

Running Head: Psychopathy and persuasion

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

Brandon Weiss

University of Georgia

Donald R. Lynam

Purdue University

Joshua D. Miller

University of Georgia

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

Abstract

Previous work has demonstrated mostly null to small associations between boldness and externalizing behaviors associated with psychopathy. The present study replicates this finding and examines an alternative manner in which boldness may be relevant to the construct of psychopathy, namely by enhancing psychopathic individuals' capacity for interpersonal manipulation. Using data collected from an MTurk sample, we measured persuasiveness using ratings of video-recorded product pitches and examined the relations between psychopathic and general traits and persuasiveness across "weaker" (improvised) and "stronger" (scripted) conditions. Boldness exhibited a small, positive relation with perceived persuasiveness in the improvised condition only; conversely, psychopathic traits related to antagonism/meanness and disinhibition exhibited small negative associations with persuasiveness and trust in the scripted condition. The results suggest that boldness may help individuals persuade others so as to achieve desired outcomes, although the effect was quite small in nature, whereas psychopathic individuals who are not high on boldness may need to use other tactics (e.g., intimidation; coercion) to manipulate others.

Keywords: psychopathy, fearless dominance, boldness, persuasiveness, manipulation

Psychopathy is one of the most studied and well-validated personality disorders; yet considerable debate remains regarding its underlying structure and the centrality of certain elements within it (e.g., Lilienfeld et al., 2012; 2015; Lynam & Miller, 2012; Miller & Lynam, 2012). One of the most debated aspects of psychopathy is boldness (Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger, 2009), also known as Fearless Dominance in some inventories (i.e., Psychopathic Personality Inventory – Revised; Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005), which is characterized by resilience to stress, fearlessness, and social influence. Boldness’ relevance to psychopathy has been debated in view of its null to small correlations with maladaptive outcomes historically linked to psychopathy (e.g., antisocial behavior, aggression, substance use), as well as its divergence from measures of psychopathy that are based on the Psychopathic Checklist - Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003) (Miller & Lynam, 2012). However, boldness appears in many non-PCL-R measures of psychopathy (Lilienfeld et al., 2016) and classic descriptions of psychopathy in which psychopathic individuals are described as being callous, egocentric, impulsive, and irresponsible while also appearing well-mannered, charming, and agentic (e.g., Cleckley, 1941; Crego & Widiger, 2016; Miller, Lynam, Widiger, & Leukefeld, 2001).

Those who dispute boldness’ relevance to psychopathy regard evidence of null to weak relations with externalizing behaviors (e.g., antisocial behavior [ASB], aggression) as problematic based on the premise that antisociality is the critical criterion that defines psychopathy and is responsible for the tremendous interest in this construct across a number of scientific disciplines (DeLisi, 2009; Hare & Neumann, 2010; Karpman, 1948; Lykken, 1995; Lynam & Miller, 2012; Miller & Lynam, 2012). Others disagree, however, arguing that ASB should not be considered central to psychopathy, but rather represents an irregular behavioral manifestation arising from it (Skeem & Cooke, 2010; Lilienfeld, 1998), a view that is consistent

with certain prominent clinical theorists for whom ASB may have been of secondary importance. For instance, Cleckley (1941) focused on ASB that was “inadequately motivated,” although “long histories of ASB appeared in all 15 of Cleckley’s cases” (p. 342; Lynam & Miller, 2012).

Although boldness may be only weakly linked to overt antisocial behavior, it may exert effects via more subtle forms of interpersonal behavior. In addition to the explicit and overt antisocial behaviors typically associated with psychopathy (e.g., Hare & Neumann, 2008), prominent conceptualizations suggest that psychopathic traits are associated with manipulation--the willingness and ability to deceive others for personal gain (Cleckley, 1941). Most models and measures of psychopathy have explicit representations of such content. Facet 1 of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (i.e., Interpersonal; Hare, 2003) includes items related to manipulativeness and superficial charm, as do self-report measures derived from this assessment (e.g., Self-report Psychopathy Scale [Paulhus, Neumann, & Hare, 2009]). Other measures such as the Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised (Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005) and the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment (Lynam et al., 2011) also include relevant scales titled “Machiavellian Egocentricity” and “Manipulation,” respectively. Most of these scales load on a domain that is both theoretically and empirically linked with trait disagreeableness/antagonism (Lynam & Miller, 2015). There is also some evidence to suggest that boldness may be linked to charm and manipulativeness given small to moderate relations with PCL-R Interpersonal facet (Venables, Hall, & Patrick, 2013), weak to moderate relations with manipulativeness as indexed by clinical self-report and interview measures (e.g., Strickland et al., 2013), and small to moderate inverse relations with five-factor model (FFM) Straightforwardness (e.g., Miller, Lamkin, Maples-Keller, & Lynam, 2016).

Boldness and Persuasiveness

Boldness-related traits may be relevant to interpersonal manipulativeness if such traits make psychopathic individuals more persuasive, allowing such individuals to penetrate deeper into social networks before their more clearly aversive traits (i.e., antagonism; disinhibition) are detected. One study found that boldness exhibited a curvilinear relation with sales performance, such that increases in boldness up until $-.39$ standard deviations were associated with increased sales performance, after which point boldness was associated with decreased performance (Titze, Blickle, & Wihler, 2017). Although there is little research available on the relation of boldness and persuasiveness per se, there is some research available, particularly within the industrial-organizational psychology literature, linking the main personality correlates of boldness – extraversion and (low) neuroticism (Miller & Lynam, 2012). For instance, extraversion has a generally positive relation to sales performance, sales figures and supervisor ratings of sales success (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Vinchur et al., 1998).

It bears noting that persuasiveness does not in itself imply manipulativeness and/or antisociality in that individuals can persuade others to behave in more prosocial behaviors (e.g., using famous individuals to encourage others to vote, get vaccinated, etc.). If boldness evinces a substantive relation to persuasiveness, it is possible that bold individuals use persuasiveness in the service of prosocial motives in their interpersonal relationships (e.g., persuading a loved one to make a positive life change), given findings linking boldness/Fearless Dominance to some prosocial qualities including empathy, emotion recognition, and sociability (Gatner et al., 2016) as well as altruism under conditions of physical or social risk (e.g., heroism; Smith, Lilienfeld, Coffey, & Dabbs, 2013).

Examining Persuasiveness in Weak and Strong Situations

To study an individual difference like persuasiveness, it is important to consider the

extent to which the situation may affect the degree to which the trait is observed. Theory and research on the expression of individual differences in “weak” versus “strong” situations (Mischel, 1977; Snyder & Ickes, 1985) is useful for designing studies that optimize the likelihood of observing individual differences. Situations that are relatively ambiguous and fail to specify behavioral norms are considered “weak” because no particular response is dictated by the situation. Conversely, situations that provide individuals with salient cues for a circumscribed set of behaviors are considered “strong” (e.g., how to behave during a standardized test). Previous research has suggested that traits are typically more predictive of behavior in weak situations (e.g., Meyer, Dalal, & Bonaccio, 2009) because they are more conducive to variable expression of dispositional traits (e.g., Monson, Hesley, & Chernick, 1982).

Present Study

The present study examines the associations among psychopathic traits, general traits, and persuasiveness based on ratings of video-recorded product pitches, in which participants were incentivized to persuade raters to buy a specific product. We examined this association across two conditions: a “weak” condition in which participants were asked to video-record themselves giving an improvised pitch for a new smartphone; and a “strong” condition in which participants were asked to video-record themselves giving a scripted pitch of a photo editing smartphone app. We expected that the improvised condition would yield stronger effect sizes for psychopathy than the scripted condition.

Our first aim was to replicate previous findings on the relations among psychopathic traits and self-reports of externalizing behaviors; we expect traits related to antagonism/meanness and disinhibition to show stronger associations with externalizing outcomes than traits related to boldness. Second, we examine relations between psychopathic

and general personality traits and ratings of persuasiveness across improvised and scripted conditions. As a third aim, we examine relations between psychopathic traits and ratings of trust in an exploratory fashion in order to investigate whether trust-building may be another manner in which boldness aids psychopathic individuals.¹

Method

Participants

A power analysis indicated that a sample of at least 300 would be sufficiently well-powered (at .95) to detect correlations as small as .20 using a $p \leq .01$ threshold for significance. Six hundred thirty three participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk of which 139 were excluded due to invariant responding to more than 85% of EPA items or BFI items and/or invalid responding based on Elemental Psychopathy Assessment validity scales. One hundred eighty seven participants were excluded due to failure to submit at least one video, leaving a final sample of 307 (165 females and 145 males; *mean* age = 31.39 [*SD* = 9.19]; 74% White, 11% Black, 6% Asian, and 10% Hispanic). Independent samples t-test analyses were conducted to test for differences between validly responding participants who did and did not submit videos. Participants who submitted videos exhibited lower levels of antagonism- and disinhibition-related traits (i.e., TriPM Meanness, $d = -.64$; TriPM Disinhibition, $d = -.56$; EPA Antagonism, $d = -.54$; EPA Disinhibition, $d = -.43$; EPA Narcissism, $d = -.26$; BFI

¹ Results from three additional aims are provided in supplemental materials. First, we examine several possible confounding variables including gender, intelligence, attractiveness, and video length. Second, we examine the association between psychopathic traits and the use of pre-specified pros and cons in product pitches, and additional pros (i.e., pros that were not specified by the experimental protocol) that participants chose to present in the improvised condition. We conceptualize these outcomes as possible indices of deception. Third, given ongoing debates, we also examined whether levels of boldness moderate the association between other psychopathic traits and criteria.

Agreeableness, $d = .38$; BFI Conscientiousness, $d = .23$; BFI Openness, $d = -.60$). Importantly, the groups did not differ on traits related to boldness (i.e., Boldness, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Neuroticism), except for EPA Narcissism. IRB approval was obtained for all aspects of the study.

Video-recording Persuasive Pitch Procedure

Participants were asked to video-record themselves giving two 30-second to 2-minute presentations of a consumer product. In the first condition (improvised; i.e., “weak” condition), participants were asked to improvise a “persuasive pitch for a new smartphone” using elements from a list of eight pros (e.g., “Good low light performance”) and six cons (e.g., “heavier than chief competitor”). Participants were asked to use at least two cons (see Supplemental Materials for list). In the second condition (scripted; i.e., “strong” condition), participants were asked to recite a script detailing the attributes of a new mobile app (see Supplemental Materials for script). Participants were directed to read from the script to reduce variation in persuasiveness due to possible effects of reciting from memory. In order to incentivize performance, participants were told that the 5 most persuasive participants in each condition would receive a bonus of \$20.00. Participants uploaded their videos to a digital storage database using a file transfer link.

Predictor Measures

Triarchic Psychopathy Measure. (TriPM). The TriPM (Patrick, 2010) is a 58-item self-report measure of psychopathy composed of three scales: Boldness (19 items; $\alpha = .88$), Meanness (19 items; $\alpha = .88$), and Disinhibition (20 items; $\alpha = .87$). Scale intercorrelations are reported in Supplemental Table 1. TriPM data were available for 307 participants.

Elemental Psychopathy Assessment Short Form (EPA-SF). The EPA-SF is an 88-item version of the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment (Lynam et al., 2013). It assesses 18 subscales

of psychopathy, as well as two validity scales (Infrequency and Virtue). The EPA can be aggregated into four higher-order factors (Few, Miller, & Lynam, 2013): Antagonism ($\alpha = .90$), Emotional Stability ($\alpha = .90$), Disinhibition ($\alpha = .90$), and Narcissism ($\alpha = .76$). Intercorrelations are reported in Supplemental Table 1. EPA data were available for 306 participants.

Big Five Inventory (BFI). The BFI (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991) is a 44-item scale that measures each Big Five domain of personality. Alphas ranged from .81 to .89. Correlations are reported in Supplemental Table 1. BFI data were available for 307 participants.

International Cognitive Ability Resource (ICAR). The ICAR (Condon & Revelle, 2014) is a measure of cognitive ability. Eight items from the ICAR Sample Test was used to assess cognitive ability including items related to Verbal Reasoning (4 items) and Letter Number Sequence (4 items) ($\alpha = .60$). ICAR data were available for 303 participants.

Criterion Measures

Persuasiveness and Trust Ratings. Six research assistants served as raters and rated one video from each participant on seven bipolar characteristics (i.e., Unpersuasive-Persuasive, Dishonest-Honest, Unintelligent-Intelligent, Immoral-Moral, Phony-Genuine, Untrustworthy-Trustworthy, Doesn't care-Cares about me) using a seven-point Likert scale. Raters were blind to participants' psychopathy scores as well as the purpose of the study. Items were adapted from McCroskey and Teven's (1999) scale measuring goodwill. Exploratory factor analysis using Parallel Analysis (PA) method of Horn (1965) and the Minimum Average Partial (MAP) method of Velicer (1976) of the latter six-items suggested a one factor solution that accounted for 94% of the variance in the improvised condition and 95% of the variance in the scripted condition. Thus, the latter six characteristics were averaged to create a composite for each video condition to capture the perceived trustworthiness of each participant. Raters judged only one video from

each participant (i.e., scripted or unscripted) to ensure that ratings were not biased by exposure to the other video; three raters rated each video. Inter-rater reliability (IRR) analyses were conducted (Hallgren, 2012). IRR Intra-class correlations (ICC) were calculated, specifying a one-way model, absolute agreement, and an “average” unit of analysis, using the ‘irr’ package in R. IRR results for Persuasiveness indicated an *ICC* of .56 (for improvised video condition) and .64 (for scripted condition). Aggregation of the Trust component ratings resulted in a linear-composite reliability of .86 (for improvised video condition) and .87 (for scripted video condition) (Nunnally, 1978).

Attractiveness Ratings. Three separate undergraduate research assistants rated the attractiveness of one still frame picture of each participant using a 10 point scale ranging from very unattractive to very attractive². Each still frame picture was edited to conceal distinctive features of the environment. IRR ICCs were calculated, specifying a two-way model, absolute agreement, and an “average” unit of analysis, using the ‘irr’ package in R (IRR *ICC* = .78).

Crime and Analogous Behavior Scale-BRIEF (CAB). The CAB-BRIEF (Miller & Lynam, 2003) is a 25-item self-report inventory that assesses a variety of externalizing behaviors. An *antisocial behavior* count was created by giving participants a “1” for every antisocial act they endorsed (10 items; *M* = 1.52; *SD* = 1.14). An *intimate partner violence* variety count was created by giving participants a “1” for every act of interpersonal violence they endorsed using (6 items; *M* = .89; *SD* = 1.51). A *substance use* variety count was created by giving participants a “1” for every substance they endorsed using (5 items; *M* = 1.81; *SD* = 1.35).

Results

² Still frame pictures were selected on the basis of exhibiting neutral affective expressions from participants.

Examining Relations between Psychopathic Traits and Externalizing Behavior

Given the number of tests of statistical significance conducted, an alpha level of $p \leq .01$ was set for all analyses. The correlations between psychopathic and general traits, as well as gender, IQ scores, and attractiveness, with antisocial behavior (ASB), intimate partner violence (IPV), and substance use (SU) were examined (see Table 1).³ Gender was significantly related only to IPV with females reporting higher levels. IQ scores and attractiveness ratings were not related to any of the three externalizing behaviors. Five of seven psychopathic traits were significantly associated with ASB (exceptions: TriPM Boldness, EPA Emotional Stability), as were Big Five Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. In relation to IPV, only TriPM and EPA Disinhibition, as well as EPA Narcissism were significantly, positively related. Finally, with regard to SU, only TriPM and EPA Disinhibition, as well as Openness were significantly related.

Correlations between Psychopathic and General Traits and Persuasiveness and Trust

Improvised Video Condition

Persuasiveness and Trust. Ratings of persuasiveness were significantly positively related to IQ, attractiveness, and ratings of trust (Table 2).⁴ From the perspective of psychopathic

³ Table 1 reports correlations in which original TriPM scales were used. To address issues of criterion contamination in which shared items are included for the predictor and outcome variables, we also examined correlations using shortened TriPM scales. For correlations with CAB Antisocial behavior, TriPM Disinhibition and Meanness scores were modified such that five items (TriPM 24, 34, 43, 53, 58) were omitted from Disinhibition due to overlap with content related to stealing others' belongings and two items (TriPM 14, 40) were omitted from Meanness due to overlap with content related to fighting/injuring others. For correlations with CAB Intimate partner violence, the same two items were deleted from TriPM Meanness for the same reason. Results from these analyses where explicitly overlapping items were removed from the TriPM showed slightly lower effect sizes, but the same pattern of significant findings. Comparisons of effect sizes were also conducted while disattenuating reliability to adjust for slightly reduced reliability associated with shortening TriPM scales. Results from analyses involving the shortened TriPM scales still showed slightly lower effect sizes.

⁴ Given some significant relations between gender, IQ, and attractiveness with persuasiveness and trust, semi-partial correlation analyses were conducted to examine whether psychopathic and

and general traits, persuasiveness was significantly predicted only by Boldness ($r = .17$) and Extraversion ($r = .16$); both effects were small in nature. Ratings of trust were positively related to ratings of persuasiveness ($r = .60$) but not significantly related to gender, IQ, attractiveness, or any of the psychopathic or general personality traits.

Scripted Video Condition

Persuasiveness and Trust. *Persuasiveness* was negatively correlated with male gender and video length, and positively correlated with IQ scores and ratings of trust. Two of three TriPM scales (i.e., Meanness, Disinhibition) and two of four EPA factors (i.e., Antagonism, Disinhibition) were significantly, negatively related to ratings of persuasiveness in the scripted condition. None of the general personality traits were significantly related to ratings of persuasiveness. Ratings of trust were positively related to ratings of persuasiveness ($r = .70$) and IQ scores, as well as negatively related to male gender and video length. Ratings of trust were significantly negatively related to two of three TriPM scales (i.e., Meanness, Disinhibition) and two of four EPA scales (i.e., Antagonism, Disinhibition); all effect sizes were small in nature. None of the general traits were significantly related to ratings of trustworthiness.

Discussion

There is substantial debate surrounding the relevance of boldness to the broader psychopathy construct (e.g., Lilienfeld et al., 2012; Lynam & Miller, 2012; Miller & Lynam, 2012) due, in part, to its null to small relations with externalizing behaviors, as replicated here. Given this, we tested an alternative manner in which boldness may be relevant to outcomes

FFM traits remained associated with persuasiveness and trust when removing shared variance between each trait and gender, IQ, and attractiveness, separately. Results from these analyses reflected a parallel pattern of significant associations compared to the bivariate correlation results (Supplemental Table 2).

typically associated with psychopathy, namely by enhancing psychopathic individuals' capacity for interpersonal manipulation. We investigated this question using a unique methodology with a number of strengths. First, we measured persuasiveness and trust using ratings of video-recorded product pitches. Second, we examined the relation between boldness and persuasiveness across "weaker" and "stronger" contexts. Third, we collected a sample that was large enough to detect reasonably small effect sizes and incentivized performance by compensating top performers.

Our analysis yielded two key findings, each with implications for the conceptualization of psychopathy. First, boldness bore a small association with perceived persuasiveness in the "weaker" context (i.e., improvised condition), suggesting that boldness may enhance an individual's ability to persuade (or manipulate) others into making decisions that may not be in their interest or persuade others with prosocial motives (e.g., to behave kindly or charitably). The relation for TriPM Boldness was only found in the improvised ("weak") condition. Extraversion exhibited a similarly sized association with persuasiveness, consistent with the robust correlation between the two constructs ($r = .62$ in current sample). It is possible that both boldness and Extraversion are connected to persuasiveness via a desire for obtaining social and monetary rewards, greater ease at social interactions, and/or greater practice or skill in social interaction and persuasion. Boldness' relation with persuasiveness may support claims from contemporary scholars that boldness underlies Cleckley's "mask" of sanity (e.g., Edens, Poythress, Lilienfeld, Patrick, & Test, 2008), though the null linear effect on trust as well as null moderational results (see Footnote 1 and Supplemental Materials) suggest that boldness does not underlie trustworthiness or buffer the effects of meanness or disinhibition on perceived persuasiveness or trust. These results may provide some tentative evidence against the "mask" hypothesis, but more research is needed under conditions designed to elicit trustworthiness rather

than persuasiveness more narrowly and where power is optimized to interpret a null finding. The present findings may also provide one possible avenue for understanding the successful (or non-criminal) psychopathic individual. Boldness has been linked to effective leadership at least in the short term (e.g., Boddy et al., 2010), and perceptions of good communication and strategic thinking in the workplace (Babiak et al., 2010). More research is needed to determine to what degree some of these adaptive characteristics may be mediated by persuasiveness.

Second, psychopathic traits related to antagonism/meanness and disinhibition exhibited small negative associations with persuasiveness and trust in the scripted condition, where we generally expected fewer effects, suggesting that being disinhibited and antagonistic may actually impair individuals from manipulating others in a socially appropriate way or gaining access to social networks. These findings suggest that some psychopathic traits may be related to a different style of interpersonal manipulation than is generally considered. Psychopathic individuals' ability to manipulate others may not always involve the use of charm, ingratiation, or trust-inducement in a socially appropriate way, but rather may involve the concealment of intentions or the use of coercion and intimidation. Antagonism/disinhibition may be associated with some styles of speech underlying persuasiveness and trust, but not with others (i.e., not associated with persuasiveness via diction and syntax; negatively associated with persuasiveness via tone/intonation).

Limitations and Future Directions

Despite its many strengths, some limitations must be acknowledged. First, recruiting from MTurk was associated with some challenges due to invalid responding and failures to upload videos; our final sample exhibited lower mean levels of antagonism and disinhibition than non-video-submitting participants, which may have resulted in some range restriction and

attenuation of effect sizes for those traits. The reasons for attrition are not clear but we suspect it was due, in part, to the novelty of our request for video-recording (vs. the more typical task of completing questionnaires), the onerousness of complying with technologically detailed instructions, as well as the atypicality of our request to expose their faces and bodies may have deterred some participants from following through with the video task. Importantly, however, the sample was not lower on boldness-related traits, which was the construct of greatest interest in this study. Future studies should examine these questions in samples that have higher mean levels of psychopathic traits and greater diversity in terms of age, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. In addition, a substantial proportion of respondents (~30%) were excluded due to invariant or invalid responding. While MTurk workers are generally thought to provide data of equal or higher quality than many other samples (e.g., Chandler & Shapiro, 2016; Miller, Crowe, Weiss, Maples-Keller, & Lynam, 2017) – in this case there was a significant minority of participants whose data were of questionable validity and thus were excluded. Second, our observations of psychopathic traits were derived from self-report data; future studies should compare self-report data on these scales with data collected from other modalities (e.g., informant reports; interviews), although self and informant reports of psychopathy in research settings tend to converge at reasonably high levels (e.g., Miller, Jones, & Lynam, 2011). Third, we were not powered in this study to detect correlations below .20 with a reasonable level of confidence, although we wonder about the importance of trait-behavior correlations smaller than .20 which would indicate they shared less than 4% of their variance. Fourth, inter-rater reliability was not optimal in the case of one of our primary outcomes of interest (i.e., Persuasiveness) in the improvised condition. According to Cicchetti's (1994) benchmarks, the associated ICC is considered only "fair," though Persuasiveness in the scripted condition is considered "good."

This lower reliability likely attenuated the size of the relations reported here. To counter this, we report these associations disattenuated for unreliability in Supplemental Materials (Table 5).

In closing, the current study replicated previous work demonstrating that boldness is not a robust correlate of the externalizing behaviors often associated with psychopathy. However, boldness did manifest a small positive relation with perceived persuasiveness in the non-scripted condition suggesting that boldness may allow psychopathic individuals to manipulate others, although it is important to note that this manipulation may be found in the service of both antisocial and prosocial goals.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2011). *Changes to the reformulation of personality disorders for DSM–5*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Babiak, P., Neumann, C.S. & Hare, R.D. (2010). Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 28, 174–193.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Boddy, C.R., Ladyshevsky, R.K. & Galvin, P. (2010). The influence of corporate psychopaths on corporate social responsibility and organizational commitment to employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97, 1–19.
- Chandler, J., & Shapiro, D. (2016). Conducting clinical research using crowdsourced convenience samples. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 12, 53-81
- Cicchetti D. V. (1994). Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment*, 6, 284–290.
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The Mask of Sanity*, St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Condon, D. M., & Revelle, W. (2014). The International Cognitive Ability Resource: Development and initial validation of a public-domain measure. *Intelligence*, 43, 52-64.
- Crego, C., & Widiger, T. A. (2016). Cleckley’s psychopaths: Revisited. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 125, 75-87.
- DeLisi, M. (2009). Psychopathy is the unified theory of crime. *Youth Violence and Juvenile*

Justice, 7, 256–273.

Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., Patrick, C. J., & Test, A. (2008). Further evidence of the divergent correlates of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory factors: Prediction of institutional misconduct among male prisoners. *Psychological Assessment*, 20, 86–91.

Few, L. R., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2013). An examination of the factor structure of the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 4, 247–253.

Gatner, D. T., Douglas, K. S., & Hart, S. D. (2016). Examining the incremental and interactive effects of boldness with meanness and disinhibition within the triarchic model of psychopathy. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 7, 259–268.

Hallgren, K. A. (2012). Computing inter-rater reliability for observational data: an overview and tutorial. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 8, 23–34.

Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised, 2nd edition*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R. D., & Neumann, C. S. (2008). Psychopathy as a clinical and empirical construct. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 4, 217–246.

Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 30, 179–185.

Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869–879.

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big-Five Inventory-Version 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Institute of Personality and Social Research, University of

California.

Karpman, B. (1948). The myth of the psychopathic personality. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 104, 523–534.

Lilienfeld, S. O. (1998). Methodological advances and developments in the assessment of psychopathy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 36, 99-125.

Lilienfeld, S. O., Patrick, C. J., Benning, S. D., Berg, J., Sellbom, M., & Edens, J. F. (2012). The role of fearless dominance in psychopathy: Confusions, controversies, and clarifications. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3, 327-340.

Lilienfeld, S. O., Smith, S. F., Sauvigné, K. C., Patrick, C. J., Drislane, L. E., Latzman, R. D., & Krueger, R. F. (2016). Is boldness relevant to psychopathic personality? Meta-analytic relations with non-Psychopathy Checklist-based measures of psychopathy. *Psychological Assessment*, 28, 1172-1185.

Lilienfeld, S. O., Watts, A. L., Francis Smith, S., Berg, J. M., & Latzman, R. D. (2015). Psychopathy deconstructed and reconstructed: Identifying and assembling the personality building blocks of Cleckley's chimera. *Journal of Personality*, 83, 593-610.

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Widows, M. R. (2005). *Professional manual for the Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised: (PPI-R)*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Lykken, D. T. (1995). *The antisocial personalities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lynam, D. R., Gaughan, E. T., Miller, J. D., Miller, D. J., Mullins-Sweatt, S., & Widiger, T. A. (2011). Assessing the basic traits associated with psychopathy: development and validation of the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, 23, 108-124.

Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2012). Fearless dominance and psychopathy: Response to

- Lilienfeld et al. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3, 341-353.
- Lynam, D. R. & Miller, J. D. (2015). Psychopathy from a basic trait perspective: The utility of a five-factor model approach. *Journal of Personality*, 83, 611-626.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Teven, J. J. (1999). Goodwill: A reexamination of the construct and its measurement. *Communication Monographs*, 66, 90-103.
- Meyer, R., Dalal, R., & Bonaccio, S. (2009). A meta-analytic investigation into the moderating effects of situational strength on the conscientiousness-performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 1077-1102.
- Miller, J. D., Crowe, M., Weiss, B., Maples-Keller, J. L., & Lynam, D. R. (2017). Using online, crowdsourcing platforms for data collection in personality disorder research: The example of Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 8, 26-34.
- Miller, J. D., Jones, S. E., & Lynam, D. R. (2011). Psychopathic traits from the perspective of self and informant reports: Is there evidence for a lack of insight? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 120, 758-764.
- Miller, J. D., Lamkin, J., Maples-Keller, J. L., & Lynam, D. R. (2016). Viewing the Triarchic Model of Psychopathy through general personality and expert-based lenses. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 7, 247-258.
- Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2003). Psychopathy and the five-factor model of personality: A replication and extension. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 81, 168-178.
- Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2012). An examination of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory's nomological network: A meta-analytic review. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 3, 305-326.

- Miller, J. D., Lynam, D., Widiger, T. A., & Leukefeld, C. (2001). Personality disorders as an extreme variant of common personality dimensions: Can the five-factor model represent psychopathy. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 253-276.
- Miller, J. D., Lamkin, J., Maples-Keller, J. L., & Lynam, D. R. (2016). Viewing the Triarchic Model of Psychopathy through general personality and expert-based lenses. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 7, 247-258.
- Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology* (pp. 333-352). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Monson, T. C., Hesley, J. W., & Chernick, L. (1982). Specifying when personality traits can and cannot predict behavior: An alternative to abandoning the attempt to predict single-act criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 385-399.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory (2nd Edition)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
- Patrick, C. J. (2010). Operationalizing the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Preliminary description of brief scales for assessment of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition. *Unpublished manual, Department of Psychology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL. Retrieved from <http://www.phenxtoolkit.org>.*
- Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Development and Psychopathology*, 21, 913-938.
- Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2009). Manual for the self-report psychopathy scale. *Toronto: Multi-health systems*.

- Skeem, J. L., & Cooke, D. J. (2010). Is criminal behavior a central component of psychopathy? Conceptual directions for resolving the debate. *Psychological Assessment*, 22, 433-445.
- Smith, S. F., Lilienfeld, S. O., Coffey, K., & Dabbs, J. M. (2013). Are psychopaths and heroes twigs off the same branch? Evidence from college, community, and presidential samples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47, 634-646.
- Snyder, M., & Ickes, W. (1985). *Personality and social behavior*. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 883-947). New York: Random House.
- Strickland, C. M., Drislane, L. E., Lucy, M., Krueger, R. F., & Patrick, C. J. (2013). Characterizing psychopathy using DSM-5 personality traits. *Assessment*, 20, 327-338.
- Titze, J., Blickle, G., & Wihler, A. (2017). Fearless dominance and performance in field sales: A predictive study. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 25, 299-310.
- Velicer, W. F. (1976). Determining the number of components from the matrix of partial correlations. *Psychometrika*, 41, 321-327.
- Venables, N. C., Hall, J. R., & Patrick, C. J. (2014). Differentiating psychopathy from antisocial personality disorder: A triarchic model perspective. *Psychological Medicine*, 44, 1005-1013.
- Vinchur, A. J., Schippmann, J. S., Switzer, F. S., & Roth, P. L. (1998). A meta-analytic review of predictors of job performance for salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 586-597.
- Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., Lamkin, J., Miller, J. D., & Pardini, D. (2016). Identifying essential features of juvenile psychopathy in the prediction of later antisocial behavior: Is there an additive, synergistic, or curvilinear role for fearless dominance? *Clinical Psychological*

Science, 4, 572-590.

Table 1

Bivariate relations between trait and externalizing behaviors

	Antisocial Behavior	Intimate Partner Violence	Substance Use
Gender (male = 1; female = 0)	.12	-.21*	.00
IQ	.02	.00	.10
Attractiveness	-.11	.01	.00
Triarchic Psychopathy Measure			
Boldness	.12	.11	.13
Disinhibition	.44*	.19*	.21*
Meanness	.25*	.06	.03
Elemental Psychopathy Assessment			
Antagonism	.28*	.12	.00
Disinhibition	.37*	.19*	.19*
Emotional Stability	.07	-.06	.00
Narcissism	.23*	.23*	.10
Big Five Inventory			
Neuroticism	-.03	.12	.00
Extraversion	.03	.06	.15
Openness	.00	.02	.19*
Agreeableness	-.21*	-.13	.00
Conscientiousness	-.17*	-.07	.00

Note. * $p \leq .01$.

Table 2

Bivariate relations between traits and persuasiveness and trust

	Improvised Condition		Scripted Condition	
	Persuasive	Trust	Persuasive	Trust
Gender	.00	-.14	-.18*	-.21*
IQ	.16*	.10	.24*	.15*
Attractiveness	.18*	.13	.10	.14
Video Length	.11	.07	-.16*	-.16*
Triarchic Psychopathy Measure				
TriPM Bold	.17*	.11	.07	-.04
TriPM Disinhibition	-.06	-.09	-.22*	-.16*
TriPM Mean	-.06	-.03	-.26*	-.22*
Elemental Psychopathy Assessment				
EPA Antagonism	-.06	-.05	-.21*	-.19*
EPA Disinhibition	-.01	-.04	-.20*	-.20*
EPA Emotional Stability	.04	.02	-.08	-.13
EPA Narcissism	.14	.06	-.05	-.07
Big Five Inventory				
BFI N	-.02	.02	.10	.14
BFI E	.16*	.07	.11	.07
BFI O	.07	-.02	.12	.06
BFI A	-.02	-.03	.09	.04
BFI C	.00	.06	.11	.07

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

Supplemental Materials

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supplemental Table 1

Results of Bivariate Correlations among Predictors and Criteria

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Gender	-													
IQ	-.07	-												
Attractiveness	-.02	-.01	-											
TriPM Bold	.08	-.05	.14	-										
TriPM Disinhibition	.17*	-.16*	.01	-.23*	-									
TriPM Mean	.32*	-.15*	.14	.10	.49*	-								
EPA Antagonism	.19*	-.12	.16*	.02	.50*	.81*	-							
EPA Disinhibition	.15*	-.09	.10	-.09	.78*	.53*	.52*	-						
EPA EmoStability	.19*	-.05	.03	.74*	-.34*	.14	.00	-.28*	-					
EPA Narcissism	.12	-.14	.10	.56*	.24*	.43*	.36*	.35*	.32*	-				
-														
BFI N	.19*	.09	.03	-.70*	.32*	-.06	.07	.34*	-.91*	-.26*	-			
BFI E	-.07	-.07	.09	.62*	-.08	-.07	-.19*	-.03	.38*	.57*	-.42*	-		
BFI O	-.09	.08	-.01	.39*	-.22*	-.33*	-.31*	-.17*	.14	.07	-.19*	.29*	-	
BFI A	-.13	.04	-.09	.17*	-.38*	-.64*	-.71*	-.48*	.22*	-.27*	-.32*	.27*	.33*	-
BFI C	-.07	.00	-.04	.37*	-.62*	-.27*	-.25*	-.70*	.46*	.00	-.50*	.25*	.19*	.34*
	1	2	3											
Improvised Persuasive	-													
Improvised Trust	.60*	-												
Scripted Persuasive	.45*	.28*	-											
Scripted Trust	.39*	.27*	.70*											

Note. * $p < .01$.

Supplemental Table 2

Results of Semi-partial Correlation Analysis

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

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

Supplemental Table 3

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

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

Note. * $p < .01$.

Supplemental Table 4

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

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

Note. * $p < .01$.

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

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

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

Appendix A

PROS

Camera:

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

Display:

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

Feel / Construction:

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

Functionality:

- Fingerprint sensor

CONS

Camera:

- Less overall camera resolution than competitors

Feel:

- Weight is heavier than chief competitor

Functionality:

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

Safety:

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

Appeal:

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

Appendix B

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