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ABSTRACT

Psychopathy is a personality disorder that is composed of characteristics that include poverty of empathy, lack of anxiety or fear, impulsive actions, and manipulation of others. The definition and measurement of psychopathy has changed over time and remains controversial. Ethnicity is an under researched area of psychopathy. In particular, previous psychopathy research has focused primarily on European American men. Despite increased attention to differences between African Americans and European Americans, Latin Americans continue to be overlooked, with only a small number of studies examining psychopathy among individuals from Latin ethnicities. The current study is among the first to examine psychopathy traits among Latino males. Features of Latin American culture that may affect psychopathy traits were explored, including interpersonal protective factors, increased egocentrism, machismo (culturally based masculinity), and interpersonal violence. This research was conducted with Latin American and European American male undergraduates. Results indicate that there are differences in psychopathy traits at the global scale and subscale level. In addition, machismo and psychopathy traits are moderately related. Psychopathy traits, machismo, and the interaction are predictive of violence in European Americans. However, psychopathy traits, machismo, and the interaction were less reliably predictive of violence in Latin Americans. Psychopathy traits in Latin Americans may not be related to correlates of psychopathy traits (i.e. aggression and violence). Overall, culturally based differences are significant and future research should give culture a more significant role.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Personality is a stable set of tendencies and characteristics that determine commonalities in individuals’ thoughts, feelings, and actions across situations (Maddi, 1996). Although personality is an important part of everyday life, personalities can be disordered and dysfunctional. Personality disorders often significantly and adversely affect an individual’s interactions with others, their way of thinking, and everyday actions (Maddi, 1996). Psychopathy is a complex and misunderstood personality disorder that can cause pervasive interpersonal difficulties, legal problems, and troubled lives (Skeem, Polaschek, Patrick, & Lilienfeld, 2011). Although individuals with psychopathy are often portrayed in popular media as serial killers or habitual criminals, these characteristics may apply to some, but not all, individuals with psychopathy. In other words, it is not the case that all criminals are psychopathic or that all psychopathic individuals are criminal. The vast majority of what is known about psychopathy stems from research conducted primarily with European American men; as such, cross-cultural verification of the construct is limited, particularly in regards to how psychopathy manifests among Latin Americans (Skeem et al., 2011). Psychopathy is usually measured in a categorical way, however recent research has supported the continuous nature of personality disorders (LeBrenton et al., 2006). Due to the continuous nature of psychopathy traits the current study examined subclinical psychopathy among a student sample.
The current study addresses this gap in knowledge by examining whether European American men and Latin American men differ in the way they express psychopathic features. Specifically, I examined the relationship between psychopathy and *machismo*, a culturally based construct of masculinity (i.e. head of the house, in charge, domineering, and flat affect; Arciniega et al., 2008). There is potentially some overlap between negative aspects of *machismo* and personality characteristics of psychopathy. For example, *machismo* includes aggression, antisocial tendencies, and alexithymia (sub-clinical inability to identify one’s own emotions; Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, & Tracey, 2008). Personality aspects of psychopathy that may overlap with *machismo* include egocentrism, antisocial behaviors, and poverty in affect (Patrick et al., 2008). *Machismo*, psychopathy, culture, and their interaction may result in different outcomes between Latin and European Americans when explaining violent behavior. Psychopathy and *machismo* may be expressed differently across Latin and European American cultures. Culture may also affect the predictive relationship between psychopathy and aggressive and violent behavior. Antisocial behaviors (as measured by the Psychopathy Checklist) are the main relating facet between psychopathy and violent and aggressive behavior (Kennealy, 2012). However, no research has yet examined the relationship between psychopathy and *machismo*, and how each construct may interact or differentially relate to violence. Due to similarities between *machismo* and psychopathy (i.e. egocentrism, low emotional reactivity, and aggressive behavior), I hypothesized that the two constructs are related. *Machismo* and psychopathy were expected to be related through egocentrism, hypermasculinity, antisocial tendencies, and aggression/violence. These hypotheses were developed based on the following literature.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this literature review I will first describe the theoretical conceptualizations of psychopathy; this includes (a) personality focused theories, (b) behavior inclusive theories, and (c) hybrid theories. Second, the measurement of psychopathy is examined and the controversy of its measurement is discussed. Third, the existing cross-cultural research on psychopathy will be examined, and its limitations will be described. Fourth, the predicted relationship between psychopathy, *machismo*, and violence is examined. Finally, a study will be described that seeks to (a) examine culturally based differences in psychopathy (both global and at a subscale level) between Latin Americans and European Americans, (b) examine the relationship between psychopathy and *machismo*, and (c) examine how the relationship between *machismo* and psychopathy relates to history of interpersonal violence.

**Theoretical Descriptions of Psychopathy**

In the more than one hundred years that psychologists have been studying psychopathy, there has been ongoing controversy about how to define the construct. Theories of psychopathy can generally be divided into three categories. The first is personality focused, and includes both negative personality features (i.e. anger, callousness) and positive traits (i.e. superficial charm, likability; Cleckley, 1988; Poythress, Edens, & Lilienfeld, 1998; Skeem & Bibeau, 2008). The second type of theory includes behavioral components of psychopathy (i.e. arrests, harming others, destruction of property; Pinel, 1806; McCord & McCord, 1964; Cloniger, Christiansen,
Reich, & Gottesman, 1978). The third type of theory can be thought of as a hybrid of the other two, combining negative personality features, positive adjustment, and antisocial or criminal behavior (Lykken, 1957). Some (but not all) of these hybrid theories propose that psychopathy is not a unitary construct, but is composed of distinct subtypes of the disorder (Karpman, 1948a; Lykken, 1957; Skeem et al., 2008).

**Personality focused theories.** Hervey Cleckley was one of the first and most influential psychopathy theorists. In his book, *The Mask of Sanity*, he wrote extensively about patients he observed under his psychiatric care that did not seem to fit other diagnostic categories. His conceptualization still influences our modern understanding of psychopathic individuals (Cleckley, 1988). Cleckley described 16 specific characteristics that individuals with psychopathy often have, which he used to develop the clinical profile of a prototypic individual with psychopathy. These individuals often have positive characteristics, such as good intelligence and low anxiety. They are often likable individuals on the surface who may be very socially skilled and superficially charming (Cleckley, 1988). However, these individuals are reported to be insincere, unreliable, untruthful, and lacking in all major affective reactions and emotional responses (Cleckley, 1988). Cleckley’s description is the modern foundation of many psychopathy theories, particularly personality theories.

One way that modern personality theorists have conceptualized psychopathy is by examining the extent to which the traits of psychopathy relate to normal personality traits. For example, psychopathy can be related to the Five Factor Model (FFM), a widely accepted model of normal personality traits. This model describes personality traits on five continua: (a) Neuroticism versus Emotional Stability, (b) Extraversion or
Introversion, (c) Openness to new experience, (d) Agreeableness versus Antagonism, (e) and Conscientiousness (McCrae & Costa, 1997). Support for the relationship between psychopathy and normal personality traits is revealed by research has suggesting that the predictors of violence are the same for individuals with and without psychopathy. To examine this, psychopathy in psychiatric patients was studied through the big five personality traits using the Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness-Five Factor Index (NEO-FFI). This study discovered that general personality traits that are associated with psychopathy (i.e. selfishness, callousness, manipulation, impulsivity, instability, and social deviance) are relatively strong predictors of violence. The results indicate that a combination of higher order personality traits can describe psychopathy, since the general traits captured by the FFM are a part of normal personality structure. The factors that are most indicative of psychopathy are low conscientiousness and antagonism (Lynam, 2005). As evidence of discriminant validity, adolescents with psychopathy were discovered to have significant negative correlations between total psychopathy scores with agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness ($R = -.69, -.77, -.30$, respectively; Lynam, 2005). As such, this research suggests that psychopathy traits are an extreme version of normal personality traits.

**Behavioral inclusive theories.** In contrast to personality focused theories, which emphasize traits, competing theories of psychopathy focus instead on behaviors. In particular, early accounts of the syndrome of psychopathy emphasized violent and antisocial behavior. These types of behavior were often observed in individuals who seemed otherwise rational. Early case studies described individuals who were considered to be suffering from periodical insanity. These individuals would seem normal for times
and then suffer from periods of severe anger and violence (Pinel, 1806). Pinel described these individuals as suffering from “ungovernable fury” and thirsting for “deeds of blood” (Pinel, 1806, p. 14). Future theorists gave the disorder described by Pinel the name of psychopathy (Partridge, 1930). The construct of psychopathy described by Pinel seems different from Cleckley’s version of psychopathy, which emphasizes interpersonal and affective deficits more than behavior. However, both types of psychopathy have central traits in common. These include a lack of empathy and a tendency to be quick-tempered and manipulative (Pinel, 1806; Cleckley, 1988). These characteristics exemplify the similarities between personality focused and behavior inclusive approaches to psychopathy—both theoretical stances have personality traits in common. However, the primary difference between theories is the emphasis placed on antisocial behaviors in diagnosis of the disorder. Although the differences between Pinel’s and Cleckley’s conceptualizations were not significant enough to spawn separate disorders, the differences between the two theories was the beginning of controversy and debate in psychopathy research.

Behavioral inclusive theories evolved differently than personality focused theories. In contrast to the psychiatric samples studied by Cleckley, criminal samples presented a somewhat different picture of psychopathy. Studies using criminal populations of psychopathy emphasized features of social detachment, dangerousness, and behavioral inhibition (i.e. inability to inhibit behaviors that are often negative in nature; McCord & McCord, 1964). This type of research describes individuals with psychopathy as lacking a social conscience and inhibitions against aggression. This results in those with psychopathy responding with rage in fearful or threatening situations
(McCord & McCord, 1964). This relationship between psychopathy and general antisocial behavior has led to further research between antisocial behaviors and psychopathy.

The emphasis on antisocial behaviors within psychopathy led to a diagnostic change from psychopathy to Antisocial Personality Disorder (ASPD). The move from psychopathy to Antisocial Personality Disorder occurred when the Diagnostic Statistical Manual III (DSM-III) was revised and the diagnosis shifted (DSM-III, DSM-IV; APA 1980, 2000). This shift in diagnosis implies that psychopathy and Antisocial Personality Disorder are synonymous. However, antisocial personality disorder and psychopathy are not one and the same in terms of the traits central to each disorder (Skeem et al., 2011). Further, validated psychopathy measures do not correlate well with ASPD measures (Hare, 1985, 2008). Further research has discovered that prison populations often have an overabundance of individuals with ASPD (50-80%) and rates of psychopathy are much lower (15%; Ogloff, 2006). Thus, despite some degree of overlap, they are not the same construct.

**Criticism of personality and behavioral theories.** The debate about the theoretical lens with which to examine psychopathy has been going on for some time, and centers partially on whether antisocial behavior is central to the construct (Skeem & Cooke, 2010). Personality focused researchers argue that antisocial behavior is not central to the diagnosis (Skeem & Cooke, 2010). On the other hand, behavior inclusive theory postulates that psychopathy includes both personality deficits and antisocial behavior (Hare & Neumann, 2010). Researchers who include the behavioral aspects of
psychopathy typically focus on the antisocial aspects of the disorder as central criteria for diagnosis (Hare & Neumann, 2010).

Behavioral theorists emphasize that using behavioral characteristics (i.e., damage of property, fighting, arson) as a primary diagnostic criteria allows for more reliable diagnoses and inter-rater reliability (Cloninger et al., 1978). Some behavior inclusive theorists assert that emphasizing observable behavior offers higher reliability, which they argue is sacrificed by the personality focused approaches (Cloninger et al., 1978; Robins, 1978). Some behavioral researchers also postulate that psychopathy is a function of genetic or neurobiological deficits which directly underlies the antisocial behavior and criminal behavior which underlies psychopathy (Hare & Neumann, 2008). However, personality focused theorists have three strong criticisms of behavioral inclusive theories (Lilienfeld, 1996).

First, measures that include antisocial behaviors may not identify those with affective and interpersonal traits (key components of personality based theories of psychopathy) as having a disorder. This under-identification could be a problem. Consider an individual who is characterized by interpersonal deficits and poverty in major affective reactions, but not a dense history of criminal behavior. This individual is less likely to be identified as having psychopathy, which causes research and criminal justice challenges. These challenges could be found in inability to accurately identify those who do and do not have psychopathy. Also, in criminal justice settings challenges could be found in inaccurate detection of psychopathy, resulting in a risk assessment tool that does not accurately identify individuals with psychopathy. In signal detection terminology, this would result in a false negative. Second, by including items
emphasizing criminality this increases the likelihood of incorrect diagnosis of psychopathy (false positives). For example, an individual who is characterized by a history of criminal behavior, but not the major personality components is more likely to be identified as having psychopathy (Kennealy, 2012). This is problematic because psychopathy carries significant clinical and legal baggage (i.e., treatment pessimism and more severe criminal sentences; Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 2002). The third and final criticism points to the circular logic that limits the explanatory power of the behavioral theory (Kennealy, 2012). The circular logic describes that antisocial behaviors cannot be the cause and outcome of psychopathy. Both theoretical stances have their value and most modern theories of psychopathy seem to have integrated components from each theoretical background.

**Subtypes and hybrid theories.** Hybrid theories offer a compromise to the competing explanations of the disorder by personality and behavior based theories. These theories bring together the most salient features of the most promising theories. As such, psychopathy can be considered a function of a two-deficit model (i.e., fear and anxiety). Lykken developed from Cleckly’s theory an idea that came to be known as the “Low Fear Hypothesis” (1957). He theorized that individuals with psychopathy have deficits in fear and anxiety responses (Lykken, 1995). In this usage, fear and anxiety responses are considered the reactions to fearful and anxiety-provoking situations. Further, he postulated that psychopathy could be subdivided into primary and secondary psychopathy. Primary psychopathy is described as internal deficits in reward and punishment reactions, and this is described as being individuals who are attracted to conflict, lacking in active avoidance (avoidance of dangerous or anxiety provoking
situations), and display impulsivity (Lykken, 1995). Modern research has discovered that fear deficits in psychopathy involve abnormalities in attention that undermine sensitivity to peripheral information (Kosson, Smith, & Newman, 1990). Attention has been discovered to moderate the fearlessness of individuals with psychopathy (Baskin-Summers et al., 2011). This supports that fearlessness is resulting from a lack of attention not due to failure to react from the stimuli.

Secondary psychopathy is characterized by deficits in punishment reactions only (Lykken, 1995). Individuals with primary psychopathy were discovered to have poor electrodermal activity (EDA, the skin conductance response, primarily a reflection of sweat gland activity). Poor EDA responses are indicative of individuals who lack normal fear and anxiety responses. For those with secondary psychopathy, the deficit was not as severe as the primary psychopathy group (Lykken, 1995). This study indicated that primary psychopathy is characterized by deficits in fear conditioning, hyporeactivity to negative conditioning, and poor avoidance of further negative punishment (Lykken, 1957). Of the three findings, electrodermal hyporeactivity has been the most replicated by far (Hare, Frazelle, & Cox, 1978; Fowels, 2000; Fowels & Missel, 2006; Lykken, 1995). This line of research into psychopathy unearthed the possibility that psychopathy may not be a unitary construct.

Subtypes within psychopathy can vary based on their theoretical background and time period of development. These subtypes seem phenotypically similar, however they can be clearly distinguished based on underlying behavior. Primary psychopathy is characterized by antisociality driven by an unidentified motivation (Karpman, 1948). This group has a particular absence of specific social reactions. This includes
conscience, guilt, and generous emotions. These individuals are purely egoistic, uninhibited, and instinctive. Secondary psychopathy is behaviorally driven by identifiable antisocial motivations. This antisocial behavior on the surface is traceable back to definite influences (Karpman, 1948). These influences might include poor home life, early exposure to crime, and abuse. This description is similar to the criminal psychopaths described by behavioral theories (McCord & McCord, 1964).

Subtypes of psychopathy may have originally been defined by their fear reactions, but later research has evolved, influenced, and changed the subtypes of psychopathy (Lykken, 1957). Moreover, primary and secondary psychopathy has also evolved in their definition. Primary psychopathy is postulated as an inherited affective deficit. Affective deficits are often observed in fear and anxiety stimuli responses. This type of psychopathy is conceptualized as more hereditary and less environmental. Secondary psychopathy is described as individuals who have an acquired affective dysfunction (Skeem, Johansson, Andershed, Kerr, & Eno Louden, 2007). Further research has been done to assess if subtypes of psychopathy exist. For example, individuals with secondary psychopathy manifest more borderline personality traits, poorer interpersonal functioning, and more symptoms commonly associated with major mental disorders when compared to individuals with primary psychopathy (Skeem et al., 2007). When compared to control individuals without psychopathy, individuals with secondary psychopathy are more emotionally unstable and withdrawn. In contrast, individuals with primary psychopathy were less anxious and more assertive than the comparison group. This is indicative of two similar yet distinct groups within psychopathy.
Triarchic Theory of Psychopathy. Modern psychopathy theorists have grappled with developing theories that fully explain the complex construct of psychopathy. The most promising of modern conceptualizations comes from Patrick, Fowles, and Krueger (2009). This theory’s merit is derived from how it was developed; this model has synthesized the major theories and major components of psychopathy to develop the modern triarchic theory of psychopathy. This triarchic theory focuses on disinhibition, boldness, and meanness as the phenotypical components of psychopathy (Patrick et al., 2009).

Disinhibition refers to the general lack of impulse control that is associated with psychopathy. This includes a lack of life planning and foresight, impaired regulation of affect and urges, insistence on immediate gratification, and dysfunctional behavioral restraint. Individuals manifest these traits behaviorally through irresponsibility, impatience, impulsiveness, and untrustworthiness. Related concepts include externalizing (Krueger et al, 2002), disinhibitory psychopathy (Sher & Trull, 1994), and low inhibitory control (Kochanska, Murray, & Coy, 1997). Disinhibition can be viewed as a combination of impulsivity and negative affectivity (Krueger, 1999) and can be manifested behaviorally in many ways. These include irresponsibility, impatience, impulsive action, alienation and distrust, aggressive acting out, untrustworthiness, affinity for drug and alcohol problems, and engagement in illicit or other norm-violating activities (Krueger, Markon, Patrick, Benning, & Kramer, 2007). Historically, Cleckley (1988) describes individuals with psychopathy who struggle to follow a life plan and have a cunning ability to damage their own life. However, it is only when disinhibition is married to boldness and meanness that a diagnosis of psychopathy is applicable.
Boldness describes an individual who is able to remain calm and focused in threatening, stressful, or anxiety provoking situations (Patrick et al., 2009). This aspect also includes positive traits like high self-assurance, social efficacy, and tolerance for danger and ambiguity. In this case, boldness is not conceptualized the same as fearlessness; boldness includes fearless behaviors (Patrick et al., 2009). The act of being fearless is more associated with a lack of physiological response to danger and fear. Terms associated with boldness include fearless dominance (Benning, 2005), audacity, daringness, and resiliency (Block & Block, 1980). Boldness can be viewed as the meeting of social dominance, low stress reactivity, and thrill seeking (Benning, Patrick, Salekin, & Leistico, 2005). This can manifest behaviorally as imperturbability, social poise, assertiveness, persuasiveness, and bravery. Boldness in this definition is not used as synonymous with fearlessness (Patrick et al., 2009). Fearlessness is considered an underlying disposition based in a reduced sensitivity of the brain’s defensive motivational system (Fowels & Dindo, 2006). Cleckley’s (1941) conceptualization of psychopathy, emphasized boldness and disinhibitory tendencies. Hare’s classic psychophysiological studies of psychopathy emphasized a certain fearlessness and unresponsiveness to punishment (Hare & Forth, 1985).

The third and component of the triarchic theory, meanness, describes a myriad of attributes which at their core indicate a global lack of empathy. These include: poor attachments with others, rebelliousness, exploitativeness, and cruelty (Patrick et al., 2009). This facet of psychopathy involves actively seeking pleasure and satisfaction at the expense of others and passive disengagement from others. Terms associated with meanness include callousness (Frick, O’Brien, Wootton, McBurnett, 1994),
coldheartedness (Lilienfeld & Fowler, 2006), and antagonism (Lynam, Caspi, Moffitt, Raine, Loeber, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 2005). In relation to normal emotions, meanness can be described as the connection between high dominance and low affiliation.

Historically, this notion of meanness is central to the conceptions of psychopathy studied behavioral theorists (McCord & McCord, 1964). Meanness in the past has been assessed through criminal activity and violence. However, recent research has supported that the strongest indicator of antisocial behaviors are scales indexing responsibility and impulsivity (Kennealy, 2012). By bringing all the major components of psychopathy together, the triarchic theory joins the most salient theoretical features related to psychopathy (Patrick et al., 2009). Due to the comprehensive nature of the triarchic definition of psychopathy, it will be used as the operational definition of psychopathy in the current study.

**Measurement of Psychopathy**

Given the debate about the definition of psychopathy itself, it is not surprising that there has been a similar level of debate regarding how to best measure psychopathy. This debate in many ways mirrors the content of the theoretical debates about the nature of psychopathy: some measures include both antisocial behaviors and personality aspects of psychopathy and other measures focus primarily on personality features of psychopathy. The measures of psychopathy have also given rise to a debate over the number of factors that explain psychopathy.

Two of the most common measures to assess psychopathy are the Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R; Hare, 2002) and the Psychopathy Personality Inventory (PPI;
Lilienfeld, 2003). The development of the Psychopathy Checklist was based on the characteristics that Cleckley described. However, the Psychopathy Checklist was developed and normed on prison populations. Due to the population used to develop the PCL-R, the measure has a large antisocial behavioral component (Hare, 1996), such as criminal offenses and a history of violence. Factor analyses reveal that the PCL-R has a two factor optimal solution. Factor 1 is composed of selfishness, callousness, and interpersonal manipulation. Factor 2 is composed of impulsivity, instability, and social deviance. The PCL-R has been the most widely used measure of psychopathy for years (Skeem et al., 2011). However, modern research has seen a need for more psychopathy measures, especially self-report measures.

Due to the PCL-R’s popularity, a comparable self-report measure was developed; the Self Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP) measure was designed to measure psychopathy the same theoretical way that the PCL-R does but in a different format. The PCL-R and the SRP both emphasize antisocial behavior and criminal acts along with personality deficits. However, the SRP was developed to be used with non-criminal populations and was standardized with student populations. The SRP is composed of 4 subscales including Callous Affect (CA), Interpersonal Manipulation (IPM), Erratic Lifestyle (EL), and Antisocial Behaviors (AB; Lester, Salekin, & Selbom, 2012).

The other leading measure of psychopathy, the Psychopathy Personality Inventory (PPI) is also self-report. It was developed with a student population and has also been tested in forensic populations. The measure can be used in both forensic or community settings. The PPI’s factor solution contains three primary factors. However, the factor structure of this measure is more controversial. The original three-factor solution has
come under fire and a two-factor solution has been proposed (Lilienfeld et al., 2012).
The PPI is composed of eight subscales and three validity scales. The subscales include
Egocentricity (ME; 30 items), Social Influence (SOI; 24 items), Coldheartedness (C; 21
items), Carefree Nonplanfulness (CN; 20 items), Fearlessness (F; 19 items), Blame
Externalization (BE; 18 items), Rebellious Non-conformity (RN; 17 items), Deviant
Responding (DR; 10 items), and Virtuous Responding (VR; 13 items; Lilienfeld &
Widows, 2005). The PPI’s differences may come from its development with a general
population sample and a personality based approach. Overall, the measures of
psychopathy have benefits and drawbacks depending on how the measure is used. The
PPI is best used for personality focused research while the SRP would be best used for
behavior inclusive researchers. Because there is merit to both of these lines of research,
the current study includes two types of measures to address both theoretical approaches
to psychopathy.

**Multicultural Study of Psychopathy**

To truly understand a disorder it must be examined in various populations. This
allows researchers to understand how the disorder manifests among people of differing
age groups, genders, and ethnicities. Culture impacts an individual’s daily life, behavior,
and personality. Due to the pervasive nature of culture, it is important that culture is
considered in all aspects of psychology. However, the cross-cultural validity of
psychopathy has been neglected until recently, and there is a general lack of research
with Latin Americans (Skeem et al., 2011); the majority of multicultural research has
been with African Americans. This research has found that African Americans score
similarly to European Americans on global measures of psychopathy, but there are
meaningful differences at the subscale level. For example, a recent study discovered that psychopathy as measured by the PCL-R was less predictive of violence for African Americans when compared to European Americans (Swogger, Walsh, Kosson, Cashman-Brown, & Caine, 2012). There has also been research suggesting that antisocial behavior may be less problematic for those who are African American, and related to lower rates of criminal activity. In a large multicultural study of psychopathy in inmates, African Americans \( (n = 84) \) are more likely to score 1-2 points higher on measures of psychopathy, but the effect size is small \( (R^2 = .13, p>.05) \). Although nuanced differences may be observed among the subscales, meta-analysis has not supported any mean differences in psychopathy scores when comparing European American and African American samples. Although factor structures support compatibility of psychopathy and the associated measures, there is a differing pattern of correlates that have been identified within African Americans when compared to European Americans (Skeem et al., 2011). When examining general population samples, African Americans compared to European Americans are more likely to have deficits in passive avoidance learning, fear related startle, and lexical decision-making (Skeem et al., 2011). These findings indicate that psychopathy measures (primarily the PCL-R) may be tapping different traits among African Americans (Kosson et al., 1990). However, research is still needed in this area to confirm previous findings.

The limited amount of psychopathy research conducted with Latin American individuals has found differences in the predictive utility of psychopathy and less severe scores on measures of interpersonal deficits. One study examined the cross ethnic stability of the predictive relationship for psychopathy and violence. Here, psychopathy
was assessed using the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised with 424 detained offenders. Psychopathy was most strongly predictive of violence among European Americans \((R^2 = .13, p < .01)\), relative to African Americans \((R^2 = .05, p < .01)\). However, the Psychopathy Checklist was discovered to be not at all predictive of future violence for Latin American individuals \((R^2 = .02, p = .22; \text{Walsh, 2012})\). The antisocial facet of psychopathy was the most predictive of violence for Latin Americans. However, this relationship was non-significant and much weaker than the relationship observed between European Americans and violence (Walsh, 2012). One fundamental flaw in psychopathy research is highlighted by Walsh et al. (2012), which is the assumption that psychopathy is expected to predict violence and aggression the same way as in European Americans. However, this groundbreaking study discovered that common psychopathy measures did not predict violence with Latin Americans, unlike psychopathy studies with European and African Americans. Latin American individuals were also discovered to have lower elevations on interpersonal deficits when measured with the PPI (Sullivan et al., 2006). Although this area of research is lacking, the scant research finds some differences between Latin Americans and European Americans in psychopathy expression.

Psychopathy research has not yet addressed traits unique to the Latin American population. For example, research suggests that there are cultural differences in general emotional regulation. Emotional expression was explored with 80 Latin Americans, this study uncovered that pride was expressed more often in Latin Americans than any other emotion or culture. Latin Americans reported that they felt prideful 80% of the time compared with the next highest score in European Americans, who felt prideful 60% of the time (Scollan et al., 2005). Pride is defined as inwardly directed sense of satisfaction
and towards one’s choices or actions or artificially inflated personal status (Scollan et al., 2005). The Latin American culture displayed the highest levels of pride when compared to all other major ethnicities (European American, African American, and Asian American; Scollon, Diener, Oishi, & Biswas-Diener, 2004). These cultural differences and past research has significantly influenced our first hypothesis in which we examine cultural differences.

**Latin American Cultural Differences**

**General differences.** Latin American cultures have some characteristics that are specifically applicable to psychopathy. Latin American is a cultural term that broadly defines anyone who is from or a descendant of a Latin country. These cultures include Mexican American, South/Central American, Puerto Rican American, and Latin Americans have a more collectivist culture when compared to European Americans (Comes-Diaz, 2006). Collectivism among Latin Americans may yield protective factors that prevent interpersonal deficits from being as severe as among European Americans. These protective factors include strong interpersonal connections and a fairly enmeshed family structure. The emphasis on interpersonal relationships and enmeshed families may foster psychopathy traits that are not as severe in Latin Americans, when compared to European Americans (Comes-Diaz, 2006). Another important factor to consider in psychopathy is differences in emotional regulation. Latin Americans show some basic differences when compared to European Americans (Scollon et al., 2004). They discovered that Latin Americans and European Americans often prefer to experience and recall positive emotions. They also discovered that Latin Americans reported experiencing the highest levels of pride when compared to European Americans, African
Americans, and Asian Americans (Scollon et al., 2004). Due to the prevalence of pride within the culture, Latin Americans may be more likely to exhibit egocentricity.

**Machismo.** Of particular relevance to psychopathy is *machismo*, a cultural construct that has recently begun to gain attention due to findings between *machismo*, violence, and negative life outcomes. *Machismo* is a culturally based conception of masculinity that is popular primarily with Latin Americans. Recent research has characterized *machismo* as having both positive and negative traits (Arciniega et al., 2008). The negative aspects of *machismo* are described as aggressive, chauvinistic, and hypermasculine. The positive aspects of *machismo* are described as nurturing, family centered, and chivalrous (Arciniega et al., 2008). The relationship between *machismo* and violence has not been fully examined. However, studies examining hypermasculinity has discovered that individuals with hypermasculine traits are more likely to be violent (Gudjonsson, Goggin, Smith, & Helgadottir, 2011).

The relationship between psychopathy and *machismo* has not yet been explored. However, research highlights where the overlap between psychopathy and *machismo* might be found. A few aspects central to *machismo* that may be related to psychopathy are egocentrism, hypermasculinity, and aggression. Egocentrism is a central component of psychopathy and negative aspects of *machismo* (Patrick et al., 2009; Arciniegra et al., 2008). Hypermasculinity has independently found to be related to violent behavior and aggression (Walker, 2004). Masculinity is also a central component to *machismo* and can be observed in male offenders who are more likely to be violent (Arciniegra et al., 2008, Walker, 2004). General violent attitudes (i.e. attitudes that are generally favorable towards violence and aggression) also been found to be related to additional violent
offenses. Violent attitudes indicate a willingness to resort to violence in daily life. This aspect is related to both psychopathy and *machismo*. In addition, psychopathy is related to a general inability to understand and process fear (Kosson, Smith, & Newman, 1990). *Machismo* may result in those who feel that is necessary to protect their loved ones based on what is considered culturally “masculine” (Arciniega et al., 2008). Therefore, individuals with both psychopathy and *machismo* will not only have a proclivity towards violence but also a drive to protect their family. Research with *machismo* has developed recently, and much of the recent research has examined the negative aspects of *machismo* and the relation to violence or intimate partner violence.

**Aggression**

*Psychopathy and aggression.* Aggression is a correlate of psychopathy that differs by culture. The relationship between psychopathy and aggressive behavior has been well established in adult offenders, antisocial children and adolescents, and civil psychiatric patients (Patrick et al., 2005). Previous research supports that psychopathy as measured by the PCL-R and violent criminal acts are related (Walsh, Swogger, Walsh, & Kosson, 2007). The relationship between psychopathy and violence is still currently being researched (Skeem et al., 2011). However, there is some research that indicates that psychopathy as measured by the PCL-R is related to violence due to the antisocial behavior component of the measure (Skeem & Cooke, 2010). When assessing psychopathy measures, it was discovered that antisocial behavior is the primary indication of predicting aggressive behavior. Theoretically, this occurs because previous behavior is the best predictor of future behavior (Kennealy, 2012). This indicates the relationship between psychopathy, as evaluated by the PCL-R, may be driven by the way
it is measured. Research has supported the predictive relationship between psychopathy and future violent behavior (Porter & Woodworth, 2006). A large number of studies support the relationship between psychopathic traits (as measured by the PCL-R) and adult offenders. One study discovered that individuals with psychopathy were convicted of 7.32 violent crimes and the non-psychopathic group committed only 4.52 violent crimes (Porter & Woodworth, 2006). Researchers have also examined the relationship between aggressive behavior and general personality traits related to psychopathy. General personality traits, as identified by the NEO-FFI, were discovered to be moderately good predictors of violence ($R^2 = .14$; Skeem et al., 2005). Thus, it is clear that psychopathy is closely related to violence, especially when measured with the PCL-R or derivative measures (Porter & Woodworth, 2006). Psychopathy has also been shown to impact different types of violent offenses, specifically intimate partner violence.

**Intimate partner violence.** Due to the prevalence of intimate partner violence, the impact that psychopathic personalities may play in this type of contextual violence and recidivism is significant (Chan, Straus, Brownridge, Tiwari, & Leung, 2008). This type of violence is statistically supported to have higher elevations among certain populations. For example, both college students and Latin Americans are more likely to either commit or be a victim of interpersonal violence (Chan et al., 2008; Walsh, 2012). These populations are especially important for the current study and the samples being examined. Interpersonal violence is the violence that occurs between two individuals who are in an intimate relationship. Current reports suggest that interpersonal violence is on the rise. Recent studies suggest that one in three couples will be involved in one incident of violence during the course of the dating relationship (Luthra & Gidycz, 2006).
The seriousness of intimate partner violence is highlighted in a worldwide prevalence study (Chan et al., 2008). Twenty-eight percent of all individuals reported being victims of assault, 35% were male and 25% were female (Chan et al., 2008). Recent research has examined the relationship between psychopathy and those who perpetrate intimate partner violence, or batterers. Psychopathy and a facet of impulsive antisociality were discovered to be positively associated with further intimate partner violence offenses (Rock, Sellbom, Ben-Porath, & Salekin, 2012). In this case, failure was assessed as committing an additional intimate partner crime (Rock et al., 2012). Latin Americans are often considered to have higher risks for intimate partner violence due to some cultural factors such as the prevalence of traditional gender roles and the promotion of *machismo* (Walsh, 2012).

**Study Aims**

The current study seeks to fill gaps in the literature by examining ethnicity differences in psychopathy traits, *machismo*, and the relationship with aggression, and has four primary aims. The first aim of this study is to determine if there are any culturally based differences in psychopathy traits, when comparing European Americans (i.e., those of European or Anglo decent sometimes referred to as White or Caucasian) and Latin Americans (i.e., individuals who are from, or descendants of, individuals in a country in America that speaks a romance language). Previous research has found generalizability across global psychopathy scores, which supports the generalizability of the construct across ethnicities. As such, I hypothesize that there should not be any significant global differences in psychopathy traits.
In contrast to the first aim, the second aim examines sub-scale differences. Literature on Latin American differences in psychopathy traits has found some sub-scale differences. Previous research has discovered that Latin Americans have smaller elevations in the interpersonal deficit subscale on the psychopathic personality inventory (Sulliven et al., 2006). Latin American cultures have been shown to be more likely to express pride than their European American and African American counterparts, which may relate to the way psychopathy egocentricity is expressed in psychopathy (Scollon et al., 2004). The second aim will assess differences on psychopathy subscales between European Americans and Latin Americans. In this case, I aim to examine differences within egocentrism and interpersonal deficit sub-regions of psychopathy traits. I hypothesize egocentrism will be higher in Latin American individuals while interpersonal deficits should be lower, when compared to European Americans.

The third aim of this study examines how the cultural construct of machismo and psychopathy traits are related. Psychopathy traits and machismo are expected to be moderately related. These constructs are expected to be related through hypermasculinity, egocentrism, and aggression. Previous research has supported that these aspects are central or correlates of both machismo and psychopathy (Arcinegra et al., 2006; Patrick et. al., 2006). This addresses gaps in the multicultural study of psychopathy and informs on the relationship between hypermasculinity and psychopathy. Psychopathy traits and machismo are expected to be moderately and positively correlated.

The fourth and final aim of this study will assess how psychopathy traits and machismo interact with violence. Due to the overlap between psychopathy and machismo, the two together may increase the incidence of aggressive acts (Arciniegra et
al., 2008; Patrick et al., 2008). The relationship between psychopathy and Machismo is expected to interact with violence. Theoretically, as aggression increases psychopathy and machismo will increase differentially. This would indicate that the interaction between psychopathy traits and machismo are related to higher incidence of violence.

The relationship between psychopathy traits and machismo is expected to vary based on the incidence of reported violence. Incidence of violence should increase as psychopathy and machismo increases. The interaction of the personality problems within psychopathy and the hyper masculine attitudinal characteristics of psychopathy will combine for an overall higher rate of violence.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The study aims were assessed via an online survey that administered self-report measures of the constructs of interest (e.g., psychopathy, *machismo*, violence, and acculturation) to male undergraduate participants. As described earlier, two different psychopathy measures have been used to assess the two theoretically different conceptualizations of psychopathy (Self Report Psychopathy Scale, Psychopathic Personality Inventory). Further, because the sample consists of undergraduates, the current study is examining psychopathy traits, not necessarily clinically significant psychopathy.

**Participants.** Participants were recruited through the psychology department subject pool and from 3 undergraduate classes (1 from UTEP, 2 from Georgia and Vermont). Participants were drawn from different universities out of the necessity to have an adequate European American sample. In total, 430 individuals were recruited (UTEP \( n = 323 \), other universities \( n = 117 \)). After removing data that was incomplete (as described later), the study was left with 282 participants. The majority of participants were Mexican American (49%), and the next largest group was European American (32%; African American, 6%; Asian American, 10%; Native American, 1%; Other 2%). The age of participants on average was 19.2 years old (SD = ± 3.2). After eliminating all cultural groups except European and Latin Americans the study was left with 203 participants. Because *machismo* is primarily found among men and psychopathy traits
differs extensively in its manifestation between men and women, the sample was male participants only (Arciniega et al., 2008; Skeem et al., 2011).

**Procedure.** The questionnaires were administered through a computer-based program (Qualtrics). The majority of participants used SONA system, found through introductory psychology courses and received a link to the survey from this system. Participants recruited directly from classes or other universities were contacted through email with the link to the survey. Participants were directed to click a link to the informed consent form, where they read information about the study and then gave consent by clicking “continue”. Next, the participant completed all study materials in random order. Identifying information was collected to ensure all participants are given appropriate course credit or extra credit. However, identifying information has been kept separate from the participants’ responses. This ensures that identifying information and responses are kept separate to ensure confidentiality.

**Measures.**

Measures were addressed with eight different measures. These included demographics, psychopathy, aggression, machismo, acculturation, and attention check.

**Demographics.** Participants were asked to answer some basic questions about their personal information, demographics, and criminal history. This included age, gender, educational progress, cultural background, and if there are any arrests or criminal sentences. Cultural information was used to determine group membership. Questions assessing demographics can be found in appendix A.
**Psychopathy.** Due to the differences in measurement described earlier, the current study included two different types of psychopathy measures (PPI and SRP).

*Self-Report Psychopathy Scale.* The Self Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP) was constructed by Hare and colleagues and is composed of 64 items (Hare, 1985). This measure was developed using a combination of rational, empirical, and internal consistency approaches, resulting in a self-report measure analogous to the Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R). The SRP has been designed with a two-factor structure. The first factor assesses the core interpersonal and affective features of psychopathy. The second factor assesses primarily antisocial and impulsive lifestyle features. The scale was later revised so the factor structure was closer to that of the PCL-R (Hare, 2011). This measure was scored on a 1 to 5 scale and specific items were reverse coded. Each subscale is summed from designated items, the subscales are then summed to create a total scales score. The SRP has adequate psychometric properties as evidenced by the correlations with other self-report measures of psychopathy (Levenson Self Report Psychopathy \( r = .62, p < .01 \); Psychopathic Personality Inventory \( r = .34, p < .01 \)). The SRP also displays discriminant validity through negative correlations with agreeableness and conscientiousness subscales of the Big Five Inventory \( (r = -.46, p < .01; r = -.23, p < .01; \) Neal & Sellbom, 2012). The SRP had adequate internal consistency in the current sample \((\alpha = .908)\). This measure can be found in appendix B.

*Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI).* The Psychopathy Personality Inventory was constructed by Lilienfeld and colleagues and is composed of 120 items and 8 subscales (Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996). The PPI was designed to measure psychopathy with a personality based approach. The measure was developed based on
the criteria set forth by Cleckley’s text *The Mask of Sanity* (Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996). To account for the possibility of socially desirable responses, this measure includes a Virtuous Response scale. This measure also includes a Deviant Response scale, which indicates if an individual is being dishonest in their responses (Young-Lundquist, Boccaccini, Simpler, 2012). The assessment is scored 1 to 4 and some items are reverse coded. Scale scores were then calculated based on the score response form, which isolated the appropriate items in each scale. All scales are calculated individually but factors are a combination of subscales. The PPI indicates adequate internal validity and is highly correlated with interview rating based on Cleckley’s conceptualization of psychopathy ($r = .60, p < .001$; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996). The PPI displays discriminant validity by having negative relationships with somatization and trustworthiness ($r = -.39, p < .001$; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996). This measure had adequate reliability in the current sample ($α = .935$). I am unable to print the PPI due to copyright restrictions, but an example score report from the measure can be found in appendix C.

Aggression.

*Conflict Tactics Scales.* Physical assault, injury, and sexual coercion were measured by the revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2; Appendix D; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). The CTS-2 PC version is composed of 78 items. Half of these correspond to the participant’s behavior and the second half of questions corresponds to their partner’s behavior. These scales are widely used to measure the occurrence and severity of tactics to resolve conflicts between intimate partners. The items of the scales report on actual behavioral acts of violence. Items are scored on a 0 to
7 scale, and a subset of items are reverse coded. Scoring is calculated by summing items to create 5 subscale scores. All scales associated with violence and aggression within a relationship were summed to create the CTS-2 total scores. Subjects are asked to respond to items that measure physical assault, psychological aggression, negotiation, injury, and sexual coercion (Straus et al., 1996). Reliability of the measure ranges from $\alpha = .79$ to .95 (Straus et al., 1996). The current sample had adequate reliability ($\alpha = .991$).

**Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ).** The BPAQ measures aggression against rivals and strangers and was included to provide a more complete picture of the individual’s history of violence. The scale is composed of 16 items with 6 subcategories to each question. This gives a total of 138 items scored on a 0 to 5 scale (Archer & Webb, 2006). A total score was calculated by summing all the values. This scale has correlated highly with other aggression scales that are similar ($r = .81$; Archer & Webb, 2006). The current sample had adequate reliability with this measure ($\alpha = .969$). This measure can be found in appendix E.

**Machismo.** The Castro Lab Machismo Scale was derived from Castro’s Integrative and Mixed Methods project (2010). This measure is a self-report scale and was developed with responses to interviews assessing perceived definitions of machismo. From these comprehensive interviews conducted as part of a larger diabetic behavior study, the machismo measure was developed. The measure is composed of 6 subscales: Protecting Family, Expression Emotions, Male Privilege, Caring Conduct, Honorable Conduct, and Selfish Conduct. These are all combined to reach a total of 61 items. All scales have acceptable reliability ($\alpha = .80, .74, .77, .87, .68, .75$, respectively). The Castro Lab Machismo scale also had adequate reliability in the current sample ($\alpha = .905$).
The items are divided into two different sections one that assessed attitudinal components and the second assesses behavioral components of machismo. The items are scored 1 to 6 and some items are reverse coded. Scores are calculated by summing the scores for the attitude and behavioral scale to create two subscale scores. These scores are summed to create the total machismo scale. This measure focuses on both the positive and negative aspects of machismo. Positive aspects of machismo includes items that assess caring, supportive, and loving behavior. Items that assess positive aspects of machismo were reverse coded before analysis; this method of handling positive aspects of machismo is based on the scales scoring procedure. This measure can be found in appendix F.

Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans – II (ARSMA-II). This measure assesses four main factors associated with acculturation. These include language and use preference, ethnic identity and classification, cultural heritage and ethnic behaviors, and ethnic interaction (Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995). The items are scored on a 1 to 5 scale and some items were reverse coded. The scale derives two different scores, one for Mexican orientation and one for Anglo orientation. These were calculated by summing each scale separately to create the two separate scale scores. ARSMA-II has a total of 48 items. The full scale reports adequate internal consistency (α=.87; Cuellar et al., 1995). The scale also has adequate reliability in the current sample (α = .928). This measure can be found in appendix G.

Attention Check. Participants were required to answer questions to ensure that they were completing the measures in a careful and purposeful manner. (e.g., “Leave this item blank” or “Mark 5 on this item”). This measure can be found in appendix H.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

As stated earlier, the present study had four primary aims: (1) to assess global scale differences in psychopathy traits between Latin Americans and European Americans, (2) to examine subscale differences between Latin Americans and European Americans, (3) to examine the relationship between psychopathy and machismo, and (4) to examine how psychopathy traits and machismo interact with violence. The analyses used to address these aims are described next.

Data Preparation and Cleaning

Before the analyses were begun, several steps were taken to prepare and clean the data. First, missingness trends in the data were examined, which resulted in assessing missing trends, imputing data, and data pruning. If an individual completed at least 80% of the items, the rest of the responses were imputed. Before imputation, I examined the data to ensure that there was no homoscedastity. I used Little’s Missing Completely at Random test (MCAR) to assess this (Little, 1998). This assessment ensures data was missing in a random fashion to ensure the imputation could be completed. The MCAR indicated that data was missing in a random fashion and should be imputed with Multiple Imputation. After completing the MCAR, I then completed the imputation for all variables by entering them by scale into the Multiple Imputation Analysis model in SPSS.
The replacement variables were calculated by using a random seed, with 25 iterations, and allowed the software to determine the best model for the data. After all scales were imputed the new imputed values were combined into one complete data set for analysis.

During this elimination process, the attention check questions were also considered to ensure the data quality. Participants who missed 3 of 5 attention checks were removed from the dataset. Research has yet to be conducted on the importance of attention checks for online studies; however, I decided individuals who missed over half of the attention checks were likely not answering in a purposeful manner. After combining the incomplete data and attention checks, 105 people were removed from the data set. During the final elimination process, only individuals who were members of the ethnic groups that pertained to the aims were kept for data analysis. The cultural groups eliminated were African American (7%, n = 18), Asian American (10%, n = 28), Native American (1%, n = 2), and other (2%, n = 5). This resulted in a final sample of 203 individuals in the European American (n = 72) and Latin American (n = 131) groups. The power analysis conducted in G*power indicated that the sample would need 203 participants to have sufficient power. The final sample of 203 participants gives the current study more than sufficient power (α = .97).

Next, I assessed for any differences between the naturally occurring samples: University of Texas at El Paso sample and the other university samples (Georgia and Vermont). Overall, the two samples were similar in age, sex, and machismo measures, (see Table 1). This was examined in a basic t-test comparison of the means, the results of which are presented in Table 1. Overall, the differences between the samples were small
and ultimately allowed the samples to be combined. Differences between ethnicity are examined in Table 2. Table 2 indicates that cultural differences were not observed across the scales at the average level.

Table 1

*T-test and Descriptives comparing the UTEP and Other University Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>UTEP Mean</th>
<th>UTEP SD</th>
<th>Other Mean</th>
<th>Other SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.965</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>19.051</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>19.752</td>
<td>1.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-1.659</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>2.522</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP IPM</td>
<td>2.477</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>43.676</td>
<td>9.333</td>
<td>40.236</td>
<td>8.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP CA</td>
<td>2.477</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>44.107</td>
<td>6.032</td>
<td>441.963</td>
<td>6.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP ELS</td>
<td>2.272</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>44.070</td>
<td>8.880</td>
<td>43.163</td>
<td>9.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP ASB</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>30.770</td>
<td>9.960</td>
<td>30.150</td>
<td>10.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP Total</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>162.625</td>
<td>27.242</td>
<td>155.513</td>
<td>27.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI ME</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>42.485</td>
<td>3.964</td>
<td>42.924</td>
<td>4.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI SOI</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>34.886</td>
<td>4.326</td>
<td>34.376</td>
<td>4.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI F</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>33.924</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>33.375</td>
<td>4.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI RN</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>38.957</td>
<td>4.825</td>
<td>38.791</td>
<td>4.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI C</td>
<td>-1.290</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>38.753</td>
<td>5.184</td>
<td>39.729</td>
<td>4.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI STI</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>31.095</td>
<td>4.570</td>
<td>30.248</td>
<td>4.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI CN</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>48.663</td>
<td>5.412</td>
<td>48.020</td>
<td>6.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI DR</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>15.607</td>
<td>2.912</td>
<td>14.879</td>
<td>2.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI BE</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>36.629</td>
<td>3.945</td>
<td>30.893</td>
<td>4.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI Total</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>305.530</td>
<td>27.037</td>
<td>305.762</td>
<td>30.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPAQ</td>
<td>-.751</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>215.878</td>
<td>58.478</td>
<td>222.959</td>
<td>74.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS-2</td>
<td>-1.130</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>61.758</td>
<td>129.767</td>
<td>85.605</td>
<td>143.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macho Attitudes</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>76.616</td>
<td>9.256</td>
<td>76.603</td>
<td>8.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macho Behaviors</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>83.432</td>
<td>17.088</td>
<td>89.554</td>
<td>10.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macho Total</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>160.048</td>
<td>22.087</td>
<td>165.982</td>
<td>15.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSMA LA</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>59.789</td>
<td>20.454</td>
<td>35.425</td>
<td>13.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSMA EA</td>
<td>-1.279</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>82.563</td>
<td>13.641</td>
<td>82.548</td>
<td>5.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* SRP: Self Report Psychopathy Scale; IPM: Interpersonal Manipulation subscale; CA: Callus Affect subscale; ELS: Erratic Lifestyle subscale; ASB; Antisocial Behavior subscale; PPI: Psychopathic Personality Inventory scale; ME: Machiavellian Egocentricity subscale; SOI: Social Influence subscale; C: Coldheartedness; CN: Carefree Nonplanfulness subscale; F: Fearlessness subscale; BE; Blame Externalization
subs; RN: Rebellious Non-conformity subscale; DR: Deviant Responding validity scale; VR: Vurtuous Responding validity scale; BPAQ: Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire; Macho Attitudes: Machismo Attitudes subscale; Macho Behaviors: Machismo Behavior subscale; Macho Total: Machismo total score; ARSMA: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans; LA: Latin Americans; EA: European Americans

The final step before analysis was to consider multicollinearity. Collinearity was assessed in the regression portion of the analysis and relates the degree of overlap between the constructs. Overlap was assessed with the variance inflation factor (VIF) and was discovered to not be a significant problem in the current study (VIF = 1.000, 1.093, 1.098, 1.085, 1.172, 1.061, 1.048, 1.213). After ensuring collinearity was not a problem, the analysis was carried out using a statistical software package (SPSS 22).

Descriptive statistics divided by cultural groups can be seen in Table 2. The information in this table also includes the total scores for each measure as well as subscale scores.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale scores by Ethnicity</th>
<th>EA Mean(SD)</th>
<th>LA Mean(SD)</th>
<th>Effect Size (d)</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.423(2.365)</td>
<td>19.125(3.412)</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.112(3.560)</td>
<td>2.003(2.456)</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP IPM</td>
<td>38.8(8.2)</td>
<td>41.7(8.3)</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>-2.316</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP CA</td>
<td>43.2(6.4)</td>
<td>43.9(6.3)</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-1.338</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP ELS</td>
<td>41.6(9.4)</td>
<td>45.1(8.1)</td>
<td>-.399</td>
<td>-2.064</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP ASB</td>
<td>30.5(10.1)</td>
<td>31.7(9.7)</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-0.858</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP Total</td>
<td>154.4(26.8)</td>
<td>162.4(25.6)</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>-2.093</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI ME</td>
<td>47.9(6.9)</td>
<td>49.9(6.5)</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>-1.023</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI SOI</td>
<td>42.2(3.9)</td>
<td>42.7(4.0)</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-1.953</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI F</td>
<td>33.5(4.7)</td>
<td>33.9(4.4)</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.605</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI RN</td>
<td>36.2(7.3)</td>
<td>37.2(6.2)</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI C</td>
<td>43.4(5.2)</td>
<td>42.4(6.4)</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI STI</td>
<td>32.2(3.4)</td>
<td>32.1(4.1)</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-2.891</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPI CN</td>
<td>PPI DR</td>
<td>PPI BE</td>
<td>PPI VR</td>
<td>PPI Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.4(5.7)</td>
<td>24.4(2.6)</td>
<td>34.8(5.5)</td>
<td>31.1(3.4)</td>
<td>327.0(29.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.3(5.5)</td>
<td>24.5(2.9)</td>
<td>36.8(5.3)</td>
<td>30.8(3.7)</td>
<td>333.1(31.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** SRP: Self Report Psychopathy Scale; IPM: Interpersonal Manipulation subscale; CA: Callus Affect subscale; ELS: Erratic Lifestyle subscale; ASB: Antisocial Behavior subscale; PPI: Psychopathic Personality Inventory scale; ME: Machiavellian Egocentricity subscale; SOI: Social Influence subscale; C: Coldheartedness; CN: Carefree Nonplanfulness subscale; F: Fearlessness subscale; BE: Blame Externalization subscale; RN: Rebellious Non-conformity subscale; DR: Deviant Responding validity scale; VR: Vurtuous Responding validity scale; BPAQ: Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire; Macho Attitudes: Machismo Attitudes subscale; Macho Behaviors: Machismo Behavior subscale; Macho Total: Machismo total score; ARSMA: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans; LA: Latin Americans; EA: European Americans

**Aim One**

The first aim examined whether there are any global differences in psychopathy traits between European Americans and Latin American groups. To address this aim, participants were sorted into two groups by ethnicity: European American \((n = 72)\) and Latin American \((n = 131)\). Psychopathy trait total scores for the two groups were examined with a Multivariate ANOVA. The psychopathy totals (PPI and SRP) were both entered as dependent variables and then examined across ethnic group, which was the independent variable. A single ANOVA was performed during this stage because contrasts were used to analyze group-based differences. Consistent with the hypothesis, Latin Americans and European Americans did not differ significantly on psychopathy.
global scores as measured by the PPI or SRP, $F(2, 203) = 2.711, p = .069, d = -.249$; $F(2, 203) = 3.021, p = .051, d = -.324$. Overall, the hypothesis was supported, given that it was hypothesized that global psychopathy scores would be similar for the two groups.

**Aim Two**

The second aim examined ethnic differences in psychopathy traits at the subscale level between Latin Americans and European Americans. The subscales of interest are egocentrism and interpersonal manipulation. To address this aim, participants were sorted into two groups by ethnicity. Psychopathy subscale scores for the two groups were examined with a Multivariate ANOVA. The psychopathy subscale scores for interpersonal manipulation and egocentricity were both entered as dependent variables and then examined across ethnic group, which was the independent variable. A single ANOVA was performed during this stage. The psychopathy subscale scores were analyzed with an ANOVA test where all psychopathy subscale scores were entered as independent variables and ethnicity was entered as the dependent variable. Differences were discovered at the subscale level. Specifically, Latin American interpersonal manipulation scores ($M = 43.989$) were higher on average than European Americans ($M = 40.909; F(2, 203) = 5.436, p < .01, d = .255$). This finding was not in the expected direction. Latin Americans ($M = 49.00$) scored higher on average than European Americans on the egocentricity subscale ($M = 42.791; F(2, 203) = 4.675, p < .05, d = .342$). This difference was in the expected direction. In sum, there are subscale differences between Latin Americans and European Americans—one as hypothesized and one in the opposite direction as hypothesized.
Aims Three

The third aim examined the relationship between psychopathy traits and machismo across ethnicities. To address this aim, correlations were calculated for each cultural group relating machismo and psychopathy (both the PPI and SRP). Psychopathy traits as measured by the PPI and machismo were significantly related among both European Americans and Latin Americans (respectively; \( r = .253, p < .05; r = .500, p < .01 \)). In addition, psychopathy as measured by the SRP and machismo were significantly related among both European Americans and Latin Americans (respectively; \( r = .056, p = .303; r = .150, p < .05 \)). A full table of correlations in this study can be found in Appendix J. This finding supports the third hypothesis, which predicted a relationship between machismo and psychopathy traits, regardless of psychopathy measure used.

Aim Four

The fourth aim examined the interaction between psychopathy traits, machismo, and aggressive behavior. The regression was conducted by entering psychopathy, machismo, and the interaction term (psychopathy X machismo) regressed onto violence. Due to the necessity of two psychopathy measures and two violence measures, this required a series of four regressions for each ethnic group (EA \( n = 72 \), LA \( n = 131 \)), for a total of eight regressions. The first examined psychopathy (PPI), machismo, and the interaction term regressed onto aggression as measured by the CTS-2. The first set of regressions (PPI, machismo, interaction, regressed onto CTS-2) supported that machismo predicts of future violence (psychopathy: \( \beta = -1.155, t = -1.645, p = .105 \); machismo: \( \beta = -1.911, t = -2.275, p < .05 \)). This regression also supported the interaction between
psychopathy and *machismo* \((\beta = 3.086, t = 2.329, p < .05)\). Consistent with the fourth hypothesis, the direction of this model is in the expected direction; however, this was only in European Americans. As psychopathy and *machismo* increase, aggression increases also. Contrary to the hypothesis, psychopathy was the only significant predictor for violence. The results from all regressions are in Table 3.

Table 3

*Aim 4 Regression Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>LA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(t) (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CTS-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg 1</td>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>-5.745</td>
<td>-1.155</td>
<td>-1.645(3.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>-14.671</td>
<td>-14.671</td>
<td>-2.275*(6.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>3.086</td>
<td>2.329*.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg 2</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>-15.701</td>
<td>-3.274</td>
<td>-2.819*(5.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>-14.639</td>
<td>-1.810</td>
<td>-1.634***(5.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>4.092</td>
<td>2.970***(.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg 3</td>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>-4.229</td>
<td>-2.100</td>
<td>-2.100*(2.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>2.421*.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg 4</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>-11.976</td>
<td>-4.621</td>
<td>-4.253***(2.816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>-10.889</td>
<td>-2.492</td>
<td>-3.876***(2.810)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>5.636</td>
<td>4.372***(.017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* 'p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01; Reg: Regression; PPI: Psychopathic Personality Inventory; SRP: Self Report Psychopathy Scales; Int: interaction term psychopathy x *machismo* interaction; Mac: Machismo

The second set of regressions examined the predictive relationship among aggressive behavior (BPAQ) from the PPI, *machismo*, and the interaction term. The findings were consistent with hypothesis 4, that European American aggression was predicted from psychopathy, *machismo*, and the interaction term. The direction of the model was expected; psychopathy and *machismo* increases at different rates as
aggression increases, which provides further support for the fourth hypothesis. Contrary to the hypothesis, Latin American aggression was not predicted from psychopathy, _machismo_, and the interaction term. The third set of regressions examined the predictive relationship between psychopathy (SRP), _machismo_, the interaction term and aggression (CTS-2). The SRP and _machismo_ were found to be predictive of aggression. The direction of this regression was expected; as psychopathy increases aggression increases. The interaction term indicates that psychopathy and _machismo_ increases at different rates across aggression. This finding only partially supports the fourth hypothesis. The direction of the model was expected; psychopathy and the interaction increases as aggression increases, which provides further support for the fourth hypothesis. Contrary to the hypothesis, Latin Americans’ aggressive behavior was not predicted from psychopathy, _machismo_, or the interaction. The fourth and final set of regressions tested the predictive relationship between psychopathy (SRP), _machismo_, the interaction, and aggression (BPAQ). In European Americans, _machismo_ and the interaction term were discovered to be predictors of aggression. The direction of the relationship was as expected, as _machismo_ and the interaction term increase aggression increases. Psychopathy (SRP) was not found to be a predictor of aggression (BPAQ) in European Americans. This finding only partially supports the fourth hypothesis. Consistent with the hypothesis, psychopathy (SRP) and _machismo_ predicted aggression in Latin Americans. Overall, the fourth hypothesis was only partially supported, primarily due to the fact that psychopathy, _machismo_, and the interaction were only predictive of violence for European Americans. Latin Americans showed no predictive relationship between aggression and the interaction term.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Research with the Latin American community is lacking in many different areas (Schuck et al., 2004), with psychopathy being no exception (Skeem et al., 2011). The current study was the first to examine how ethnicity-specific traits (i.e. machismo) relate to psychopathy and adds to the minimal research on psychopathy among Latin Americans. Previous research has been non-committal on ethnic differences, often assuming that measures of psychopathy works and predicts in the same ways across ethnicities (Skeem et al., 2011). The current study found that there are cultural nuances in psychopathy that are not well understood, and the present findings indicate that the expression of psychopathy traits and its relationship to interpersonal violence is different among Latin Americans as compared to European Americans. First, Latin Americans do not have meaningful differences in global psychopathy scores from European Americans. Second, differences were observed at the subscale level, indicating meaningful ethnic differences in the manifestation of psychopathy traits. Specifically, Latin Americans scored higher than European Americans on interpersonal manipulation and egocentrism subscales. Third, psychopathy traits and machismo (i.e. negative aspects of culturally based masculinity) are moderately related, indicating that there is some overlap between the construct of psychopathy and machismo. Fourth, psychopathy traits, machismo, and the interaction were predictive of aggression in European Americans, but not among
Latin Americans. Each of these findings are discussed next, along with the study’s limitations and implications for research and practice.

**Primary Findings**

*Psychopathy scores differ across subscales.* Psychopathy global scores were not expected to vary across ethnicities. This hypothesis was developed based on previous research, which has supported the cross-cultural use of psychopathy measures (primarily the PCL-R and PPI; Cooke, Kossan, & Michie, 2001; Skee et al., 2011). The current study used the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI) and the Self Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP, a derivative of the PCL-R) to assess psychopathy from both personality focused and behavioral inclusive theoretical approaches. This hypothesis held for both measures, as no differences between Latin American and European American ethnicities were discovered. With the SRP, the difference approached significance, which may indicate differences between ethnic groups. This could be due to the differences in the way that these measures assess psychopathy; the SRP includes behavioral assessments that are not found in the PPI. The two measures were also developed from different theoretical backgrounds. The PPI is developed with a personality focused theoretical approach (Lilienfeld, 2003), where the SRP was developed with a behavioral inclusive theory (Lester et al., 2012). The differences in these measures may result in ethnic based differences between the psychopathy measures. Differences in the PPI and SRP are similar some findings from the factors of the Psychopathy Checklist. Factor 1 (personality deficits) and Factor 2 (antisocial behavior) of the PCL-R differentially relate to psychopathy and violence (Hare, 2002). Factor 1 of the PCL-R has been found to show similar patterns across ethnicities, whereas factor 2 has been found to differ across
ethnicity (Kosson et al., 1990). The differences discovered across ethnicities on the SRP support a growing area of research that has found cultural differences in psychopathy (Walsh, 2012). Overall, the results from the total PPI and SRP scores indicate that psychopathy traits as measured personality traits may be similar in Latin Americans and European Americans.

It was expected that Latin Americans and European Americans would differ from each other at the level of psychopathy subscales. Notably, prior psychopathy research has discovered differences at the subscale level across ethnicities (Sullivan et al., 2006), but typically emphasize generalizability across global scales. As such, hypotheses were generated based on cross cultural psychopathy research and general cultural and emotional expression research with Latin Americans. Specifically, cultural research describes the collectivist nature of Latin American ethnicity (Comez-Diaz, 2006). The collectivist emphasis on relationships and the interconnected nature of the ethnicity led to the hypothesis that Latin Americans may have protective factors against interpersonal deficits. However, because the relationship was not in the expected direction, this indicates that Latin collectivist ethnicity may not provide protective factors from psychopathy, as was originally hypothesized. Quite the opposite in fact: those who are deviant in a collectivist ethnicity may grow even more so because of the nature of the ethnicity (Comez-Diaz, 2006). This suggests different mechanisms may underlie interpersonal manipulation across ethnicities (Sullivan et al., 2006). The nature of the ethnicity may make it easier for those who have higher psychopathic traits to manipulate others. Due to close interpersonal ties, the ethnicity may simply provide more opportunity for manipulation compared to European Americans.
Multicultural emotional expression research discovered that Latin Americans are more likely to exhibit pride than any other emotion when compared to European Americans and African Americans (Scollon et al., 2004). This led to the hypothesis predicting higher levels of egocentricity among Latin Americans. Consistent with the hypothesis, Latin Americans scored higher on the egocentrism measure when compared to European Americans. Further, differences in egocentrism are indicative of an emotional preference to express pride, unique to the Latin American ethnicity. The differences are caused by the Latin American proclivity towards expressing pride above all other emotions (Scollon et al., 2006). Since pride is one of the most commonly expressed emotions in Latin American ethnicity, it stands to reason that even in disordered personalities, pride would be a highly expressed emotion. Therefore, Latin Americans with psychopathy will have higher levels of egocentrism. These differences support that psychopathic traits are expressed differently across ethnicities.

**Psychopathy and machismo are related.** The third primary finding is that psychopathy traits and *machismo* are related. *Machismo* is conceptualized as culturally based masculinity with both negative and positive aspects (Arciniega et al., 2008). Negative aspects of *machismo* were the focus in this study; these negative aspects include chauvinism, violence, and rudeness. The present study revealed a moderate to large relationship between psychopathy traits and *machismo*, depending on the measure of psychopathy. This finding was expected because the components common to psychopathy and *machismo* conceptually overlap. These include the hypermasculine nature of psychopathy and *machismo* (Patrick et al., 2008; Gudjonsson et al., 2011). Hypermasculinity is a component of superficial charm that is often observed in
psychopathy (Patrick et al., 2008). Negative aspects of machismo (i.e. self-centeredness and trouble with emotional expression) are often associated with hypermasculinity (Arciniega et al., 2008). Overlap between psychopathy and machismo also comes from a certain proclivity towards violence and aggression. (Gudjonsson et al., 2011; Skeem & Cooke, 2010). Machismo has not been related directly to aggressive behavior; however, hypermasculinity is related to an increase incidence of violence (Gudjonsson et al., 2011). Psychopathy is comprised of personality features that are commonly related to aggressive and violent behavior and have been used to predict violent behavior (Skeem & Cooke, 2010). Egocentricity also plays a key role in psychopathy and machismo (Patrick et al., 2008; Arciniegra et al., 2008). In psychopathy, egocentrism is a central component of the personality disorder and is further accented by a general lack of empathy (Patrick et al., 2008). This could be related to selfishness and egocentrism within the construct of machismo (Arciniegra et al., 2008). These correlations between psychopathy and machismo indicate that there is overlap egocentricity, hypermasculinity, and aggressive behavior (Arciniegra et al., 2008).

It is interesting to note that the relationship between psychopathy traits and machismo was present for both European Americans and Latin Americans. This was assessed because machismo is an applicable construct in both European and Latin Americans (Arciniegra et. al., 2006; Walker, 2005). Although machismo is conceptualized as culturally based masculinity among Latin Americans, there is some previous research that has assessed machismo in European Americans (Walker, 2005). This study supports the previous findings that the traits related to machismo may not be specific to Latin Americans. Previous research with machismo has also found that it was
related to aggression and violence in European Americans (Walker, 2005). The current finding is especially interesting based on the large amount of cultural differences discovered in the current study. However, the next finding indicates that machismo’s predictive utility may vary across ethnicities.

Psychopathy and machismo are related to aggression for European Americans. Psychopathy and machismo are related to aggression in Latin Americans to a lesser degree. The fourth hypothesis was developed through bringing together two different types of literature: psychopathy and machismo research. I first considered the relationship between psychopathy and machismo and how this might impact violence; this led to expecting an interaction. This hypothesis predicted that psychopathy traits, machismo, and their interaction would predict aggression and violence in Latin and European Americans. However, European American violence was predicted by psychopathy traits, machismo, and the interaction. The significant interaction indicates that psychopathy and machismo increase at different rates across aggression. Psychopathy traits and machismo were discovered to predict aggression or violence in Latin Americans. This finding is not as strong as the relationship between psychopathy, aggression, and violence. Psychopathy, machismo, and the interaction were discovered to significantly predict aggression in European Americans, which supports previous research with psychopathy and machismo in European Americans (Walsh et al., 2007; Skeem et al., 2005; Porter & Woodworth, 2006; Walker, 2004). The results also display, for the first time, that machismo and its interaction with psychopathy traits also predict aggressive behavior in European Americans. This supports previous research that has discovered that hypermasculinity is related to aggressive behavior. This finding may
exist because hypermasculinity is not culturally accepted among European Americans; therefore those who express this personality trait may have other more problematic personality traits and/or a tendency towards violence. Although this model was significant for European Americans, the results were not the same for Latin Americans.

Psychopathy, *machismo*, and the interaction term were not found to significantly predict aggressive behavior in Latin Americans. These findings were unexpected given the majority of literature support relationships between psychopathy and aggression. However, these findings also have found that psychopathy does not predict violence as well with ethnic minorities (Sullivan & Kosson, 2006). Previous research with aggressive behavior has supported a relationship with psychopathy; however, Latin Americans and psychopathy have been tenuously related to violence through being included in major analysis and are often not assessed separately by ethnicity (Sullivan & Kosson, 2006). This indicates that future psychopathy research should assess ethnicity separately. These results did not support the hypothesis, which expected all three constructs to predict aggression. This is meaningful for the measurement of psychopathy among Latin Americans; many psychopathy researchers have assumed that if the global scores of the measure show no cultural differences, then the construct is then the same across ethnicities (Skeem et al, 2011). The present study supports the notion that this is not the case, and the expression of psychopathy and its correlates may vary widely across ethnicities (Sullivan, 2006; Walsh, 2012). The predictive differences discovered between Latin Americans and European Americans indicates significant cultural differences. This supports a controversial study that found similar results. Walsh (2012) discovered that psychopathy was not at all predictive of violence for Latin Americans whereas other
research supported the predictive relationship of psychopathy and violence with Latin Americans (Sullivan, 2006). The current study confirmed Walsh’s (2012) results, which may indicate that the assessment of Latin American psychopathy traits may not be consistent across ethnicity (Walsh, 2012). The reason behind the current findings may relate to cultural differences for Africans Americans in psychopathy research. Research among African Americans suggests that psychopathy may not be as problematic (Skeem et al., 2011). This may be due to differences in the distribution of psychopathy among ethnic minority groups. Impulsivity has been observed to not be as significant in African Americans when compared to European Americans, but the personality factor of psychopathy (factor 1 of the PCL-R) displays similar patterns in African Americans when compared to European Americans. However, the antisocial behaviors factor (factor 2 PCL-R) differs between ethnicities (Kosson, Smith, and Newman, 1990). Similar to African Americans, Latin American psychopathy may not be related to antisocial behaviors in the same way as it is in European American ethnicity. Psychopathy, while still technically deviant, may not result in the correlates (i.e. aggression and violence) that are common to European Americans. Moving forward, psychopathy research should be more inclusive of cultural differences and ensure the application of psychopathy and its correlates are used appropriately. Aggression as measured by the conflict tactics scale indicates that psychopathy is predictive of intimate partner violence. This supports previous research, which was able to predict the likelihood of reoffending based on psychopathy with Latin Americans (Rock, 2012). This relationship between psychopathy and intimate partner violence may be due to the interpersonal deficit facet in psychopathy. Individuals suffering from psychopathy may be more inclined to be violent
with their family or spouses. This facet of psychopathy may predispose individuals with psychopathy to be much more likely to commit intimate partner violence crimes.

Another notable finding is that *machismo* was not related to violence in Latin Americans. This may be due to the fact that *machismo* has different cultural significance in European and Latin ethnicity. For Latin ethnicities, *machismo* can often be positive and adaptive and is related to caring for family, loving, and even nurturing (Arciniegra et al., 2008), while in European American ethnicities *machismo* is perceived as a negative and maladaptive, this has also been related to violence and negative life outcomes (Walker, 2005). These cultural differences add a layer of complexity to this study. The present study suggests that there truly are cultural differences between Latin Americans and European Americans within psychopathy and *machismo*. Research needs to attend to these differences and realize that ethnicity can sometimes have a great impact on psychological constructs and their usage.

**Limitations**

As with any research, the current study had some limitations, some of which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Due to the use of a student population, limitations may arise when generalizing to the general population or offender samples. However, there are strengths in using students by minimizing variability and having a fairly uniform sample. Moving forward, studies similar to the current one could employ interview techniques and a wider community or prison sample. Another possible limitation is that, out of necessity (to recruit enough European Americans), two different student samples were used. In an attempt to ensure that these groups were compatible,
they were compared by demographics and found to be compatible overall. Further, self-report measures can pose problems such as random responding, social desirability, and dishonesty. These problems were addressed by informing participants of the time constraints of the study, assessing for random responding, and using the validity scales of the PPI. These validity scales assessed for social desirability and deceptive response patterns (Lilienfeld, 2006). These resulted in overall normal response patterns for participants as measured by the PPI’s validity scales. This indicates that the majority of participants were honest and not responding in a socially desirable manner.

**Implications for future research**

Future research is needed to further disentangle the relationships among psychopathy, *machismo*, and violence to fully understand what is going on at a causal and construct basis. Specifically, prospective research would allow researchers not only to assess violence and psychopathy but also compare the predictability of psychopathy with aggression, against actual aggressive acts. This will also likely inform future research on the predictive utility of psychopathy (as measured by both the SRP and PPI) for future violent offenses within the Latin American prison population (Walsh, 2012). Further research should be done to ensure that the SRP is generalizable across ethnicities. This could be done by reassessing the psychometric properties for Latin Americans. Another way to do this would be to sample many different ethnicities and examine psychometric findings across ethnicity to ensure cross-cultural validity. The present results would benefit from being replicated with different samples (i.e. different Latin Americans, prison samples, and community samples). Also, there needs to be further research as to why psychopathy does not seem predictive of aggression and violence with Latin
Americans. Due to the nature of the current study, it is unable to relate any causal mechanisms. Experimental studies could attempt to shed light on the underlying causal mechanisms; this could be done by having samples of both European American and Latin Americans high in psychopathy traits, perform tasks to test the different ways these traits are expressed.

**Implications for practical application**

The findings from this research have the potential to affect policy and treatment for individuals with psychopathy. For example, criminal justice policies that use psychopathy measures as risk assessment tools may need to also consider the ethnicity of the individual up for sentencing or probation (Skeem et al., 2011); the fact that the present study uncovered ethnic differences in psychopathy suggests that measures developed among European Americans may not be appropriate for Latin Americans. The study’s findings suggest that measures of psychopathy may not be accurate risk assessment tools among Latin Americans. Until more research can be done on psychopathy among Latin Americans, criminal justice agencies could use risk assessment tools that have been validated with the Latin American ethnicity. For example, the MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment tool shows promise with Latin Americans (Cirlugea, Benuto, & Leany, 2013). There is limited research that supports the constructs usage to predict violence with Latin Americans (Skeem et al., 2011). Criminal justice agencies should be made aware that psychopathy measures are not risk assessments that should be used with Latin Americans. Additional research is desperately needed in this area, but until that is possible psychopathy should not be used in court, probation, or parole decisions of Latin Americans. The current study is the first step in understanding
cultural differences and discovering their existence—this research represents a first step towards ensuring that research is not blind to culture in the pursuit of understanding psychopathy.
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APPENDIX A

Please answer the following questions

about yourself: Gender:  Male  Female

Age: _____

Ethnicity (circle all that apply):  African/Black  Caucasian/White  Hispanic/Latino(a)  East Asian  South Asian  Native  American  Other__________

Country (and state) of origin

How far are you in your degree? Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, or Other

Average Annual Income?

What is your occupation (besides student):

Have you ever been arrested?

If yes, Why?

Have you ever been sentenced to probation or prison?

If yes, Why?
APPENDIX B:

Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (SRP)

SRP III – R11
Please rate the degree to which you agree with the following statements about you. You can be honest because your name will be detached from the answers as soon as they are submitted.

1  2  3  4  5
Disagree Strongly  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Agree
Strongly

1. I’m a rebellious person.
2. I’m more tough-minded than other people.
3. I think I could "beat" a lie detector.
4. I have taken illegal drugs (e.g., marijuana, ecstasy).
5. I have never been involved in delinquent gang activity.
6. I have never stolen a truck, car or motorcycle.
7. Most people are wimps.
8. I purposely flatter people to get them on my side.
9. I’ve often done something dangerous just for the thrill of it.
10. I have tricked someone into giving me money.
11. It tortures me to see an injured animal.
12. I have assaulted a law enforcement official or social worker.
13. I have pretended to be someone else in order to get something.
14. I always plan out my weekly activities.
15. I like to see fist-fights.
16. I’m not tricky or sly.
17. I’d be good at a dangerous job because I make fast decisions.
18. I have never tried to force someone to have sex.
19. My friends would say that I am a warm person.
20. I would get a kick out of ‘scamming’ someone.
21. I have never attacked someone with the idea of injuring them.
22. I never miss appointments.
23. I avoid horror movies.
24. I trust other people to be honest.
25. I hate high speed driving.
26. I feel so sorry when I see a homeless person.
27. It's fun to see how far you can push people before they get upset.
28. I enjoy doing wild things.
29. I have broken into a building or vehicle in order to steal something or vandalize.
30. I don't bother to keep in touch with my family any more.
31. I find it difficult to manipulate people.
32. I rarely follow the rules.
33. I never cry at movies.
34. I have never been arrested.
35. You should take advantage of other people before they do it to you.
36. I don't enjoy gambling for real money.
37. People sometimes say that I'm cold-hearted.
38. People can usually tell if I am lying.
39. I like to have sex with people I barely know.
40. I love violent sports and movies.
41. Sometimes you have to pretend you like people to get something out of them.
42. I am an impulsive person.
43. I have taken hard drugs (e.g., heroin, cocaine).
44. I'm a soft-hearted person.
45. I can talk people into anything.
46. I never shoplifted from a store.
47. I don't enjoy taking risks.
48. People are too sensitive when I tell them the truth about themselves.
49. I was convicted of a serious crime.
50. Most people tell lies everyday.
51. I keep getting in trouble for the same things over and over.
52. Every now and then I carry a weapon (knife or gun) for protection.
53. People cry way too much at funerals.
54. You can get what you want by telling people what they want to hear.
55. I easily get bored.
56. I never feel guilty over hurting others.
57. I have threatened people into giving me money, clothes, or makeup.
58. A lot of people are “suckers” and can easily be fooled.
59. I admit that I often “mouth off” without thinking.
60. I sometimes dump friends that I don’t need any more.
61. I would never step on others to get what I want.
62. I have close friends who served time in prison.
63. I purposely tried to hit someone with the vehicle I was driving.
64. I have violated my probation from prison
APPENDIX C:
PSYCHOAPATHIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY SCORE REPORT

PPI-R Scoring Summary Table
(Normative Group: Community/College)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Scales</th>
<th>Raw score</th>
<th>T score</th>
<th>%ile</th>
<th>90% C.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellian Egocentricity (ME)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellious Nonconformity (RN)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>52-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame Externalization (BE)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carefree Nonplanfulness (CN)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence (SOI)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>59-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearlessness (F)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>52-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Immunity (STI)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldheartedness (C)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity Scales</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtuous Responding (VR)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant Responding (DR)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36-58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>358</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>65-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME + RN + BE + CN + SOI + F + STI + C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Centered Impulsivity (ME + RN + BE + CN)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearless Dominance (SOI + F + STI)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldheartedness (C)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inconsistent Responding Total</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Protocol classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 - 94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR 40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 - 93.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PPI-R T-Score Profile
(Normative Group: Community/College)
APPENDIX D:
BUSS PERRY AGGRESSION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate how frequently the following things happened in the 12 months prior to starting the program using the scale below:

0 = Never
1 = Maybe once
2 = 1-2 times
3 = 3 times
4 = 4 times
5 = 5 or more times

Punched

1. ___ Did this to my partner
2. ___ My partner did this to me
3. ___ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
4. ___ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
5. ___ Did this to a stranger
6. ___ A stranger did this to me

Spread rumors

7. ___ Did this to my partner
8. ___ My partner did this to me
9. ___ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
10. ___ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
11. ___ Did this to a stranger
12. ___ A stranger did this to me

Shoved

13. ___ Did this to my partner
14. ___ My partner did this to me
15. ___ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
16. ___ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
17. ___ Did this to a stranger
18. ___ A stranger did this to me

Insulted person behind back

19. ___ Did this to my partner
20. ___ My partner did this to me
21. ___ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
22. ___ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
23. ___ Did this to a stranger
24. ___ A stranger did this to me
Threw an object at the person

25. ____ Did this to my partner
26. ____ My partner did this to me
27. ____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
28. ____ Did this to a stranger
29. ____ A stranger did this to me

Made up stories about the person

31. ____ Did this to my partner
32. ____ My partner did this to me
33. ____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
34. ____ Did this to a stranger
35. ____ A stranger did this to me

Hit the person with an object

37. ____ Did this to my partner
38. ____ My partner did this to me
39. ____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
40. ____ Did this to a stranger
41. ____ A stranger did this to me

Gossiped behind person's back

43. ____ Did this to my partner
44. ____ My partner did this to me
45. ____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
46. ____ Did this to a stranger
47. ____ A stranger did this to me

Said bad things behind back

49. ____ Did this to my partner
50. ____ My partner did this to me
51. ____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
52. ____ Did this to a stranger
53. ____ A stranger did this to me

Slapped in the face

55. ____ Did this to my partner
56. ____ My partner did this to me
57. ____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
58. ____ Did this to a stranger
59. ____ A stranger did this to me

Made up lies about person

61. ____ Did this to my partner
62. ____ My partner did this to me
63. ____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
64. ____ A stranger did this to me
65. _____ Did this to a stranger
66. _____ A stranger did this to me

Kicked them Stole things from them

67. _____ Did this to my partner
68. _____ My partner did this to me
69. _____ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
70. _____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
71. _____ Did this to a stranger
72. _____ A stranger did this to me

Threaten with weapon

73. _____ Did this to my partner
74. _____ My partner did this to me
75. _____ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
76. _____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
77. _____ Did this to a stranger
78. _____ A stranger did this to me

Turned your friends against them

79. _____ Did this to my partner
80. _____ My partner did this to me
81. _____ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
82. _____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
83. _____ Did this to a stranger
84. _____ A stranger did this to me

Scratched them

85. _____ Did this to my partner
86. _____ My partner did this to me
87. _____ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
88. _____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
89. _____ Did this to a stranger
90. _____ A stranger did this to me

Told others not to associate with them

91. _____ Did this to my partner
92. _____ My partner did this to me
93. _____ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
94. _____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
95. _____ Did this to a stranger
96. _____ A stranger did this to me

Screamed at the person

97. _____ Did this to my partner
98. _____ My partner did this to me
99. _____ Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
100. _____ Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
101. _____ Did this to a stranger
102. _____ A stranger did this to me

Cursed at the person
103. Did this to my partner
104. My partner did this to me
105. Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
106. Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
107. Did this to a stranger
108. A stranger did this to me

Pinched

109. Did this to my partner
110. My partner did this to me
111. Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
112. Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
113. Did this to a stranger
114. A stranger did this to me

Made obscene gesture

115. Did this to my partner
116. My partner did this to me
117. Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
118. Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
119. Did this to a stranger
120. A stranger did this to me

Called obscene name

121. Did this to my partner
122. My partner did this to me
123. Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
124. Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
125. Did this to a stranger
126. A stranger did this to me

Beaten them up

127. Did this to my partner
128. My partner did this to me
129. Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
130. Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
131. Did this to a stranger
132. A stranger did this to me

Grabbed the person

133. Did this to my partner
134. My partner did this to me
135. Did this to someone flirting with or harassing my partner
136. Someone flirting with or harassing my partner did this to me
137. Did this to a stranger
138. A stranger did this to me
APPENDIX E:
CASTRO LAB MACHISMO MEASURE

9. Gender Issues

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree with the following questions using the scale below:


1. __When it comes to family decisions, the man’s opinion is always the most important and should never be questioned.

2. ___A man should always face his problems, not avoid them.

3. ___It is a man's right to exaggerate his personal accomplishments to make himself look important.

4. ____ A man deserves to be taken care of by the women in his family.

5. A real man takes care of himself and doesn't need a wife to do everything for him.

6. ___A real man will fight anyone who disrespects his authority.

7. ___A real man will do the right thing, even if it is unpopular.

8. ___It is wrong for a man to admit that he needs help

9. ___A man should always tell his wife and children how much he loves them.

10. ____A man must appear tough in the eyes of others.

11. A man should avoid activities that are commonly performed by women.

12. It is better for a man to be a follower rather than a leader.

13. ___A man's first priority is his family.

14. ___
A real man will refuse to share the household responsibilities with his wife (e.g., cooking meals).

15. __ A man must stand up for what he believes.

16. ___ A real man can share his feelings.

17. ___ A real man can follow orders as well as give them.

18. __ Men who can drink a lot of alcohol impress their friends with their strength.

19. ___ A good father treats every member of his family as equals.

20. __ I avoid dangerous situations.

21. __ A real man can ask for help when he needs it.

22. __ It is acceptable for little boys to play with dolls.

23. __ A man who can express his emotions is strong.

24. ___ A real man puts the needs of his wife and children before his own.

25. A real man is dishonest and is unfaithful to his wife.

26. ___ A wife must obey her husband at all times.

27. __ A man who cries at a family funeral is weak.

20. __ A father will often guide and care for his children.

21. __ It is inappropriate for a man to talk to others about his problems.

22. ___ A man is always responsible for protecting his family.

23. __ A good father will hug and kiss his children often.

24. ___ A father’s best form of discipline for his children is physical punishment (hitting them).
How often have you done the following behaviors within the past five years? Here the term partner refers to wife, spouse, partner, or girlfriend. If you are not currently in a relationship consider previous relationships.

How OFTEN did you do these behaviors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-Does not apply</th>
<th>1-Never</th>
<th>2-Seldom</th>
<th>3-Sometimes</th>
<th>4-Often</th>
<th>5-Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cared for your partner when she was ill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shared your feelings with your partner about a problem that you had.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participated with your friends in a drinking contest on “Who can drink the most?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Helped your partner with household responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Left home at night to drink with friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Made a family decision without asking for your partner’s opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asked for help when you had trouble completing a task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Left home for a while without telling your family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Told your partner to change her outfit when you didn’t like what she was wearing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Refused to let your partner go out with her friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stood by your beliefs even when others disagreed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Told your friends a story about yourself that exaggerated your strengths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Refused to cry even when you were really sad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Worked extra hours to pay your bills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Asked your partner about her feelings when she seemed sad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Turned down a challenge to prove your manhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Acted to resolve a difficult situation in your life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Carried a weapon just to let other people know you have it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Told your partner and children that you love them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Bought something for yourself instead of for your children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Fulfilled a promise that you made to a loved one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Scolded your son for participating in games played mostly by girls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Hid personal information that other people needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Helped your children solve a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Hugged a close friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Used physical punishment to discipline your children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Admitted a failure in front of female friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Encouraged others to do the honest thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Asked your partner permission before making a big purchase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Depended on your partner to do work that you could really do on your own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F:
ACCULTRUATION SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARSMA-II</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I speak Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I speak English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I enjoy speaking Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I associate with Anglos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I associate with Méxicans and/or Méxican Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I enjoy listening to Spanish language music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I enjoy listening to English language music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I enjoy Spanish language TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I enjoy English language TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I enjoy English language movies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I enjoy Spanish language movies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I enjoy reading (e.g., books in Spanish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I enjoy reading (e.g., books in English)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I write (e.g., letters in Spanish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I write (e.g., letters in English)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My thinking is done in the English language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My thinking is done in the Spanish language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My contact with México has been</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My contact with the USA has been</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My father identifies or identified himself as ‘Méxicoano’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. My mother identifies or identified herself as ‘Méxicana’

22. My friends, while I was growing up, were of Mexican origin.

23. My friends, while I was growing up, were of Anglo origin.

24. My family cooks Mexican foods

25. My friends now are of Anglo origin

26. My friends now are of Mexican origin.

27. I like to identify myself as an Anglo American

28. I like to identify myself as a Mexican American

29. I like to identify myself as an American
30. I have difficulty accepting some ideas held by Anglos.
31. I have difficulty accepting some behaviors exhibited by Anglos.
32. I have difficulty accepting some behaviors of Anglos.
33. I have difficulty accepting some values held by Anglos.
34. I have difficulty accepting certain practices and customs commonly found in some Anglos.
35. I have, or think I would have difficulty accepting Anglos as close personal friends.
36. I have difficulty accepting some idea held by some Mexicans.
37. I have difficulty accepting certain attitudes held by Mexicans.
38. I have difficulty accepting some behaviors exhibited by Mexicans.
39. I have difficulty accepting some values held by some Mexicans.
40. I have difficulty accepting certain practices and customs commonly found in some Mexicans.
41. I have or think I would have difficulty accepting Mexicans as close personal friends.
42. I have difficulty accepting ideas held by some Mexican Americans.
43. I have difficulty accepting some values held by Mexican Americans.
44. I have difficulty accepting some behaviors that exhibited by Mexican Americans.
45. I have difficulty accepting certain attitudes held by Mexican Americans.
46. I have difficulty accepting certain practices and customs commonly found in some Mexican Americans.
47. I have, or I think I would have, difficulty accepting Mexican Americans as close personal friends.
APPENDIX G:
ATTENTION CHECK ITEMS

1. Please leave this question blank.
2. Please mark number 5 on this question.
3. Please mark number 1 on this question.
APPENDIX H:
CORRELATION TABLE

Table 4

*All Scales and Subscales Correlations and Inter-correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eth</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Uni</th>
<th>SRP IPM</th>
<th>SRP CA</th>
<th>SRP ELS</th>
<th>SRP ASB</th>
<th>SRP TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>-0.459</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>-0.582</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP IPM</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP CA</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP ELS</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP ASB</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP TOT</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI ME</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI SOI</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-0.207</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI F</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI RN</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI C</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI STI</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI DR</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI CN</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI VR</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI BE</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPAQ</td>
<td>Mac PF</td>
<td>Mac EE</td>
<td>Mac MP</td>
<td>Mac CC</td>
<td>Mac HC</td>
<td>Mac SC</td>
<td>Mac AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.207</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>-0.283</td>
<td>-0.405</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPI ME</td>
<td>PPI SOI</td>
<td>PPI F</td>
<td>PPI RN</td>
<td>PPI C</td>
<td>PPI STI</td>
<td>PPI DR</td>
<td>PPI CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI ME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI SOI</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI F</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI RN</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI C</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI STI</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI DR</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI CN</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI VR</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI BE</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPAQ</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac PF</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac EE</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac MP</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac CC</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac HC</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac SC</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac AT</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac BH</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac TOT</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC E</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAS</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>BPAQ</td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Mac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPAQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC E</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mac BH</td>
<td>Mac TOT</td>
<td>AC E</td>
<td>AC S</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>CPAS</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI TOT</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>-0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI SCI</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI FD</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPI TOT</th>
<th>PPI SCI</th>
<th>PPI FD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI TOT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI SCI</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI FD</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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