

October 2017

The Association between DSM-5 Personality Pathology Traits and Violence

Marissa Jennings

Southern Methodist University, Marissa.jennings@du.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.smu.edu/jour>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jennings, Marissa (2017) "The Association between DSM-5 Personality Pathology Traits and Violence," SMU Journal of Undergraduate Research: Vol. 3, Article 6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25172/jour.3.1.6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SMU Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in SMU Journal of Undergraduate Research by an authorized administrator of SMU Scholar. For more information, please visit <http://digitalrepository.smu.edu>.

The Association Between DSM-5 Personality Pathology Traits and Domestic Violence

Marissa Jennings*

mjennings@smu.edu

ABSTRACT

The DSM-5 includes a dimensional model of personality pathology, which includes pathological personality traits. This model is a response to the many criticisms and problems documented with the traditional categorical model of personality disorders. To date, numerous studies have demonstrated that the trait model is more valid and reliable than the traditional categorical model (Krueger and Markon 2013). This study expands research on the trait model by assessing the association between the DSM-5 personality pathology trait model and propensity for, or attitudes about, domestic violence. This study identified personality pathology traits; values and beliefs about violence; and attitudes about violence in participants and how these variables correlate with one another. The researchers utilized the DSM-5 personality trait model in a way that might help identify criminogenic risk in the future. The results of this study yielded a statistically significant relationship between antagonism and attitudes, values, and beliefs about violence. It is necessary to conduct further research to identify additional markers and additional criminogenic risk factors related to a person's condition (e.g. personality, environment, and intelligence). Furthermore, due to the limitations of this study, gender and demographic differences (relationship status, criminal history, etc) must be evaluated.

1. INTRODUCTION

Colorado, along with California, is a pioneer of domestic violence treatment. Prior to revisions, Colorado did not emphasize rehabilitative treatment for domestic violence offenders. After the revisions, laws regarding domestic violence emphasize a rehabilitative based plan, allowing offenders with misdemeanors and some felonies to be enrolled in treatment programs. As of 2006, Colorado's Domestic Violence Offender Management Board (DVOMB) polled DV providers from September 2004 through April 2006 to identify the effectiveness of the programs (Henry 2006). This research revealed positive steps towards rehabilitation with 71% of offenders without prior charges successfully discharged and 61% of offenders with previous charges discharged (Henry 2006). The evolution of this program has yet to be analyzed, but with an additional 12 years of clinician and legal development, procedural changes, and curriculum development, the results of treatment programs may be more profound.

Some facilities utilize cognitive behavioral therapy and motivational interviewing techniques, while others employ dialectical behavior therapy and gestalt therapy techniques; regardless of the methods used by counselors and psychotherapists, the goal is the same: providing offenders with treatment to reduce or neutralize violence in the home or future relationships. Treatment may be based on domestic violence group therapy, substance abuse treatment, cognitive restructuring, or anger management classes. The services provided are intended to take an offender's existing schema and reshape it to reflect prosocial thinking, control over one's impulses, and knowledge of what healthy relationships look like. For the purpose of this paper, domestic violence encompasses both intimate partner violence (IPV) and family violence. Domestic violence is categorized by physical, verbal, sexual, or psychological abuse, in which the perpetrator exercises power and control behaviors over their victim. This paper is interested in those who display personality traits that are compounded by risk factors for violence, such as substance abuse, one's belief in physical punishment, as well as power and control behaviors in relationships and how these variables may impact the development of future risk assessment and recidivism protocols.

The study of personality disorders and domestic violence has been a focal point of research in the field of forensic psychology. The impetus for increased attention to this area is due to an increased interest in capturing risk factors for domestic violence. For example, Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD) was included in the DSM-III to capture those who fail to conform socially, as well as those with traits related to psychopathy. A group of researchers, Bovasso et. al (2002), found that there was a correlation between participants who scored low on empathy and high on antisocial personality with their likelihoods of committing violent crimes. Since the DSM-III, the definitions of psychopathy and APD have evolved which necessitates that we adapt our approach to identifying, assessing, and treating domestic violence offenses. In 2010, Esbec and Echeburúa wrote, "from the dimensional point of view, those personality traits having the greatest tendency towards violence are impulsiveness, deficient affective regulation, narcissism, and paranoidism." This perspective on personality traits and personality pathology is important to this research because our concept of personality, more specifically personality disorders, is becoming more fluid. Similarly, the DSM-5 was edited to

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

reflect a dimensional personality pathology trait model. Without this dimensional model, it is possible that if certain rigid criteria of a categorical are not met, potential offenders and reoffenders, may go unnoticed. Categorical personality disorders are currently a point of contention within psychology for several reasons, including the difficulty clinicians face in separating normal personality pathology from that of a personality disorder. The DSM-5 endeavored to make it more difficult for diagnoses to occur with the provision of the General Personality Disorder diagnosis, which sets general criteria for individuals to meet prior to being diagnosed with a specific disorder from Clusters A - C. This paper's study of the DSM-5 trait model in association with domestic violence is related to this reconceptualization of personality disorders in that "the DSM-5 trait model is useful because it can account for the variance in DSM-IV [personality disorders] and associated constructs (e.g., psychopathy) while also structuring that variance in a more empirically based fashion" (Krueger 2013). Research in the forensic specialty of psychology is increasingly geared towards recidivism and tools for predicting violence, thus the DSM-5's reconceptualization of existing models may be key to better understanding the psychology of potential and repeat domestic violence offenders.

The focus of this study is an assessment of the association between personality traits and propensity for violence. While treatment may prove to be an effective end to the cycle of violence for some individuals, it is critical to begin the search for a way to predict domestic violence in chronic offenders or aid in recidivism assessments. It is largely accepted that those who score high on psychopathy items are resistant to a treatment-based program. These individuals incorporate what they learn in group therapy settings into their repertoire of skills to perpetuate their violence. It is imperative to find a way to identify and implement tools that can better treat these clients. While it is important to note that not all offenders exhibit psychopathic or antisocial traits, these are the traits that have captured the attention of researchers studying domestic violence. This paper addresses key traits thought to be associated with domestic violence, but also to identify other traits that might also require individualized treatment.

The paper examines links between the personality pathology trait model and violence – violence in this case includes attitudes, values, and beliefs about violence (propensity for violence). We predict that the Personality Inventory for the DSM-5 (PID-5) will yield strong associations between violence and the domain of antagonism. However, we are also interested to know if this research will yield additional personality traits related to violence. Does the DSM-5 trait model provide a wide enough scope to identify core traits that relate strongly to violence or belief systems surrounding violence?

2. METHODS

PARTICIPANTS

The participants were recruited via Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), ages eighteen to sixty-five years, all from within the United States. In total, 562 participants were recruited for the study. Participants were

selected based on MTurk's ratings of users; ratings are determined based on participants' reliability in completing past studies

PROCEDURE

Participants selected the study on Amazon's Mechanical Turk and, if they met the requirements, completed the included measures. Measures included a violence screener, the Personality Inventory for the DSM-5, the Attitudes, Values and Beliefs Scale, and the Revised Attitudes Towards Violence Scale. Upon completion of the study, the participants recorded their unique identifiers and were paid for their participation. The researchers then exported and reviewed the data in SPSS.

MEASURES

PID-5: Personality Inventory for the DSM-5 (APA 2013). The PID-5 assesses five broad personality pathology trait domains: antagonism, psychoticism, detachment, disinhibition, and negative affect. Antagonism measures manipulateness, deceitfulness, and grandiosity; psychoticism measures unusual beliefs and experiences, eccentricity, and perceptual dysregulation; detachment measures withdrawal, anhedonia, and intimacy avoidance; disinhibition measures irresponsibility, impulsivity, and distractibility; and negative affect measures emotional lability, anxiousness, and separation insecurity (Krueger et al. 2013). It is important to note that not all the traits identified in the PID-5 are included in the domains, meaning there are individual traits that were excluded from this study. The use of the PID-5 measure is key to evaluating the DSM-5 trait model. Since the beginning of this study, there have been new releases regarding the reliability and validity of the PID-5 tool, which Fossati et al. dubbed as reliable in 2013. This was due to the tool's ability to predict psychopathy measures and account for variance in the PDQ-4+ (Fossati 2013).

Participants completed the Revised Attitudes Towards Violence Scale (Anderson et al. 2006), which measures attitudes regarding war, corporal punishment, and intimate partner violence. The RATVS intimate partner scale was the subscale of most interest to this study. This subscale assesses attitudes about control in romantic relationships, punishment for partners, and tactics used to settle domestic disputes. The reliability of the original assessment was evaluated by Funk, Elliot, Geysa, and Mock in 1999 – the researchers concluded that the assessment has good internal reliability, hence the use of the revised version of this tool.

Similarly, the Attitudes, Values, and Beliefs Scale (McLaren 2010), developed in New Zealand, assesses one's attitudes about a myriad of topics related to three subgroups: partners, children, and the elderly. Such topics are as follows: gender roles in romantic relationships, a child's obedience, the punishment of partners, children, and the elderly; and, also includes defenses for certain aggressive or violent behaviors towards any one of the three groups. The AVB was included because of its incorporation in New Zealand's national study on family violence. Because the RATVS and the AVB primarily evaluate attitudes and values, they do not account for perpetrated violence. For example, a question

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

in the AVB asks if one thinks it is acceptable to hit their child for messing the bed, but not if they have abused their child for this reason. This study is not so much concerned with perpetrated violence as much as it is interested in core beliefs about violence. Furthermore, there are numerous risk factors that may lead to one's abuse of their child or spouse, but it is not the purpose of this study to capture those who have engaged in abuse, but rather to assess those who may condone the abuse of one's partner or family. For example, drug abuse, animal abuse, and exposure to abuse in the family during childhood are all risk factors but do not always result in perpetrated violence in relationships or family environments. The AVB and RATVS were chosen as tools to assess beliefs and values, as one's belief-system provides insight into one's potential to engage in domestic violence

ANALYSIS

The correlations and regressions were calculated based on a p-value of $p=0.01$. The PID-5 domains exclude traits of callousness, attention seeking, depressivity, hostility, perseveration, rigid perfectionism, submissiveness, and suspiciousness. The first set of correlations was obtained from the AVB intimate partner violence scale (including attitudes, values, beliefs, and excuses), the RATVS (corporal punishment of children and intimate partner violence subscales), and the five domains of the PID-5. Table A1 displays the relationships between the subscales and domains selected above. The AVB and RATVS correlated moderately at 0.471 and was significant at the $p=0.01$ level. The PID-5 is positively correlated moderately only with the antagonism domain at 0.388 and 0.428, respectively. The remaining domains of the PID-5 are weakly correlated with the AVB and RATVS subscales. The antagonism domain was significant at $p=0.01$ when correlated with both the AVB and RATVS.

The second set of correlations was obtained from the AVB subscales pertaining to parent-child relationships (attitudes, values, beliefs, and excuses). The RATVS correlation is drawn from the total score (war, intimate partner violence, prisoners, and corporal punishment). The PID-5 domains are the same. The antagonism domain is both positively and moderately correlated with the RATVS at 0.425 but was weakly correlated with the AVB at 0.170. The antagonism domain is significant at the 0.01 level with both measures. Table A2 displays the correlations and significance between each variable.

It is important to note that the PID-5 domains are moderately to strongly correlated with other domains of the assessment. For example, psychoticism and negative affect are strongly correlated at .575. It is possible that associations between measures is accounted for by the association between some domains. However, as the antagonism domain is the only domain with a moderate correlation with the other measures, a demographic data breakdown would be beneficial to further identify the variance.

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

Table A1: AVB, RATVS, and PID-5 correlations

		Correlations						
		AVB	RATVS	Negative Affect	Detachment	Antagonism	Disinhibition	Psychoticism
AVB	Pearson Correlation	1	.417**	.166**	.207**	.388**	.152*	.273**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.008	.000	.033	.000
	N	521	512	487	161	300	197	378
RATVS	Pearson Correlation	.417**	1	.152**	-.045	.428**	.094	.249**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.001	.578	.000	.190	.000
	N	512	512	478	156	297	195	373
Negative Affect	Pearson Correlation	.166**	.152**	1	.338**	.284**	.431**	.575**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	487	478	494	156	288	195	357
Detachment	Pearson Correlation	.207**	-.045	.338**	1	.209*	.420**	.487**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.578	.000		.026	.000	.000
	N	161	156	156	164	114	75	103
Antagonism	Pearson Correlation	.388**	.428**	.284**	.209*	1	.393**	.422**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.026		.000	.000
	N	300	297	288	114	303	155	214
Disinhibition	Pearson Correlation	.152*	.094	.431**	.420**	.393**	1	.396**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	.190	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	197	195	195	75	155	201	132
Psychoticism	Pearson Correlation	.273**	.249**	.575**	.487**	.422**	.396**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	378	373	357	103	214	132	381

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

Table A2: AVB (parent-child), RATVS (total), and PID-5

		Correlations						
		Negative Affect	Detachment	Antagonism	Disinhibition	Psychoticism	AVB	RATVS
Negative Affect	Pearson Correlation	1	.338**	.284**	.431**	.575**	.110*	.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.015	.115
	N	494	156	288	195	357	487	478
Detachment	Pearson Correlation	.338**	1	.209*	.420**	.487**	.118	-.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.026	.000	.000	.137	.742
	N	156	164	114	75	103	161	156
Antagonism	Pearson Correlation	.284**	.209*	1	.393**	.422**	.170**	.425**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.026		.000	.000	.003	.000
	N	288	114	303	155	214	300	297
Disinhibition	Pearson Correlation	.431**	.420**	.393**	1	.396**	.115	.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.107	.353
	N	195	75	155	201	132	197	195
Psychoticism	Pearson Correlation	.575**	.487**	.422**	.396**	1	.216**	.120*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.020
	N	357	103	214	132	381	378	373
AVB	Pearson Correlation	.110*	.118	.170**	.115	.216**	1	.257**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.137	.003	.107	.000		.000
	N	487	161	300	197	378	521	512
RATVS	Pearson Correlation	.072	-.027	.425**	.067	.120*	.257**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.115	.742	.000	.353	.020	.000	
	N	478	156	297	195	373	512	512

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

REGRESSIONS

By examining the results of regressions, the relationship between the measures is increasingly clear. However, these statistics are not wholly indicative of the relationship between measures because of the lack of demographic data. Without the demographic data it difficult determine the source of variance. For this reason, it is necessary to replicate this study with the addition of demographics. Data sets B1- B5 note the dependent variables (personality domain) in relation to the independent variables (beliefs and attitudes measures). The data sets display the regression summary as well as the coefficient summary.

In Reference to Data Set B1

The domain of antagonism does not have significance with the independent variables regarding child

abuse. As evidenced by $r = .496$, there is a moderate correlation between personality domain and overall beliefs and values. The regressions relating antagonism to IPV in both measures is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. The beta coefficient indicates Type II error to be between 3.7% and 27.4%.

In Reference to Data Set B2

The domain of negative affect does have significance with the independent variables at the 0.01 level. However, independently, only the intimate partner scales are significant at the 0.05 level, not the 0.01 level. As evidenced by $r = .205$, there is a weak correlation between personality domain and overall beliefs and values. The regressions relating negative affect to IPV in both measures is statistically significant at the 0.05 level, but not

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

the 0.01 level. The beta coefficient indicates Type II error to be between 2% and 12.1%.

In Reference to Data Set B3

The domain of detachment does not have significance with the independent variables. As evidenced by $r = .240$, there is a weak correlation between personality domain and overall beliefs and values. The beta coefficient indicates Type II error to be between 8% and 26.5%.

In Reference to Data Set B4

The domain of disinhibition does not have significance with the independent variables at the 0.01 level. As evidenced by $r=2.17$, there is a weak correlation between personality domain and overall beliefs and values.

In Reference to Data Set B5

This regression indicates the domain of psychoticism does have significance at the $p=0.01$ level. As evidenced by $r=.356$, there is a moderate correlation between personality

domain and overall beliefs and values. The regressions relating psychoticism to IPV in both measures is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Overall, the regressions indicate a moderate correlation between the domains of antagonism and psychoticism only. The range of variance and type II error is large, but this cannot be better evaluated without accounting for demographics, which are not present in the data set. Given the results gleaned from the correlations and regressions, antagonism and psychoticism are the most strongly correlated domains. Further research must be conducted to better understand psychoticism's role in shaping attitudes, values, and beliefs about violence. Future research questions pertain to the significance of traits related to violence and if there are environmental factor that mitigate any trait-related predisposition to violence.

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

Data Set B1: Regression of Antagonism and RATVS and AVB subscales

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	.496 ^a	.246	.236	9.04094	.246	23.832	4	292	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, CorporalPunishment, AVBchild, IntimateViolence

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7791.903	4	1947.976	23.832	.000 ^b
	Residual	23867.680	292	81.739		
	Total	31659.582	296			

a. Dependent Variable: Antagonism

b. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, CorporalPunishment, AVBchild, IntimateViolence

a. Dependent Variable: Antagonism

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	-.836	8.185		-.102	.919	-16.946	15.274
	Intimate Violence	.460	.104	.274	4.424	.000	.255	.664
	Corporal Punishment	.149	.093	.099	1.609	.109	-.033	.332
	AVBchild	-.077	.128	-.037	-.604	.547	-.329	.175
	AVBipv	.419	.102	.268	4.125	.000	.219	.619

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

Data set B2: Negative Affect and RATVS and AVB subscales

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	.205 ^a	.042	.034	13.27108	.042	5.183	4	473	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, IntimateViolence, CorporalPunishment, AVBchild

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3651.217	4	912.804	5.183	.000 ^b
	Residual	83305.553	473	176.122		
	Total	86956.770	477			

a. Dependent Variable: NegativeAffect

b. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, IntimateViolence, CorporalPunishment, AVBchild

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		95.0% Confidence Interval for B		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		1	(Constant)	13.872	10.673		1.300	.194
	Intimate Violence	.327	.139	.121	2.358	.019	.054	.600
	Corporal Punishment	.004	.106	.002	.033	.973	-.206	.213
	AVBchild	.150	.156	.052	.959	.338	-.157	.456
	AVBipv	.242	.130	.104	1.865	.063	-.013	.498

a. Dependent Variable: NegativeAffect

Data Set B3: Detachment and RATVS and AVB subscales

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	.240 ^a	.057	.033	10.59536	.057	2.303	4	151	.061

a. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, IntimateViolence, CorporalPunishment, AVBchild

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1034.059	4	258.515	2.303	.061 ^b
	Residual	16951.499	151	112.262		
	Total	17985.558	155			

a. Dependent Variable: Detachment

b. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, IntimateViolence, CorporalPunishment, AVBchild

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	24.326	11.000		2.211	.029	2.592	46.059
	Intimate Violence	-.149	.172	-.080	-.864	.389	-.489	.192
	Corporal Punishment	-.103	.146	-.066	-.704	.483	-.392	.186
	AVBchild	-.049	.189	-.027	-.260	.795	-.423	.324
	AVBipv	.387	.155	.265	2.492	.014	.080	.694

a. Dependent Variable: Detachment

Data Set B4: Disinhibition and the RATVS and AVB subscales

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	.217 ^a	.047	.027	9.09934	.047	2.338	4	190	.057

a. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, IntimateViolence, CorporalPunishment, AVBchild

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	774.361	4	193.590	2.338	.057 ^b
	Residual	15731.619	190	82.798		
	Total	16505.979	194			

a. Dependent Variable: Disinhibition

b. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, IntimateViolence, CorporalPunishment, AVBchild

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

		Coefficients						
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	21.493	9.701		2.216	.028	2.358	40.629
	IntimateViolence	.278	.128	.181	2.172	.031	.025	.530
	Corporal Punishment	-.157	.116	-.115	-1.360	.175	-.386	.071
	AVBchild	.106	.157	.059	.679	.498	-.203	.416
	AVBipv	.146	.120	.108	1.211	.228	-.092	.383

Data Set B5: Psychoticism and RATVS and AVB subscales

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	.356 ^a	.127	.117	14.99964	.127	13.329	4	368	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, IntimateViolence, AVBchild, CorporalPunishment

ANOVA^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11995.785	4	2998.946	13.329	.000 ^b
	Residual	82796.032	368	224.989		
	Total	94791.818	372			

a. Dependent Variable: Psychoticism

b. Predictors: (Constant), AVBipv, IntimateViolence, AVBchild, CorporalPunishment

		Coefficients^a					95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients				
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	-31.543	16.873		-1.869	.062	-64.723	1.638
	IntimateViolence	.991	.258	.205	3.844	.000	.484	1.497
	Corporal Punishment	-.010	.133	-.004	-.076	.939	-.272	.251
	AVBchild	.417	.212	.110	1.972	.049	.001	.834
	AVBipv	.548	.192	.165	2.849	.005	.170	.927

a. Dependent Variable: Psychoticism

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences

4. DISCUSSION

Overall, the hypothesis that the DSM-5 trait model associates with violence was supported; the DSM-5 trait model clearly depicts each domain and its underlying facets, permitting us to look more closely at quantifiable traits. In short, the trait model is a useful tool that, with some more research, has the potential to aid in identifying each trait involved in violence. When used with environmental and archival data, personality trait research could become useful in risk assessment, as well as other areas within forensic psychology (i.e. dangerousness assessments, recidivism evaluations, and treatment plans). This study identified antagonism as moderately correlated with attitudes about violence. The next step in research is to break down this domain and compare pre-treatment and post-treatment offenders: will, despite having a certain trait, offenders change their beliefs?

An additional trait that was identified to have a moderate correlation is psychoticism. While this result could be due to a slightly skewed subject pool, wherein participants possess traits of psychoticism than the general population, it is possible that there are traits of suspiciousness or unusual beliefs that are affecting this result. Psychoticism's relation to delusional disorders and other psychotic disorders may indicate that unusual beliefs, suspiciousness and even cognitive distortions may increase one's propensity for violence. Overall, the results of this study are in favor of continued research in the trait model of personality and the dimensional model of personality disorders.

Limitations:

This study has three major complications: the loss of demographic data and the lack of research on the trait model at this study's onset. The loss of demographic data prevented us from assessing gender differences, marital and relationship statuses, socioeconomic influences, and historical data of exposure to violence in the home during childhood. Additionally, some of the surveys used in this study were poorly translated from the initial platform (Millisecond's Inquisit) to a second platform (MTurk / Qualtrics). Inquisit required the authors of this study to generate coded scripts of each tool used. This script required certain formats for the assessments, which did not copy well over to the Mechanical Turk survey. Thus, the authors recreated the study in an alternate form (Qualtrics). Since this study's completion there has been much research that has been published, but while this study was being completed there was little research to start from. In the future, beginning and ending the study in the same medium would dispel these problems. Similarly, the use of a consistent medium would have prevented the loss of demographic data between platforms. In terms of research, as this study is replicated or built upon, there is now much literature to examine to better assess what professionals in both forensic psychology and personality psychology need to study to advance research on the relation between personality traits and domestic violence.”

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Anderson, C.A., Benjamin, A.J., Wood, P.K., & Bonacci, A.M. (2006). Development and testing of the Velicer Attitudes Toward Violence Scale: Evidence for a four-factor model. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 122-136.
- [2] Bartol, C.R., Bartol, A.M (2016). *Criminal behavior: a psychological approach*. Eleventh Edition. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- [3] Bovasso, G.B., Cacciola, J.S., & Rutherford, M.J. (2002). The Prediction of Violent and Nonviolent Criminal Behavior in a Methadone Maintenance Population. *Journal of Personality Disorder*, 16(4). doi:10.1521/pedi.16.4.360.24124
- [4] Echeburua, E., & Esbec, E. (2010). Violence and personality disorders: clinical and forensic implications. *Actas Espanolas De Psiquiatria*, 38(5), 249-261.
- [5] Fossati, A., Kreuger, R.F., Markon, K.E., Borroni, S., Maffei, C. (2013). Reliability and validity of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5). *Assessment*.20(6), 689-708. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191113504984>
- [6] Funk, J.B., Elliot, R., Urman, M.L., Geysa, T.F., Mock, R.M. (1999). The attitudes towards violence scale: a measure for adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Vol 14, Issue 11, pp. 1123 – 1136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626099014011001>
- [9] Henry, Z., Violence Offender Management Board, Colorado. *Domestic Violence Preliminary Report on the Findings from the Domestic Violence Offender Management Board Data Collection Project an Analysis of Offenders in Court-Ordered Treatment*. Denver, CO : Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Domestic Violence Offender Management Board, 2006.
- [10] Krueger RF, Derringer J, Markon KE, Watson D, Skodol AE. (2013). *The Personality Inventory for DSM-5*. American Psychiatric Association
- [11] McLaren, F. (2010, March). *Attitudes, Values, and Beliefs about Violence within Families* Retrieved January 2016, from <http://Articles/attitudes-values-and-beliefs-about-violence-within-families.pdf>

*Mentor: Dr. Michael Chmielewski, Dedman College of Humanities and Sciences