



# HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

*Int J Law Psychiatry*. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2017 March 01.

Published in final edited form as:

*Int J Law Psychiatry*. 2016 ; 45: 70–74. doi:10.1016/j.ijlp.2016.02.012.

## Investigating the Relationships Between Antisocial Behaviors, Psychopathic Traits, and Moral Disengagement

Scott Risser and Katy Eckert

Montana Tech

### Abstract

The present study investigated the relations between morally disengaged attitudes, psychopathic affective traits, and a variety of antisocial and risky behaviors in a sample of adults ( $N = 181$ ). A second aim of the study was to examine the unique contributions of moral disengagement and psychopathic traits in predicting problematic behavior while the other construct is statistically controlled. Results indicated that whereas psychopathic traits and moral disengagement were both uniquely predictive of non-violent antisocial behaviors, only remorselessness was uniquely predictive of violence and only morally disengaged attitudes were uniquely predictive of academic cheating. Differing relationships also emerged by gender.

### Keywords

moral disengagement; callous-unemotional traits; antisocial behaviors; academic dishonesty

### 1. Introduction

A great deal of research effort has been dedicated to understanding why some individuals behave antisocially, and why others do not. A portion of this research has focused on morality and the phenomena of violations of individuals' rights and welfare (Turiel, 1983). A particularly fruitful explanation for individual differences in amoral acts has been focusing on moral reasoning and several self-serving cognitive mechanisms that allow individuals to *morally disengage* from the consequences of their harmful actions (Bandura, 1991). A somewhat separate line of research has examined traits associated with psychopathy in attempting to explain individual differences in harmful behavior. The shallow-affect traits associated with psychopathy, such as reduced remorse and empathy, have been associated with aggressive behavior and delinquency (Frick, Cornell, Barry, Bodin, & Dane, 2003). Each of these lines of research have had success in the prediction of antisocial behavior, however few studies have addressed the relative contributions and interactions of these traits and cognitions, especially in non-adjudicated populations.

---

Correspondence with authors should be initiated with Scott Risser, Liberal Studies Department, Montana Tech of the University of Montana, 1300 W. Park, Butte, MT 59701, United States, srisser@mtech.edu, or +1 (406) 496-4845.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

In attempting to explain why ordinary or “good” people perpetrate malicious, sometimes extraordinarily atrocious, actions against others, Bandura (1990, 1991) focused on the relationship between an individual’s moral reasoning and their behavior towards others. Throughout maturation, children develop guides of conduct that delineate right from wrong, acceptable from unacceptable. Typically, individuals engage in behaviors reasoned as appropriate and provide a sense of self-worth, and avoid those behaviors that would lead to negative evaluations of self. Whereas this process ostensibly seems quite simple, Bandura (2002) elaborates that this behavior regulation process allows for either activation or disengagement of these self-sanctions through both social and psychological processes. Because of this selective activation, individuals, who may normally behave in socially appropriate, moral ways may engage in behaviors that are truly harmful to others, yet face no internal feelings of self-condemnation. Bandura referred to this process as selective moral disengagement in the exercise of individual moral agency.

### 1.1 Moral Disengagement

Moral disengagement, as described well by Hymel and colleagues (2010), often centers around four categories which have been theoretically and empirically broken down further into eight mechanisms. Each of these four larger categories allows individuals to behave hurtfully while avoiding negative self-perceptions, both during and after the act. In one category, individuals can change their perceptions of the victim by *assigning blame to the victim* for provoking the aggression, or *dehumanizing* the victim in some way. This latter mechanism has been further delineated in research as animalistic or mechanistic dehumanization (Van Noorden, Haselager, Cillessen, & Bukowski, 2014). Another category allows individuals to *distort or disregard the consequences* of their harmful actions by minimizing or misconstruing the potential or occurred outcomes. Thirdly, individuals may *minimize their agentive role* in the behavior by displacing responsibility to a third party or diffusing responsibility across a larger group or context. Lastly, individuals may *cognitively restructure* the behavior itself. Here, individuals make moral justifications for their actions, create an advantageous comparison between their action and a more harmful potential or previous act, or utilize euphemistic labeling of a behavior, allowing a decrease in the perceived severity of the act.

Much of the research on moral disengagement has examined children and adolescents, and has found a significant positive relationship between those who exhibit moral disengagement and engage in aggressive behavior (for a recent meta-analysis, see Gini, Pozzoli, & Hymel, 2014). In studies examining both the peer-nominated and self-reports of youth bullying, moral disengagement has emerged as a significant predictor of aggressive behavior (Obermann, 2011). Additionally, researchers have shown associations between moral disengagement and cyberbullying, video game cheating, and aversive behaviors directed towards others in experimental settings (Robson & Witenberg, 2013; Gabbiadini, Riva, Andrighetto, Volpato, & Bushman, 2014).

Researchers have also found that morally disengaged cognitions are not only related to young adult and adult aggression, but that these cognitions may interact with other factors to increase antisocial behaviors. Kiriakidis (2008) found higher levels of moral disengagement

in youth offenders compared to a community sample, and also suggested that moral disengagement influences delinquency in this sample over and above most social, family, and lifestyle characteristics. Other researchers have investigated moral disengagement as a mediator, finding that in late adolescent and young adult samples that moral disengagement mediates the relationship between peer rejection and later criminal behavior (Fontaine, Fida, Paciello, Tisak, & Caprara, 2014), as well as hostile rumination and violence (Caprara, Tisak, Alessandri, Fontaine, Fida, & Paciello, 2014).

## 1.2 Psychopathic Affective Traits

In these studies, the process of selective disengagement may explain why some youth and young adults who possess correlates to aggression perpetrate those acts, whereas others do not. To undergo this process of removing moral sanctions however, individuals must first assume antisocial acts are indeed harmful and associate these acts with remorse, shame, or other negative self-evaluations. An individual who lacks empathy or remorse towards potential victims will not require the disengagement of self-sanctions to commit aggressive acts. Researchers investigating this socioemotional dysfunction have done so by measuring psychopathic affective traits, typically comprised of callousness, remorselessness, and unemotionality. When combined with antisocial behavior and impulsivity, these affective traits make up the core definition of psychopathy (Blair, 2013; Hare, 1994). This callousness, particularly lack of affective empathy, has been linked consistently with acts of physical aggression in adolescents (see Lovett and Sheffield, 2007 for review). The process by which this shallow affect leads to antisocial behavior is not completely known, but one possibility is that because individuals with these traits do not respond to punishment in childhood (Pardini, Lochman & Frick, 2003), and are sometimes in fact labeled as “fearless” (Frick & White, 2008). Hence, they do not have a typical internalization for morality and understanding of moral behavior; they affectively do not experience a behavior as wrong (Blair, 2007). Additionally, youth with callous-unemotional traits expect more positive outcomes for aggressive responses in situations with peers (Pardini, Lochman, & Frick, 2003), cognitively priming them for antisocial behavior.

Whereas prior research has examined either empathy (or lack thereof) or moral disengagement as predictors of antisocial acts in youth and adulthood, few studies have examined the unique contributions or the interaction of these two constructs in non-adjudicated samples. In one investigation of low-income boys, the association between parental rejection and antisocial behaviors was mediated by both empathy and moral disengagement (Hyde, Shaw, & Moilanen, 2009). Here, empathy robustly predicted moral disengagement and mediated the relationship between other variables and moral disengagement, such as early parenting variables. Another large study of felony-offending male adolescents examined the relation between moral disengagement and antisocial behavior while statistically adjusting for callous-unemotional (CU) traits (Shulman, Caffman, Piquero, & Fagan, 2011). These researchers found that CU traits were highly correlated with moral disengagement, and moderately related to self-reported antisocial behavior. Furthermore, the relationship between moral disengagement and offending remained consistent both with and without the variance of CU; as the authors state “This

finding suggests that the contribution of callousness to antisocial behavior is distinct from that of moral disengagement, in spite of the association between these variables” (pg. 1630).

In light of these findings, and the need to examine these relations in non-adjudicated samples, the current study aimed to investigate the unique contributions of psychopathic affective traits and moral disengagement processes on a variety of antisocial and risky behaviors of adults. Based on previous research, we anticipated that callous-unemotional traits would be positively related to morally disengaged attitudes (Hyde et al., 2009; Shulman et al., 2011), and that both callous-unemotional traits and moral disengagement would uniquely predict a variety of antisocial and rule-breaking behaviors in a university sample of adults. Additionally, because previous examinations have found sex differences in morally disengaged justifications (Perren & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, 2012), regressions were computed separately for men and women.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants

Participants in this study were 181 (51% female) adults attending either a four-year university (69%) or two-year vocational college (31%) in the Rocky Mountain region. These participants were part of a larger study of gene-environment interactions, and were recruited through either their introductory Psychology course or their College Success course. The average age at participation was 23, but participants’ ages ranged from 16 to 61. The racial/ethnic composition of the sample was similar to the region with 89% non-Hispanic Caucasian, 4% Asian American, 3% Native American, and 4% other. Twenty-nine percent of the sample indicated having no children, whereas the remainder of the participants indicated they either had one or more biological or non-biological children.

### 2.2. Measures

**Moral Disengagement**—The 32-item Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement scale was used to examine disengaged attitudes (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, Pastorelli, 1996). Participants responded on a four-point scale from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree,” to statements that justify negative social behavior. Example statements were: “It is alright to lie to keep your friends out of trouble,” “Stealing some money is not too serious compared to those who steal a lot of money,” and “If people fight and misbehave at work, it is their superior’s fault.” Higher summed scores indicated greater moral disengagement. Previous research utilizing this measure with young adults has indicated acceptable internal consistency ( $\alpha = .92$ , Paciello, Fida, Tramontano, Lupinetti, & Caprara, 2008), and that items load on a single factor (Shulman et al., 2011).

**Psychopathic Affective Traits**—Because the majority of these participants were young adults, callous-unemotional traits were measured using the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Stattin, & Levander, 2002). The scale included 15 self-report items assessing callousness (e.g. “I usually become sad when I see other people crying or sad (reverse coded),” unemotionality (e.g. “I don’t let my feelings affect me as much as other people’s feelings seem to affect them,” and remorselessness (e.g. “To feel

guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time”). Responses were on a four-point scale from “does not apply at all” to “applies very well.” Scores within each subscale were summed, with higher scores indicating larger amounts of emotional deficits. Scores on the YPI were significantly associated with other measures of affective psychopathy (Psychopathy Checklist, Skeem & Cauffman, 2003), however the YPI was chosen because it does not frame these traits as deficits.

**Antisocial and Risky Behaviors**—An adapted form of the Risky Behavior Questionnaire, developed for the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development and based upon the work of Conger and Elder (1994), was used to assess several antisocial and risk-taking behaviors. Participants were asked to report their behavior over the last one year as either “0 Never,” “1 Once,” or “2 Twice or more.” Behaviors were categorized into *unsafe behaviors* (5 items, e.g. “Ridden on a motorcycle without a helmet?”), *violent behaviors* (21 items, e.g. “Used a weapon (gun, knife, or club) to threaten or bully someone?”), *legal problems* (4 items, e.g. “Been arrested?”), *non-violent rule breaking behaviors* (7 items, e.g. “Taken or stolen something worth a lot, like a car?”), and *academic dishonesty* (4 items, e.g. “Cheated during a major test, exam, or final?”). These items were summed by categories, such that higher scores indicated greater activity within that category in the last year.

### 2.3. Procedure

Participants were recruited through their Psychology or College Success courses by a trained undergraduate research assistant. Because participation in this study also involved the collection of DNA, participants were able to select to receive either extra credit for their class or be compensated with a \$20 gift card of their choosing. To ensure that students did not feel coerced, alternative, non-participation options were provided as compensation alternatives. All recruitment, compensation, measures, and operating procedures for the study were approved by the university system’s Institutional Review Board. Of the 326 enrolled students in these classes, only 181 (56%) elected to participate in this study.

Individuals who agreed to participate in this study first made an appointment to meet with a researcher on either campus. During these appointments, each participant provided his or her informed consent and then a biological sample. Lastly, participants elected to either complete a battery of questions on paper with the researcher, or at their convenience through a secure online survey system. The majority (94%) of participants elected to complete their questionnaires online. At the completion of these measures, participants were compensated for their time.

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and ranges of the constructs for the sample and by self-reported gender. For gender differences, males reported greater engagement in nonviolent aggressive behaviors ( $t(179) = 2.48, p < .01$ ), moral disengagement ( $t(179) = 3.54, p < .001$ ), and psychopathic traits ( $t(179) = 4.26, p < .0001$ ) than women. These

gender differences in affective traits and moral reasoning are consistent with previous research with adolescents (Perren & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, 2012). The distributions for affective psychopathic traits and overall moral disengagement were negatively skewed, with Pearson skewness coefficients of  $-.59$  and  $-.63$  respectively. The distributions for self-reported antisocial and unsafe behavior were positively skewed, most notably with a coefficient for self-reports of violence of  $3.07$ . To address this, a log transformation was applied to this variable for analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

### 3.2. Interconstruct and Intergrade Correlations

To examine the relationships between variables, correlations were computed between each variable (Table 2). As predicted, morally disengaged attitudes were positively associated with shallow affective traits (unemotionality, callousness, and remorseless). Whereas all of moral disengagement's associations with antisocial behaviors were in the predicted direction, moral disengagement was only significantly related to self-reports of unsafe behaviors, non-violent delinquency, and academic dishonesty. Additionally, self-indicated remorselessness emerged as the only significant positive correlate to antisocial behavior of the three affective psychopathic traits. Non-significant relationships with other variables were however in the expected direction.

### 3.3. Relative Contributions of Psychopathic Affective Traits and Moral Disengagement to Antisocial Behaviors

In examining the relative contributions of psychopathic traits and moral disengagement in multiple regression models, it was possible to indicate which variable most strongly associated with each antisocial behavior. These results are shown in Table 3, which lists semipartial correlation coefficients and standardized regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ) for all variables entered in multiple regression models.

Across each analysis, save the prediction legal problems (incarceration), models accounted for modest, yet significant portions of the variance in predicting antisocial behaviors ( $R^2$ s ranging from  $.08$  to  $.15$ ). Contrary to our predictions, only remorselessness uniquely predicted self-reports of violence, and only moral disengagement uniquely predicted self-reported academic dishonesty. Only in predicting non-violent delinquency did both an affective trait (remorselessness) and morally disengaged attitudes emerge as modestly significant.

Because previous studies have indicated gender differences in both moral disengagement and psychopathic traits, these models were also constructed by gender (Table 4). In these models a similar pattern emerged for males only, such that models including affective traits and moral disengagement significantly predicted unsafe behaviors, violent behaviors, non-violent delinquency, and academic dishonesty ( $R^2$ s ranged from  $.15$  to  $.19$ ). However, for females, only the model predicting academic dishonesty was significant, and only moral disengagement emerged as a predictor when controlling for affective traits.

Lastly, multiple regression models were used to investigate the interactions between moral disengagement and affective traits, however no significant interactions emerged in predicting antisocial or risky behavior variables.

## 4. Discussion

The primary goal of this study was to further our understanding of the relationships between risky, antisocial behaviors, moral disengagement, and affective psychopathic traits in a non-adjudicated or at-risk sample of adults. Much of the research examining these two correlates has found that troubled youth who possess callous affect are also likely to have morally disengaged attitudes, and that both these traits and attitudes are uniquely related to offending (Shulman, et al., 2011). The current study attempted to replicate these findings in an older, community sample, and with a wider range of risky and aversive behaviors.

One aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between morally disengaged attitudes and callous-unemotional traits. Indeed, initial analyses in this study found that participants who showed unemotionality, remorselessness, and callousness were also more likely to express morally disengaged attitudes. Individuals with shallow empathy towards others, especially in distress situations, may easily disregard the negative consequences of their aversive actions, and conversely, individuals with high empathy find it difficult to dehumanize the victims of aversive acts because of a strong reaction to others' distress. This finding is theoretically consistent with our understanding of moral decision making, and the importance of both cognitive and affective perspective taking (Eisenberg, 2000); individuals who have even sub-clinical levels of psychopathic affective traits, will find it easier to justify their harmful actions, and may be more resistant to intervention efforts designed to re-engage moral sanctions.

A second aim of this study was to investigate the unique contributions of affective psychopathic traits and moral disengagement to risky and antisocial behavior. We predicted that each of these correlates would continue to predict self-reported behaviors even when accounting for the variance of the other. This hypothesis had mixed evidence for support. Legal problems, such as incarceration, were so infrequent in the sample that is unlikely any associations would be detected. On the other hand, violent behaviors, such as maliciously attacking others or threatening others with weapons, were uniquely predicted by remorselessness while controlling for moral disengagement, callousness, and unemotionality. This finding is especially interesting because previous investigations have focused on empathy (or the lack of empathy displayed by callousness) or combined affective traits, rather than specific lack of remorse. Of the psychopathic affective traits, this disregard for guilt and remorse emerged as the strongest predictor of antisocial acts. Individuals who felt guilt and remorse to be weaknesses, were those who were most likely to violently hurt others. In the prediction of non-violent behaviors, such as theft of another's property, both moral disengagement and remorselessness emerged as modest unique predictors. Lastly, whereas both remorselessness and moral disengagement were related to academic cheating and plagiarism, when both were entered into the same model only moral disengagement emerged as a unique predictor. Academic dishonesty may be perceived as a "victimless crime," and the outcomes of these behaviors may be easily dismissed by agents. Overall, the pattern of associations indicates that moral reasoning and psychopathic traits are differentially related to various types of risky and hurtful behavior, thus their affective and cognitive pathways may be somewhat unique for each behavior.

The third aim of this study was to investigate gender differences in these associations. Indeed, for males only did models including psychopathic traits and moral disengagement account for a significant portion of the variance for three out of five behaviors (risky, violent, and non-violent). This may be due to the low base-rate of these behaviors in women, or that women report fewer morally disengaged attitudes (Perren & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, 2012). Alternatively, these processes may actually unfold differently by gender; a great deal of theory and research has been devoted to gender differences in moral (Gilligan, 1982) and social (Maccoby, 1998) development. Further investigations of non-adjudicated samples including both genders may shed light upon how these processes unfold. For the prediction of academic dishonesty however, both males' and females' levels of moral disengagement were uniquely predictive. Whereas females in this sample were less likely to espouse morally disengaged attitudes, those who did express them were more likely engage in cheating.

A goal for future research in this area remains explaining the relationship between callous-unemotional traits and moral disengagement, and how that relationship influences the processes that lead to sustained antisocial behavior. A great deal of research has endeavored to examine the role of affective psychopathic traits (Frick & White, 2008) and the process of routinized moral disengagement (Gini, Pozzoli, & Hymel, 2014) in understanding the variance in antisocial behavior, however few studies have attempted to examine their interaction and unique influences. Because the processes underlying typical moral reasoning require empathy, individual variance in shallow or deep social emotions could explain a great deal of the differences in moral disengagement. Additionally, researchers may need to focus more closely on each facet of callous-unemotional traits. In this sample, the construct of remorselessness was the strongest predictor of each problematic behavior, and our understanding of this cognitive and emotional dismissal of guilt and regret may be fruitful in intervention efforts.

The results of this study should be considered in light of several weaknesses. The exclusive use of self-reports increases the risk of shared-method or shared-reporter variance. In many cases it may be ideal to have a secondary reporter (or observation) of behavior, but in the case of official records of legal infractions, actual self-reports may be more sensitive because the majority of infractions go undetected and unprosecuted (Dunford & Elliott, 1984). Additionally, using self-reports allowed the investigation of a wider array of antisocial or risky behaviors not considered unlawful. Additionally, the sample was recruited from a population of college students, and shares many of the faults related to samples of convenience. However, it is important to note that this particular sample included majors beyond the social sciences and a wide-variety of student types (from students seeking trade certification to 4-year degrees), and may more closely resemble a community sample than a typical university student sample. Lastly, because this work is part of a larger study that involved additional genetic and biological data, the sample was relatively small, and may have been unable to investigate modest effect sizes.

In conclusion, this study contributed to the literature in several ways. One novel finding was that moral disengagement was found to uniquely predict academic cheating, while controlling for affective psychopathic traits, and that remorselessness was uniquely



predictive of violent behaviors in a college sample. It is important that future research continue to investigate these individual differences in predicting aggression and antisocial behaviors; our understanding of how these processes unfold in both men and women are essential to ameliorating the impacts of antisocial behavior.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Montana IDeA Network for Biomedical Research Excellence (MT INBRE), funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), award number P20 GM103474-13.

## References

- Andershed, H.; Kerr, M.; Stattin, H.; Levander, S. Psychopathic traits in non-referred youths: A new assessment tool. In: Blauuw, E.; Sheridan, L., editors. *Psychopaths: Current International Perspectives*. The Hague, the Netherlands: Elsevier; 2002. p. 131-158.
- Bandura A. Selective activation and disengagement of moral control. *Journal of Social Issues*. 1990; 46:27–46.10.1111/j.154-4560.1990.tb00270.x
- Bandura, A. Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In: Kurtines, WM.; Gewirtz, JL., editors. *Handbook of moral behavior and development*. Vol. I. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1991. p. 45-103.
- Bandura A. Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*. 2002; 312:101–119.10.1080/0305724022014322
- Bandura A, Barbaranelli C, Caprara G, Pastorelli C. Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1996; 71:364–374.10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364
- Blair R. The amygdala and ventromedial prefrontal cortex in morality and psychopathy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2007; 11:387–392.10.1016/j.tics.2007.07.003 [PubMed: 17707682]
- Blair R. The neurobiology of psychopathic traits in youths. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2013; 14:786–799.10.1038/nrn3577 [PubMed: 24105343]
- Caprara GV, Tisak MS, Alessandri G, Fontaine RG, Fida R, Paciello M. The contribution of moral disengagement in mediating individual tendencies toward aggression and violence. *Developmental Psychology*. 2014; 50:71–85.10.1037/a0034488 [PubMed: 24059253]
- Conger, R.; Elder, G. *Families in troubled times: Adapting to change in rural America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter; 1994.
- Dunford F, Elliott D. Identifying career offenders using self-reported data. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 1984; 21:57–86.10.1177/022427884021001004
- Eisenberg N. Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2000; 51:665–697.10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.665
- Frick P, Cornell A, Barry C, Bodin S, Dane H. Callous-unemotional traits and conduct problems in the prediction of conduct problem severity, aggression, and self-report of delinquency. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 2003; 31:457–470.10.1023/A:1023899703866
- Frick P, White S. Research review: the importance of callous-unemotional traits for developmental models of aggressive and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2008; 49:359–375.10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01862.x [PubMed: 18221345]
- Fontaine RG, Fida R, Paciello M, Tisak MS, Caprara GV. The mediating role of moral disengagement in the developmental course from peer rejection in adolescence to crime in early adulthood. *Psychology, Crime & Law*. 2014; 20:1–19.10.1080/1068316X.2012.719622
- Gabbiadini A, Riva P, Andrighetto L, Volpato C, Bushman BJ. Interactive effect of moral disengagement and violent video games on self-control, cheating, and aggression. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 2014; 5:451–458.10.1177/1948550613509286
- Gilligan, C. *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1982.

- Gini G, Pozzoli T, Hymel S. Moral disengagement among children and youth: A Meta-Analytic review of links to aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*. 2014; 40:56–68.10.1002/ab.21502 [PubMed: 24037754]
- Hare, RD. *Without conscience: The disturbing world of psychopaths among us*. New York: Simon & Schuster; 1994.
- Hyde L, Shaw D, Moilanen K. Developmental precursors of moral disengagement and the role of moral disengagement in the development of antisocial behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 2009; 38:197–209.10.1007/s10802-009-9358-5 [PubMed: 19777337]
- Hymel, S.; Schonert-Reichl, K.; Bonanno, R.; Vaillancourt, T.; Rock Henderson, N. Bullying and morality. Understanding how good kids can behave badly. In: Jimerson, SR.; Swearer, SM.; Espelage, DL., editors. *Handbook of bullying in schools. An international perspective*. New York: Routledge; 2010. p. 101-118.
- Kiriakidis SP. Moral disengagement: Relation to delinquency and independence from indices of social dysfunction. *International Journal Of Offender Therapy And Comparative Criminology*. 2008; 52:571–583.10.1177/0306624X07309063 [PubMed: 18025073]
- Lovett B, Sheffield R. Affective empathy deficits in aggressive children and adolescents: a critical review. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2007; 27:1–13.10.1016/j.cpr.2006.03.003 [PubMed: 16697094]
- Maccoby, E. *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1998.
- Obermann M. Moral disengagement in self-reported and peer-nominated school bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*. 2011; 37:133–144.10.1002/ab.20378 [PubMed: 21274851]
- Paciello M, Fida R, Tramontano C, Lupinetti C, Caprara G. Stability and change of moral disengagement and its impact on aggression and violence in late adolescence. *Child Development*. 2008; 79:1288–1309.10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01189.x [PubMed: 18826526]
- Pardini D, Lochman J, Frick P. Callous/unemotional traits and social-cognitive processes in adjudicated youths. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2003; 42:364–371. doi:10.1097/00004583-200303000-00018.
- Perren S, Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger E. Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in adolescence: Differential roles of moral disengagement, moral emotions, and moral values. *European Journal Of Developmental Psychology*. 2012; 9:195–209.10.1080/17405629.2011.643168
- Robson C, Witenberg RT. The influence of moral disengagement, morally based self-esteem, age, and gender on traditional bullying and cyberbullying. *Journal of School Violence*. 2013; 12:211–231.10.1080/15388220.2012.762921
- Shulman EP, Cauffman E, Piquero AR, Fagan J. Moral disengagement among serious juvenile offenders: A longitudinal study of the relations between morally disengaged attitudes and offending. *Developmental Psychology*. 2011; 47:1619–1632.10.1037/a0025404 [PubMed: 21910534]
- Skeem J, Cauffman E. Views of the downward extension: Comparing the youth version of the Psychopathy Checklist with the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*. 2003; 21:737–770.10.1002/bsl.563 [PubMed: 14696029]
- Tabachnick, B.; Fidell, L. *Using multivariate statistics*. 5. Boston: Allyn and Bacon; 2007.
- Turiel, E. *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge University Press; 1983.
- Van Noorden TJ, Haselager GT, Cillessen AN, Bukowski WM. Dehumanization in children: The link with moral disengagement in bullying and victimization. *Aggressive Behavior*. 2014; 40:320–328.10.1002/ab.21522 [PubMed: 24375450]

**Table 1**

Means (Standard Deviations) and Ranges for Moral Disengagement, Psychopathic Traits, and Antisocial Behavior by Gender

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Ranges</b>
<b>Moral Disengagement</b>				
Moral Justification	8.53 (2.99)	9.78 (3.08)	7.37 (2.37)	0 – 15
Euphemistic Language	6.48 (2.52)	7.22 (2.87)	5.80 (1.91)	0 – 14
Advantageous Comparisons	5.10 (2.01)	5.48 (2.52)	4.74 (1.41)	0 – 14
Displacement of Responsibility	6.89 (2.35)	7.11 (2.66)	6.68 (2.02)	0 – 12
Diffusion of Responsibility	8.02 (2.66)	7.79 (2.89)	8.24 (2.43)	0 – 14
Distortion of Consequences	6.52 (2.46)	7.11 (2.86)	5.96 (1.85)	0 – 12
Blame Victim	7.23 (2.45)	7.54 (2.90)	6.95 (1.91)	0 – 13
Dehumanizing Victim	6.59 (2.52)	7.54 (2.88)	5.71 (1.89)	0 – 16
<b>Affective Psychopathic Traits</b>				
Unemotional	10.29 (2.99)	11.21 (3.17)	9.44 (2.55)	5 – 17
Remorseless	7.04 (2.38)	7.39 (2.55)	6.71 (2.16)	5 – 12
Callous	9.63 (3.03)	10.53 (3.27)	8.78 (2.53)	5 – 18
<b>Antisocial &amp; Risky Behaviors</b>				
Unsafe	5.66 (3.13)	5.86 (3.28)	5.46 (2.99)	0 – 10
Violent	5.23 (5.51)	5.37 (5.54)	5.08 (5.50)	0 – 43
Legal Problems	0.40 (1.25)	0.57 (1.43)	0.25 (1.03)	0 – 8
Non-violent	2.22 (2.47)	2.68 (1.15)	1.78 (2.01)	0 – 12
Academic Dishonesty	0.86 (1.74)	1.15 (2.05)	0.59 (1.33)	0 – 8

Table 2

## Correlations Among Constructs (N = 181)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Moral Disengagement								
2. Unemotionality	.41**							
3. Remorseless	.41**	.60**						
4. Callous	.47**	.48**	.45**					
5. Unsafe	.23**	.14	.25**	.10				
6. Violence <sub>L</sub>	.08	.11	.27**	.12	.45**			
7. Legal Problems	.05	.15	.05	.09	.30**	.47**		
8. Non-violent	.30**	.22	.31**	.11	.44**	.42**	.51**	
9. Academic Dishonesty	.35**	.16	.25**	.14	.32**	.24**	.20*	.54**

*L*<sub>1</sub> indicates a logarithmic transformation where  $k = -.23$ ,

\*  $p < .01$ ,

\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 3  
Relative Contributions of Psychopathic Traits and Moral Disengagement to the Predictions of Antisocial Behaviors

	Unemotional	Remorseless	Callous	Moral Dis.	Total R <sup>2</sup>
Unsafe	.00 (-.04)	.03 (.23)	.00 (-.08)	.03 (.19)	.09*
Violent <sub>L</sub>	.00 (-.09)	.06 (.32)**	.00 (.03)	.00 (-.03)	.08*
Legal Problems	.02 (.17)	.00 (-.06)	.00 (.04)	.00 (-.02)	.02
Non-Violent	.00 (.04)	.04 (.25)*	.01 (-.14)	.04 (.25)*	.14**
Academic Dishonesty	.00 (-.06)	.02 (.19)	.00 (-.08)	.08 (.33)**	.15**

Note. Numbers are semi-partial correlations (and  $\beta$ s),

\*  $p < .01$ ,

\*\*  $p < .001$ ,

$L_i$  indicates a logarithmic transformation where  $k = -.23$

**Table 4**  
 Relative Contributions of Psychopathic Traits and Moral Disengagement to the Predictions of Antisocial Behaviors, by Gender

	Unemotional	Remorseless	Callous	Moral Dis.	Total R <sup>2</sup>
Unsafe					
Male	.00 (.05)	.04 (.28)	.04 (-.25)	.06 (.31)	.19*
Female	.01 (-.14)	.01 (.15)	.01 (.08)	.00 (.03)	.03
Violent <sub>L</sub>					
Male	.00 (-.01)	.12 (.48)**	.00 (-.04)	.00 (-.05)	.19*
Female	.02 (-.18)	.01 (.12)	.01 (.13)	.00 (-.04)	.04
Legal Problems					
Male	.04 (.28)	.01 (-.14)	.01 (-.13)	.00 (-.02)	.04
Female	.00 (.03)	.00 (-.01)	.04 (.24)	.00 (.06)	.07
Non-Violent					
Male	.00 (-.04)	.05 (.32)	.04 (-.24)	.04 (.27)	.15*
Female	.00 (.07)	.02 (.18)	.00 (-.02)	.05 (.22)	.12
Academic Dishonesty					
Male	.02 (-.18)	.04 (.26)	.02 (-.18)	.09 (.39)*	.16*
Female	.00 (.06)	.01 (.11)	.00 (.05)	.08 (.29)*	.14*

Note. Numbers are semi-partial correlations (and  $\beta$ s).

\*  $p < .01$ ,

\*\*  $p < .001$ ,

<sub>L</sub> indicates a logarithmic transformation where  $k = -.23$