.00	-.50*	.25*	.19*	.34*

	1	2	3
Improvised Persuasive	-		
Improvised Trust	.60*	-	
Scripted Persuasive	.45*	.28*	-
Scripted Trust	.39*	.27*	.70*

Note. * $p < .01$.

Supplemental Table 2

Results of Semi-partial Correlation Analysis

	Improvised Video Condition						Scripted Video Condition							
	Persuasive			Trust			Persuasive				Trust			
	G	IQ	A	G	IQ	A	G	IQ	A	VL	G	IQ	A	VL
TriPM Bold	.17*	.18*	.15	.12	.12	.09	.08	.08	.06	.08	-.03	-.04	-.06	-.04
TriPM Disinhibition	-.06	-.04	-.06	-.07	-.08	-.09	-.19*	-.19*	-.22*	-.23*	-.12	-.14	-.16*	-.16*
TriPM Mean	-.07	-.04	-.09	.02	-.01	-.04	-.21*	-.23*	-.27*	-.26*	-.16*	-.20*	-.24*	-.22*
EPA Antagonism	-.06	-.04	-.08	-.02	-.04	-.07	-.18*	-.18*	-.23*	-.21*	-.16*	-.17*	-.21*	-.19*
EPA Disinhibition	-.01	.00	-.02	-.02	-.03	-.05	-.18*	-.18*	-.21*	-.20*	-.17*	-.18*	-.21*	-.20*
EPA EmoStability	.04	.05	.03	.04	.02	.01	-.05	-.07	-.09	-.07	-.09	-.12	-.13	-.11
EPA Narcissism	.14	.16*	.12	.08	.08	.05	-.03	-.03	-.06	-.04	-.05	-.05	-.08	-.06
BFI N	-.02	-.04	-.02	-.01	.01	.02	.07	.08	.10	.08	.10	.12	.13	-.12
BFI E	.16*	.17*	.14	.06	.08	.06	.10	.13	.10	.11	.05	.08	.05	.06
BFI O	.07	.06	.07	-.03	-.02	-.01	.10	.10	.12	.10	.04	.05	.06	.05
BFI A	-.02	-.03	-.01	-.05	-.03	-.02	.07	.08	.10	.11	.01	.03	.05	.05
BFI C	.00	.01	.01	.05	.06	.06	.10	.11	.11	.12	.05	.07	.07	.08

Note. G = Gender; IQ = ICAR score; A = Attractiveness; VL = Video Length; Bold = Boldness; Mean = Meanness; EmoStability = Emotional Stability; N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness;* $p < .01$.

Supplemental Table 3

Results of Bivariate Correlation Analyses for Trait Predictors and Sum of Presented Pros, Cons, and Additional Pros

Predictor	Pros Sum	Cons Sum	Additional Pros
Gender	-.03	-.04	.10
IQ	.18*	.00	.00
Attractiveness	.05	-.05	.00
Persuasive	.01	.12	.18*
Trust	.05	-.02	.10
TriPM Bold	.01	.01	.10
TriPM Disinhibition	-.08	-.04	.10
TriPM Mean	.01	-.04	.10
EPA Antagonism	-.01	-.01	.10
EPA Disinhibition	-.03	-.02	.10
EPA EmoStability	-.03	.04	.10
EPA Narcissism	-.04	-.03	.10
BFI N	.06	-.09	.00
BFI E	-.05	-.03	.10
BFI O	.10	-.02	.00
BFI A	-.06	.04	.00
BFI C	-.01	.01	.00

Note. * $p < .01$.

Supplemental Table 4

Results of Two-way Interactions between Trait Predictors in Predicting Criteria

	Improvised Condition					Scripted Condition	
	Persuasive	Trust	Pros Sum	Cons Sum	Additional Pros	Persuasive	Trust
TriPM							
Bold x Mean	.08	.09	.10	0.06	-.16*	.03	.03
Bold x Disinhibition	-.01	.07	-.00	0.04	-.07	.09	.06
Mean x Disinhibition	-.15	-.05	-.08	0.06	.03	-.08	-.06
EPA							
Antagonism x Narcissism	-.01	.00	.09	0.13	-.06	-.02	-.01
Disinhibition x Narcissism	-.01	.04	.02	0.08	.06	-.03	-.02
Emo Stability x Narcissism	.06	.01	-.02	0.06	-.03	.10	-.01
Antagonism x Disinhibition	-.11	-.02	-.05	0.13	.05	-.08	-.06
Antagonism x Emo Stability	.12	.08	.07	0.08	-.14	.02	.02
Disinhibition x Emo Stability	-.04	-.02	-.12	0.03	-.03	.01	-.04

Note. * $p < .01$.

Table 5
Bivariate relations between traits and persuasiveness and trust disattenuated for unreliability

	Improvised Condition		Scripted Condition	
	Persuasive	Trust	Persuasive	Trust
Gender	.00	-.15	-.22	-.23
IQ	.28	.14	.38	.21
Attractiveness	.27	.16	.14	.17
Video Length	.15	.08	-.20	-.18
Triarchic Psychopathy Measure				
TriPM Bold	.24	.13	.09	-.05
TriPM Disinhibition	-.08	-.10	-.30	-.18
TriPM Mean	-.09	-.03	-.35	-.26
Elemental Psychopathy Assessment				
EPA Antagonism	-.08	-.05	-.28	-.22
EPA Disinhibition	-.01	-.04	-.26	-.22
EPA EmoStability	.06	.02	-.11	-.14
EPA Narcissism	.21	.08	-.08	-.09
Big Five Inventory				
BFI N	-.03	.02	.14	.16
BFI E	.22	.08	.15	.08
BFI O	.10	-.02	.16	.07
BFI A	-.04	-.03	.13	.04
BFI C	.00	.07	.15	.08

Note. G = Gender; IQ = ICAR score; A = Attractiveness; VL = Video Length; Bold = Boldness; Mean = Meanness; EmoStability = Emotional Stability; N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Appendix A

PROS

Camera:
- Good low light performance
- Focusing speed is faster even in low light

Display:
- Large 5.5 inch display (comparable with competitors)
- Resolution is superior to competitors (approximately 77% more pixels)

Feel / Construction:
- Metal and glass construction
- Narrower and shorter than competitors in shape making it more comfortable to hold
- Water and dust resistant

Functionality:
- Fingerprint sensor

CONS

Camera:
- Less overall camera resolution than competitors

Feel:
- Weight is heavier than chief competitor

Functionality:
- Battery life does not last through the day, resulting in some cutting back on heavy usage

Safety:
- There is a .01% chance of the device exploding based on 1 in 1000 devices exploding.
- Some small number of users have reported losing their stored data.

Appeal:
- Some major cellular carriers (e.g., AT&T) do not carry this device.

Appendix B

"If you're like me, you take a lot of pictures on your phone. Most of the time, while the setting might change, they all end up looking very much the same. Instagram has some nice filters you can use to clean them up or give them a specific look that you'd want. But I wanted to share this really amazing app with you, called Optix that makes every one of your pictures look like a work of art. The interface is very user friendly and clear, and navigating the app is simple. When you take a picture, much like Instagram, you'll find multiple filters to choose from but with a wider and more artistic variety than Instagram. Each Optix filter is unique and many of the filters are patterned off of environmental landscapes, the work of famous artists, and styles from classic analog films. That's not all. The app allows you to graft objects within your photo onto other backgrounds with ease. Photoediting tools for enhancing clarity, modifying exposure level, sharpening color, reducing noise, and watermarking are also at your fingertips. Once the filter loads onto your photo, you'll find that it will look like an artist came into your home and painted the setting of the photo. The app makes the photo look more unique and interesting than anything Instagram's filters can do, because it truly changes how they look. And it's 100% free to download – try it today, you won't be disappointed!"