



Published in final edited form as:

J Abnorm Psychol. 2012 May ; 121(2): 424–432. doi:10.1037/a0026656.

DSM-5 Personality Traits and DSM-IV Personality Disorders

Christopher J. Hopwood,
Michigan State University

Katherine M. Thomas,
Michigan State University

Kristian E. Markon,
University of Iowa

Aidan G.C. Wright, and
Pennsylvania State University and Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic

Robert F. Krueger
University of Minnesota

Abstract

Two issues pertinent to the DSM-5 proposal for personality pathology, the recovery of DSM-IV personality disorders (PDs) by proposed DSM-5 traits and the validity of the proposed DSM-5 hybrid model which incorporates both personality pathology symptoms and maladaptive traits, were evaluated in a large undergraduate sample (N = 808). Proposed DSM-5 traits as assessed with the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 explained a substantial proportion of variance in DSM-IV PDs as assessed with the Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+, and trait indicators of the six proposed DSM-5 PDs were mostly specific to those disorders with some exceptions. Regression analyses support the DSM-5 hybrid model in that pathological traits and an indicator of general personality pathology severity provided incremental information about PDs. Findings are discussed in the context of broader issues around the proposed DSM-5 model of personality disorders.

There will be a considerable transition in personality disorder (PD) description moving from the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* (DSM-IV; American Psychiatric Association, 1994) to the DSM-5. Unlike the DSM-IV, in which ten PDs were represented as distinct categories with polythetic criteria, in the most recent DSM-5 proposal (<http://www.dsm5.org/proposedrevision/Pages/PersonalityDisorders.aspx>) PD would be diagnosed as follows. A patient's overall level of personality functioning would first be evaluated on a continuous dimension of severity of self and interpersonal dysfunction to determine whether a diagnosis of PD was merited. For patients with clinically significant personality pathology, 6 specific PDs (Antisocial, Avoidant, Borderline, Narcissistic, Obsessive-compulsive, and Schizotypal) would be assessed according to 5 criteria. Criterion A involves impairments in self (i.e., identity and self-direction) and interpersonal (i.e., empathy and intimacy) functioning tailored to each PD. Criterion B is a constellation of pathological personality traits descriptive of the disorder. Criterion C involves stability across time and situations, Criterion D involves distinguishing culturally or developmentally normative personality features from clinical pathology, and Criterion E is a rule out for medical or substance-related causes of personality problems. As of this writing, all criteria and all features of criteria A and B would need to be met for a diagnosis, representing a shift from the polythetic criteria sets employed in DSM-IV.

A patient with personality pathology who does not fit at least one of the six diagnostic categories would be classified using the PD-Trait Specified (PDS) diagnosis. Criterion A would involve general deficits in self and interpersonal functioning and Criterion C-E would remain the same. Criterion B would be a list of elevated pathological traits from a hierarchical model composed of 5 higher order domains (Negative Affectivity, Detachment, Disinhibition, Antagonism, and Psychoticism) which in turn encompass 25 lower-order traits or facets (see Table 1). These traits can also be used to augment the description of patients who meet criteria for another PD when they are not listed in Criterion B for that disorder.

The traits for this measure were based on an extensive literature showing robust associations between four higher order factors of the Five Factor Model (FFM; Samuel & Widiger, 2009; Widiger & Trull, 2007) and similar models (Widiger & Simonsen, 2005; Watson, Clark, & Harkness 1994) with personality pathology: Introversion (similar to Detachment), Antagonism, Emotional Dysregulation (Negative Emotionality), and Impulsivity (Disinhibition) (see <http://www.dsm5.org/Documents/APA%20Trait%20System%20Rationale.pdf>). The focus in the DSM-5 model was on maladaptive variants of these constructs, although additional scales were also created to accommodate personality disorders related to the typically more adaptive pole of a given trait (specifically, Histrionic PD and Extraversion, Obsessive-Compulsive PD and Conscientiousness). A fifth dimension involving Psychoticism was added to capture 'Cluster A' features given that Openness to Experience has shown limited associations with PD (although, see Piedmont et al., 2009), rendering the higher order model very similar to the Personality Psychopathology-5 (PSY-5; Harkness & McNulty, 1994), which is itself undergirded by a substantial empirical literature supporting its validity for depicting variants of personality pathology, as well as connections to major domains of temperament (Tellegen, 1985; Clark & Watson, 1999). Thus the DSM-5 trait model is based upon and informed by other well-known trait models of personality and personality pathology that can themselves be seen as consensual (Widiger & Simonsen, 2005; Wright et al., in review), and which can provide a higher-order structure within which to fit a number of lower-order traits relevant to PD. Items were written for these traits and administered to large community and treatment seeking samples in the empirical process leading to the creation of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5; Krueger et al., in review), the assessment instrument that operationalizes the currently proposed model.

This study was designed to evaluate the continuity of the DSM-IV and DSM-5 models and the validity of the DSM-5 proposal which combines symptoms of personality pathology (Criterion A) with maladaptive traits (Criterion B) in deriving 'hybrid' PD diagnoses. This first focus of the current study is on the link between the pathological traits proposed for DSM-5 (Krueger et al., 2011; in review) and DSM-IV PDs. The issue of how DSM-5 traits and DSM-IV disorders relate is important for a number of reasons. While the DSM-5 has the potential to provide a much-needed overhaul of a problematic DSM-IV system (Clark, 2007), it is also important that useful clinical information from the DSM-IV is not lost in the transition. The somewhat challenging shift from DSM-IV to DSM-5 will be smoother to the extent that connections across the models are understood and articulated empirically. Despite the importance of this issue, the assignment of specific traits as indicators for the remaining six PDs were based largely on committee consensus derived from clinical expertise and very little research thus far has examined the empirical relations between the DSM-5 proposal and DSM-IV constructs.

The second focus of the current study is on the validity of the hybrid aspect of the DSM-5 proposal for diagnosing PDs. Criterion A for each of the six PDs involves personality dysfunction as instantiated in problems with identity, self-direction, empathy and intimacy.

This element of the hybrid diagnosis is analogous to the general DSM-IV definition of PD, but unlike in DSM-IV it is quantified and described in greater detail. Criterion B lists the traits that further define the disorder. These traits are analogous to DSM-IV PD criteria in indicating specific features of various diagnostic constructs. However, unlike in the DSM-IV, the focus is on trait elements that fit into a valid structural model and can thus also be used to describe patients regardless of their standing on any particular PD. Currently little is known about whether the pathological symptoms in Criterion A and specific Criterion B traits proposed for the DSM-5 provide incremental, non-overlapping information about specific PD constructs. The addition of a general severity criterion and a potentially more valid trait model for underlying criteria may serve to maintain continuity with the DSM-IV system while also improving the structure and validity of the DSM-5 model relative to the DSM-IV. On the other hand, it is possible the currently proposed Criterion B traits could be altered to improve continuity with DSM-IV, or that symptoms and pathological traits do not provide incremental information and thus it would be uneconomical for clinicians to rate both sets of variables as proposed in the DSM-5.

In this study we examined three questions that will be important for shaping the DSM-5 proposal: 1) How well do the DSM-5 traits capture DSM-IV personality disorders?; 2) How well do DSM-5 specified traits map onto the PDs and can any modifications be recommended?; and 3) Do the proposed traits provide incremental information over the levels of functioning element of the proposal for indicating specific PDs?

Method

Participants and Procedures

This study occurred in the psychology department at a public university in which 963 undergraduates completed self-report questionnaires online for course credit. Of these, 808 returned data with fewer than 10% missing items and scores less than 2.5 standard deviations higher than the community average on a measure of random or careless responding (*Personality Assessment Inventory* Infrequency scale; Morey, 1991). This subsample was retained for further analyses. The average age was 19.92 (S.D. = 2.04, range = 18–40); 71% (571) were women; and 84% (678) were Caucasian. All participants were consented in this IRB-approved research study.

Measures

The *Personality Inventory for DSM-5* (PID-5; Krueger et al., 2011, in review), a 220-item questionnaire with a four-point response scale, was used to measure proposed DSM-5 traits. This measure was created as a tool for assessing the initial trait model currently proposed for the DSM-5¹ (Krueger et al., 2011). It has 25 primary scales that load onto 5 higher-order scales (see Table 1). Lower-order scale internal consistencies (Cronbach's alpha) ranged from .70 (Suspiciousness) to .95 (Eccentricity) in this sample (Mdn = .86). Krueger et al. (in review) describe the development of this instrument and initial psychometric evidence from large treatment-seeking and population-representative community samples. In the population-representative sample the PID-5 facets had internal consistency values that ranged from .72 to .96 (Median alpha = .86) and five factors were suggested by considering a variety of extraction criteria as well as substantive interpretability. Wright et al. (in review) showed that the structure identified by Krueger et al. generalizes to a large sample of students, of which the current sample is a subset, with factor congruence values > .93.

¹The American Psychiatric Association has emphasized that the DSM-5 will be subject to regular updates based upon scientific advances such that future editions will be referred to with decimals (e.g., 5.1, 5.2; <http://www.dsm5.org/Documents/DSM-Name-Change.pdf>).

The *Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire 4+* (PDQ-4+; Hyler, 1994) is a 99-item true-false instrument with item content that corresponds directly to the criteria for the DSM-IV PDs. This measure was administered because its content maps directly onto the DSM-IV symptoms, which is important given the purpose of this paper to evaluate the continuity of the DSM-IV and DSM-5. Internal consistencies ranged from .49 (obsessive-compulsive) to .75 (antisocial) (Mdn = .64). Categorical PDs were eschewed in favor of continuous symptom counts for the purposes of this study given that continuous psychopathology scales are generally more reliable and valid than categorical markers (Markon et al., 2010).

Analyses

We computed bivariate correlations between the PID-5 and PDQ-4+ scales to evaluate the degree to which the DSM-5 traits proposed by the work group to represent PD types capture PDs as represented by the DSM-IV (question 1). To examine the adequacy of these proposed traits (question 2) we used hierarchical regression models in which index PD scales were regressed on separate blocks of proposed and non-proposed traits. For instance, the work group has proposed that rigid perfectionism and perseveration are the traits that indicate Obsessive Compulsive PD. So in these regressions we entered these two traits as predictors of DSM-IV Obsessive Compulsive PD in the first step, and the rest of the PID-5 traits in the second step. This permitted an evaluation of a) the extent to which proposed traits capture the diagnostic type and b) the extent to which non-proposed traits provide any incremental information about that type. These data as well as bivariate correlations between DSM-5 traits and DSM-IV PDs were used as the basis for inferences regarding the potential need for changing the currently proposed DSM-5 PD trait criteria to smoothen the transition from DSM-IV.

To evaluate the extent to which the DSM-5 traits provide incremental information about DSM-IV PDs after accounting for general personality pathology (question 3), we first derived an estimate of general personality pathology severity. To derive this estimate we used a composite of ten PDQ-4+ items based on the results from a recent paper by Morey et al. (2011). In that paper Morey et al. listed the ten PD symptoms with the strongest positive beta coefficients in a multivariate model predicting the Item Response Theory derived estimate of overall PD severity in a large clinical sample. We summed the corresponding ten symptoms from the PDQ-4+; this composite had an internal consistency of .63 and correlated with the sum of all symptoms .81. We then entered this severity estimate, as well as the proposed traits for each PD as described above, in regression models predicting the six PDs proposed to be retained in the DSM-5. This allowed us to evaluate a) how related general personality pathology is to each proposed PD and b) whether the proposed DSM-5 traits provide incremental information about the PDs over and above general personality pathology. Because the general PD severity scale included some of the symptoms from the PDs that served as criterion variables, overlapping symptoms were removed from the PD criterion scale in these regression models.

Results

Associations between Traits and Disorders

Bivariate Associations—Tables 1 and 2 present the bivariate correlations between the DSM-5 traits and the DSM-IV PDs. The columns in Table 1 include those PDs proposed for retention in the DSM-5, with bold values indicating the traits that have been proposed to represent the PD. Table 2 columns represent PDs scheduled for elimination, as well as the general PD severity composite we constructed based on Morey et al. (2011) and the total amount of PD symptoms. Correlations $> .11$ were statistically significant at $p < .001$ in this

sample, although given the sample size and number of comparisons, we focus primarily on effect sizes.

In general, among PDs proposed for retention in the DSM-5, the traits show strong convergence with the PD they are proposed to indicate. For instance, the median bold correlation (i.e., proposed trait) in Table 1 was .51 whereas the median non-bold correlation (i.e., non-proposed trait) was .31. However, some coefficients were lower than expected, such as the correlation between Risk Taking and Borderline PD (.18), and some correlations that are not proposed to indicate certain PDs were quite high, such as Perseveration and Borderline PD (.54). Patterns for the other, non-retained PDs in Table 2 are also largely consistent with the predictions offered in the DSM-5 trait-disorder ‘cross-walk’ (<http://dsm5.org/ProposedRevisions/Pages/DSM-5TypeandTraitCross-Walk.aspx>).

Multivariate Associations—To further investigate the adequacy of the traits proposed by the DSM-5 Work Group to indicate the six retained PDs we regressed these six DSM-IV PD constructs onto their proposed (bold in Table 1) Criterion B traits as one block, followed by the other, non-proposed (non-bold) traits in the subsequent block. We also did this the other way around (non-proposed traits followed by proposed traits) to compare the improvement in variance explained with both of these sets of traits. Results (Table 3) suggest that for three retained PDs, Schizotypal, Antisocial, and Borderline, the non-proposed traits do not provide information above and beyond those traits that are proposed.

For the other three retained PDs, however, the non-proposed traits do provide incremental information. For instance, Antagonistic traits that were not proposed by the DSM-5 Work Group to indicate Narcissistic PD traits such as Manipulativeness, Deceitfulness, and Callousness had correlations with DSM-IV Narcissistic PD ranging from .47–.51. Three of the four traits proposed to indicate Avoidant PD showed strong effects: Anxiousness, Withdrawal, and Anhedonia. The effect size for Intimacy Avoidance, however, was more modest, and several traits not specified for Avoidant PD showed appreciably stronger effects, including Depressivity and Perseveration. Finally, while both Perseveration and Rigid Perfectionism had strong relations with Obsessive-Compulsive PD, others, particularly including Anxiousness, did as well.

Evaluating the Hybrid Model

Table 2 shows the correlations of PID-5 traits with the general personality pathology estimate we derived based on Morey (2011) and the total number of PD symptoms. Importantly, these patterns of correlations were very similar (the correlation between these columns was .96), which supports our use of the general personality pathology estimate to capture what the PDs have in common. The personality pathology estimate furthermore correlated strongly and consistently across the PID-5 domains, suggesting that it also captures what these pathological traits have in common. Interestingly, the correlations between lower order PID-5 facets and this indicator can therefore be interpreted as indicating which pathological traits are most strongly linked to generalized personality pathology. The five strongest correlates each exceeded $r = .50$: Depressivity, Anxiousness, Suspiciousness, Hostility, and Perseveration. Other traits correlated more weakly with this estimate (i.e., $r < .28$), such as Restricted Affectivity, Grandiosity, Attention-Seeking, and Impulsivity. This pattern indicates that some traits are more related to personality pathology in general, whereas others may be more related to particular manifestations of personality disorder.

Table 4 shows the results of hierarchical models in which the PDs proposed for retention in the DSM-5 were regressed on general personality pathology and the PID-5 traits proposed to indicate them. Results support the DSM-5 hybrid model in that both general personality

pathology and the proposed traits provide incremental information about each of the 6 retained PDs. The overall variance explained in these models indicates the potential for the DSM-5 PDs to converge reasonably well those of the DSM-IV.

Discussion

The purposes of this paper were to evaluate the degree to which 1) the clinical information from the DSM-IV PDs is recovered by the proposed DSM-5 traits, 2) the traits proposed to depict the six PDs slated for retention in DSM-5 are adequate, and 3) the proposed traits and a general estimate of personality pathology provide incremental information about retained PDs. Overall, the results provide initial support for the DSM-5 model in general and in particular support the coverage of DSM-IV PDs by traits as well as the incremental value of general personality pathology and pathological traits for indicating PDs. These results also point to areas in which the DSM-5 proposal could potentially be modified to enhance continuity with DSM-IV.

DSM-5 Traits and DSM-IV PDs

The traits specified in Criterion B for the DSM-5 PDs were generally adequate, and in fact traits not proposed for three PDs, Schizotypal, Antisocial, and Borderline, failed to significantly increment the proposed traits in indicating the diagnosis. This may be explained by the fact that these disorders are represented in the majority of empirical research on PDs. A second potential explanation is that more traits are used to depict these disorders than the others (i.e., 6 or 7 as opposed to 2 or 4). These issues might also be related to each other; for instance it may have been more straightforward to articulate the traits that would be relevant for these three disorders. Results also suggested adequate content coverage for other retained PDs, Narcissistic, Avoidant, and Obsessive-Compulsive, although non-specified traits provided incremental information about these PDs and the overall variance explained in these PDs by the DSM-5 hybrid model was somewhat lower. Overall this pattern of correlations supports the ability of the PID-5 traits to cover the diagnostic territory of the DSM-IV PD constructs, particularly those DSM-IV constructs that have received the largest amount of empirical attention.

Although these results appear to suggest that expanding the list of traits descriptive of some PDs could improve the continuity between some DSM-IV constructs and DSM-5 traits, modifying the DSM-5 PD criteria for this purpose comes with tradeoffs. In particular, one of the main problems with the DSM-IV involves diagnostic overlap. One way to address this problem in the DSM-5 would be to limit the degree to which different PDs have the same criteria, as is currently proposed. Yet this may in turn limit convergence with the DSM-IV. Thus, there is a balance between the goals of continuity/statistical explanation and discriminant validity. For instance, if the Antagonism-related traits discussed above with the strongest correlations with Narcissistic PD were specified for that disorder, Narcissistic and Antisocial PDs would share them, and thus the diagnostic overlap between these PDs would increase. However, permitting this level of overlap may improve the continuity of the trait system with the DSM-IV and, perhaps more importantly, theoretical models of PD constructs. For instance, clinical theories emphasize vulnerable and antagonistic aspects of pathological narcissism, and the narrow focus on overt grandiosity in the symptom sets has been a criticism of the DSM-IV definition by clinical theorists (Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). This issue appears to be exacerbated in the DSM-5 proposal, whereas including traits from the facets of Antagonism and Negative Emotionality could potentially improve continuity with the DSM-IV and clinical theories of pathological narcissism.

Another way to approach the balance between statistical explanation and discriminant validity is to consider two potential Criterion B trait lists for a given PD. Take the example of Borderline PD. To maximize content coverage, all traits with correlations above .40 could be listed. There are 14 such traits. To maximize discriminant validity, only those trait correlations that are most specific to BPD, operationalized as the strongest row-wise correlation with BPD in Table 1, could be listed. There are 7 such traits. The average inter-correlation among all 6 retained PDs when all disorders are determined by summing scores from any trait with correlations $> .40$ is .79, whereas the average inter-correlation of the PDs when only specific traits are retained is .46. Interestingly, the average convergent correlations of trait-specified DSM-5 PD with DSM-IV PDs are .76 when diagnoses involve overlapping traits and .75 when they do not. This pattern suggests that choosing traits for Criterion B that are specific to a given PD would have the effect of reducing diagnostic overlap without attenuating continuity with the DSM-IV.

The DSM-5 Hybrid Model

In the DSM-5 proposal, PDs would be indicated by symptoms reflecting personality pathology severity (Criterion A) as well as specific pathological traits (Criterion B). In this study our estimate of general personality pathology and the proposed traits provided significant incremental information for depicting all six proposed DSM-5 PDs. This finding supports the utility of integrating trait and symptomatic elements of PD constructs and portends a smooth transition in that DSM-IV PDs can be substantially recovered in the DSM-5. This is particularly so given that the reliabilities for PDQ-4+ scales were somewhat low, and that the general pathology estimate, which was derived from the PDQ-4+ and did not include specific PD features as proposed for DSM-5 Criterion A, may be limited relative to what has been proposed for the DSM-5.

Although these results lend support to the DSM-5 hybrid model for indicating PDs and for predicting criterion variables, it is important to mention several potential limitations of the proposal. For instance, patients are only trait specified if they fail to meet the specific criteria for a PD “type” diagnosis, yet PD diagnoses are determined by rating traits that were selected for their fit into a model that lends itself to trait specification. To the extent that the PDs serve to summarize the particular traits evident in the patient, and given that traits not included in the diagnosis can be listed alongside PDs, it would perhaps be less complex to abandon DSM-IV PDs and to simply focus on general severity and pathological traits (Livesley, 2011; Tyrer, Crawford, & Mulder, 2011). Given that dimensional models are more likely to stand up to formal tests of psychometric adequacy than categorical PDs (e.g., Bastiannasen, Rossi, Schotte, & De Fruyt, 2011; Krueger & Markon, 2006; Markon & Krueger, 2005; Markon, Chmielewski, & Miller, in press) and clinicians may be increasingly comfortable with dimensional models (Samuel & Widiger, 2006), practically speaking the DSM-5 as proposed would appear to be an intermediary step toward replacing PD constructs with trait dimensions (Krueger et al., 2007). In other words, from a clinical perspective it might be simplest to diagnose every PD patient PDTS, and thus PDs in the DSM-5 appear to function primarily as a means for clinicians to become accustomed to a new and more efficient pathological trait system.

On the other hand, by conceptualizing PD criteria as traits, narrower and more acute symptomatic elements of personality pathology such as violent behaviors following emotional provocation, perceptual dysregulation in the context of perceived abandonment, or attention-seeking behavior in the context of insecurity will be subsumed into broader constructs as potential exemplars of more general phenomena. Recognition of the dynamic character of such elements is limited in the current proposal, as even though certain symptom manifestations are depicted in Criterion A for each disorder, Criterion C requires relative stability for all PD features. Thus specific clinically relevant information about the

functional relationships among dynamic and contextually influenced behaviors that interfere with self and interpersonal functioning may be difficult to articulate in the DSM-5.

Another potential limitation is that focusing on pathological rather than normative traits may constrain the potential for clinicians to use the DSM-5 to describe people in general, their adaptive strengths, or other personality features that are not dysfunctional (Samuel, 2011). If the purposes of the DSM-5 PD system were to describe people's personalities generally while preserving the clinical importance of the dynamic PD symptoms that are often the focus of clinical interventions, the trait part of the model would need to focus less on pathology and more on normative individual differences and the pathology part of the model would need to focus more on dynamic and contextualized PD symptoms (Wright, 2011). For instance, normal traits could be assessed for all patients regardless of their diagnosis (Hopwood, 2011), and individuals with personality pathology could be assessed via a combination of a general pathology dimension and dimensional ratings of a subset of DSM-IV PD constructs, modified to enhance discriminant validity and clinical utility (Hopwood et al., 2011).

Limitations and Conclusions

The generalizability of this study is limited by the exclusive use of questionnaires and an analogue undergraduate sample. Although questionnaires are the most common method used in personality assessment research, this may lead to disadvantages with regard to understanding the validity of personality pathology measures and constructs (e.g., Bornstein, 2003, 2011). PD research in analogues is common and consistent with a dimensional model of personality pathology which would suggest that the correlates and structure of PDs should not be substantially affected by sampling (O'Connor & Dyce, 1988). Furthermore, rates of PD among undergraduates are not trivial (Lenzenweger, 2008). Nevertheless, ultimately DSM-5 is a diagnostic manual and the most direct evidence regarding the validity of different aspects of the DSM would come from clinical samples.

This study may have also been impacted by properties idiosyncratic to the measures we selected. For instance, certain anomalous findings may be due to limitations with study measures. Indeed, several significant correlations were surprising, such as between Obsessive-Compulsive PD and Irresponsibility (.15), Avoidant PD and Grandiosity (.12), Borderline PD and Restricted Affectivity (.17), and Narcissistic PD and Unusual Beliefs/Experiences (.38). Such correlations may reflect a combination of the negative valence associated with PDs and pathological traits in general, as well as possible idiosyncrasies with one or both of the measures used in this study (albeit we note also that these potentially anomalous correlations were generally small in effect size). In particular, although it was advantageous for the purposes of this study to use a measure whose content corresponds directly to the DSM-IV PDs, the PDQ-4+ may be limited psychometrically (e.g., some scales had low internal consistencies). Research using other operationalizations of DSM-IV PDs would be useful to further evaluate the continuity of DSM-IV and DSM-5 personality pathology constructs.

Although the general personality pathology estimate used to represent Criterion A correlated strongly with the total number of symptoms and thus appeared to capture what various PDs have in common, it was also weak in at least two ways. First, it was not as thorough as has been proposed for the DSM-5 (Bender, Morey, & Skodol, 2011), so that it may have been underpowered for depicting PD or criterion variables and a more thorough variable may have showed stronger effects. Second, in the DSM-5 proposal this severity estimate serves two functions: it justifies any PD diagnosis in step one, and is the framework for articulating particular PD symptoms in step 2. In this study, these functions were collapsed, with the focus primarily on the first step. Although this first step should generally accommodate any

symptoms particular to a PD, this strategy may have weakened our PD estimate and artificially limited its specificity relative to Criterion B symptoms. Further research that maps more precisely onto the DSM-5 proposal would be useful in better understanding the value of general personality pathology and Criterion A features.

Methodological limitations notwithstanding, this study is important because these are among the first data on the proposed DSM-5 traits independent of the sample in which they were derived, and this is the first study to explicitly examine the relations between proposed DSM-5 traits and DSM-IV PDs. Overall, the pathological traits in particular and the hybrid model proposed for the DSM-5 fared well in terms of the convergence of specified traits with their index disorders and criterion validity relative to DSM-IV PDs. Results also provocatively suggest that, although some PDs may appear to be undersaturated with traits, improving content coverage has the effect of worsening discriminant validity without appreciably improving convergent validity. Although theoretical issues and clinical issues should also guide decisions about how to represent PD, from a purely empirical perspective this effect illustrates the importance of discriminant validity in PD assessment.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by grants (F31MH087053, Wright) from the National Institutes of Health, Washington, DC. The views contained are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the funding source.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. 4th ed.. Washington, DC: Author; 1994.
- Babor, TF.; Higgins-Biddle, JC.; Saunders, JB.; Monteiro, MG. Alcohol Use Identification Test, second edition. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2001.
- Bastiannasen L, Rossi G, Schotte C, De Fruyt P. The structure of personality disorders: Comparing the DSM-IV-TR Axis II Classification with the Five-Factor Model Framework using Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 2011; 25:378–397. [PubMed: 21699398]
- Bender DS, Morey LC, Skodol AE. Toward a model for assessing level of personality functioning in DSM-5, Part I: An empirical review. (in review).
- Bornstein RF. Behaviorally referenced experimentation and symptom validation: A paradigm for 21st-century personality disorder research. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 2003; 17:1–18. [PubMed: 12659543]
- Bornstein RF. Toward a process-focused model of test score validity: Improving psychological assessment in science and practice. *Psychological Assessment*. 2011; 23:532–544. [PubMed: 21668126]
- Cain NM, Pincus AL, Ansell EB. Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2008; 28:638–656. [PubMed: 18029072]
- Clark, LA. Professional Manual for the Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (SNAP). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; 1993.
- Clark LA. Assessment and diagnosis of personality disorder: Perennial issues and an emerging reconceptualization. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2007; 58:227–257.
- Clark, LA.; Watson, D. Temperament: A new paradigm for trait psychology. In: Pervin, LA.; John, OP., editors. *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, second edition. New York: Guilford; 1999. p. 399-423.
- Costa, PT., Jr; McCrae, RR. Professional Manual for the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources; 1992.

- Harkness, AR.; McNulty, JL. The personality psychopathology five (PSY-5): Issue from the pages of a diagnostic manual instead of a dictionary. In: Strack, S.; Lorr, M., editors. *Differentiating normal and abnormal personality*. New York: Springer; 1994. p. 291-315.
- Hopwood CJ. Personality traits in the DSM-5. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 2011
- Hopwood CJ, Malone JC, Ansell EB, Sanislow CA, Grilo CM, McGlashan TH, Pinto A, Markowitz JC, Shea MT, Skodol AE, Gunderson JG, Zanarini MC, Morey LC. Personality Assessment in DSM-V: Empirical support for rating severity, style, and traits. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 2011; 25:305–320. [PubMed: 21699393]
- Hopwood CJ, Zanarini MC. Borderline personality traits and disorder: predicting prospective patient functioning. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2010; 78:585–589. [PubMed: 20658814]
- Hyler, SE. *Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire 4 +*. New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute; 1994.
- Krueger RF. Personality pathology is dimensional, so what shall we do with the DSMIV personality disorder categories? The case of Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD). *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*. 2010; 1:195–196.
- Krueger RF, Derringer J, Markon KE, Watson D, Skodol AE. Constructing a Personality Inventory for DSM-5. (in review).
- Krueger RF, Eaton N. Personality traits and the classification of mental disorders: Toward a more complete integration in DSM 5 and an empirical model of psychopathology. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*. 2010; 1:97–118.
- Krueger RF, Eaton NR, Derringer J, Markon KE, Watson D, Skodol AE. Personality in DSM-5: Helping delineate personality disorder content and framing the meta-structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 2011; 93:325–331. [PubMed: 22804671]
- Krueger RF, Markon KE. Reinterpreting comorbidity: A model-based approach to understanding and classifying psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2006; 2:111–133.
- Krueger RF, Skodol AE, Livesley WJ, Shrout PE, Huang Y. Synthesizing dimensional and categorical approaches to personality disorders: Refining the research agenda for DSM-V Axis II. *International Methods in Psychiatric Research*. 2007; 16:S65–S73.
- Lenzenweger MF. Epidemiology of personality disorders. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*. 2008; 31:395–403. [PubMed: 18638642]
- Livesley WJ. An empirically-based classification of personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 2011; 25:398–420.
- Markon KE, Krueger RF. Categorical and continuous models of liability to externalizing disorders: A direct comparison in NESARC. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2005; 62:1352–1359. [PubMed: 16330723]
- Markon KE, Chmielewski M, Miller CJ. The reliability and validity of discrete and continuous measures of psychopathology: A quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*. (in press).
- McGlashan TH, Grilo CM, Sanislow CA, Ravelski E, Morey LC, Gunderson JG, Skodol AE, Shea MT, Zanarini MC, Bender D, Stout RL, Yen S, Pagano M. Two-year prevalence and stability of individual DSM-IV criteria for schizotypal, borderline, avoidant, and obsessive-compulsive personality disorders: Toward a hybrid model. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2005; 162:883–889. [PubMed: 15863789]
- Morey LC. Personality disorders in DSM-III and DSM-III-R: convergence, coverage, and internal consistency. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 1988; 145:573–577. [PubMed: 3358461]
- Morey, LC. *Personality Assessment Inventory Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources; 1991.
- Morey LC, Berghuis H, Bender DS, Verheul R, Krueger RF, Skodol AE. Toward a model for assessing level of personality functioning in DSM-5, Part II: Empirical articulation of a core dimension of personality pathology. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 93:347–353. (in press). [PubMed: 22804673]
- Morey LC, Hopwood CJ, Gunderson JG, Skodol AE, Shea MT, Yen S, Stout RL, Zanarini MC, Grilo CM, Sanislow CA, McGlashan TH. Comparison of alternative models for personality disorders. *Psychological Medicine*. 2007; 37:983–994. [PubMed: 17121690]

- Mulder RT, Newton-Howes G, Crawford MJ, Tyrer PJ. Classifying personality disorder according to severity. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 2011; 25:321–337. [PubMed: 21699394]
- O'Connor BP, Dyce JA. A test of models of personality disorder configuration. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 1998; 107:3–16. [PubMed: 9505034]
- Piedmont RL, Sherman MF, Sherman NC, Dy-Liacco GS, Williams JE. Using the five-factor model to identify a new personality disorder domain: The case for experiential permeability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2009; 96:1245–1258. [PubMed: 19469599]
- Pincus AL. Some comments on nosology, diagnostic process, and narcissistic personality disorder in the DSM-5 proposal for personality and personality disorders. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*. 2011; 1:41–53.
- Pincus AL, Lukowitsky MR. Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2010; 6:421–446.
- Samuel DB. Assessing personality in the DSM-5: The utility of bipolar constructs. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 2011; 93:390–397. [PubMed: 22804678]
- Samuel DB, Widiger TA. A meta-analytic review of the relationships between the five-factor model and DSM-IV-TR personality disorders: A facet level analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2008; 28:1326–1342. [PubMed: 18708274]
- Samuel DB, Widiger TA. Clinicians' judgments of clinical utility: A comparison of the DSM-IV and Five-Factor Models. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2006; 115:298–308. [PubMed: 16737394]
- Shedler J, Beck A, Fonagy P, Gabbard GO, Gunderson J, Kernberg O, Michaels R, Westen D. Personality disorders in the DSM-5. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2010; 167:1026–1028. [PubMed: 20826853]
- Soldz S, Budman S, Demby A, Merry J. A short form of the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems Circumplex scales. *Assessment*. 1995; 2:53–63.
- Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW. Validity and utility of a self-report version of PRIME-ID: The PHQ Primary Care Study. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 1999; 282:1737–1744. [PubMed: 10568646]
- Tellegen, A. Structures of mood and personality and their relevance to assessing anxiety, with an emphasis on self-report. In: Tuma, AH.; Maser, JD., editors. *Anxiety and Anxiety Disorders*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1985. p. 681-706.
- Tyrer P, Crawford M, Mulder R. Reclassifying personality disorders. *Lancet*. 2011; 377:1814–1815. [PubMed: 21353696]
- Widiger TA, Simonsen E. Alternative dimensional models of personality disorder: Finding a common ground. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 2005; 19:110–130. [PubMed: 15899712]
- Widiger TA, Trull TJ. Plate tectonics in the classification of personality disorder. *American Psychologist*. 2007; 62:71–83. [PubMed: 17324033]
- Widiger TA. A shaky future for personality disorders. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*. 2011; 1:54–67.
- Wright AGC. Quantitative and qualitative distinctions in personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 2011; 93(4):370–379. [PubMed: 22804676]
- Zanarini MC, Frankenburg FR, Reich DB, Silk KR, Hudson JI, McSweeney LB. The subsyndromal phenomenology of borderline personality disorder: A 10-year follow-up study. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2007; 164:929–935. [PubMed: 17541053]

Table 1

Correlations between DSM-5 Traits and DSM-IV Personality Disorders proposed to be retained in DSM-5.

	STPD	ASPD	BPD	NPD	AVPD	OCPD
Higher Order Traits						
Negative Affectivity	.51	.33	.63	.45	.59	.49
Detachment	.58	.39	.55	.38	.53	.31
Antagonism	.38	.52	.38	.64	.20	.25
Disinhibition	.46	.61	.54	.45	.28	.33
Psychoticism	.70	.44	.53	.45	.36	.37
Lower Order Traits						
Submissiveness	.15	.04	.20	.11	.38	.26
Restricted Affectivity	.31	.26	.17	.25	.24	.23
Separation Insecurity	.28	.18	.45	.31	.40	.28
Anxiousness	.39	.17	.53	.31	.51	.42
Emotional Lability	.42	.22	.56	.32	.41	.35
Hostility	.38	.40	.53	.48	.38	.32
Perseveration	.51	.35	.54	.41	.48	.46
Suspiciousness	.51	.37	.46	.44	.38	.27
Depressivity	.51	.38	.61	.31	.51	.27
Withdrawal	.51	.23	.35	.28	.48	.28
Intimacy Avoidance	.31	.29	.26	.24	.24	.18
Anhedonia	.46	.28	.49	.25	.50	.22
Manipulativeness	.29	.43	.29	.49	.12	.23
Deceitfulness	.39	.55	.40	.51	.28	.19
Callousness	.39	.54	.37	.47	.20	.15
Attention Seeking	.18	.30	.24	.51	.10	.18
Grandiosity	.31	.28	.20	.54	.12	.25
Irresponsibility	.41	.49	.44	.36	.27	.15
Impulsivity	.26	.56	.39	.30	.10	.11
Distractibility	.39	.40	.47	.32	.39	.30

	STPD	ASPD	BPD	NPD	AVPD	OCPD
Rigid Perfectionism	.37	.11	.32	.36	.28	.54
Risk Taking	.10	.53	.18	.16	-.16	-.07
Eccentricity	.61	.38	.46	.39	.36	.34
Perceptual Dysregulation	.61	.44	.55	.43	.36	.35
Unusual Beliefs and Experiences	.64	.37	.41	.38	.21	.31

Note. N = 808. Correlations > .11 are significant at $p < .001$. Traits that are proposed as criteria for each retained PD in the DSM-5 are in bold. PD = Personality Disorder, STPD = Schizotypal PD, ASPD = Antisocial PD, BPD = Borderline PD, NPD = Narcissistic PD, AVPD = Avoidant PD, OCPD = Obsessive-Compulsive PD. Lines in facets indicate corresponding higher order domains.

Correlations between DSM-5 Traits and DSM-IV Personality Disorders proposed to be removed in DSM-5, total Personality Disorder Symptoms, and the General Personality Disorders Severity Estimate from Morey et al. (2011).

Table 2

	PPD	SPD	HPD	DPD	PAPD	DEPPD	PD Total	Severity Estimate
Higher Order Traits								
Negative Affectivity	.52	.36	.47	.58	.58	.62	.77	.64
Detachment	.49	.61	.24	.44	.51	.54	.68	.57
Antagonism	.42	.28	.50	.35	.44	.22	.52	.40
Disinhibition	.42	.34	.43	.44	.48	.34	.60	.43
Psychoticism	.45	.41	.36	.41	.46	.40	.64	.49
Lower Order Traits								
Submissiveness	.12	.07	.26	.38	.19	.30	.29	.28
Restricted Affectivity	.24	.42	-.02	.16	.19	.19	.31	.27
Separation Insecurity	.34	.09	.38	.51	.39	.37	.50	.42
Anxiousness	.46	.27	.36	.45	.45	.64	.64	.54
Emotional Lability	.40	.21	.47	.42	.47	.48	.58	.48
Hostility	.52	.32	.39	.36	.58	.47	.62	.53
Perseveration	.42	.37	.39	.49	.49	.51	.66	.51
Suspiciousness	.62	.39	.36	.35	.48	.37	.63	.51
Depressivity	.39	.46	.26	.48	.52	.58	.63	.54
Withdrawal	.38	.63	.10	.28	.35	.43	.49	.47
Intimacy Avoidance	.25	.44	.12	.24	.24	.22	.36	.27
Anhedonia	.33	.49	.14	.41	.45	.54	.54	.48
Manipulativeness	.38	.19	.40	.24	.34	.18	.40	.33
Deceitfulness	.39	.30	.40	.41	.46	.27	.52	.44
Callousness	.38	.43	.27	.25	.41	.20	.43	.37
Attention Seeking	.24	.03	.51	.29	.30	.16	.36	.21
Grandiosity	.29	.24	.36	.20	.27	.08	.35	.23
Irresponsibility	.31	.35	.34	.46	.46	.27	.47	.37

	PPD	SPD	HPD	DPD	PAPD	DEPPD	PD Total	Severity Estimate
Impulsivity	.26	.18	.30	.28	.32	.13	.37	.25
Distractibility	.35	.30	.37	.46	.45	.44	.57	.41
Rigid Perfectionism	.32	.27	.31	.27	.28	.34	.46	.34
Risk Taking	.14	.02	.12	-.01	.09	-.10	.11	.04
Eccentricity	.38	.35	.32	.35	.43	.41	.56	.45
Perceptual Dysregulation	.43	.40	.36	.45	.45	.42	.63	.49
Unusual Beliefs & Experiences	.39	.36	.28	.29	.36	.24	.52	.37

Note. N = 808. Correlations > .11 are significant at $p < .001$. Traits that are proposed as criteria for each deleted PD in the DSM-5 are in bold. PD = Personality Disorder, PPD = Paranoid PD, SPD = Schizoid PD, HPD = Histrionic PD, DPD = Dependent PD, PAPD = Passive-Aggressive PD, DEPPD = Depressive PD. Lines in facets indicate corresponding higher order domains.

Table 3

Relations of Proposed and non-Proposed DSM-5 Traits to DSM-IV Personality Disorders.

Personality Disorder	Overall R^2	ΔR^2	
		Criterion B Traits	Other Traits
Schizotypal	.56*	.17*	.02
Antisocial	.53*	.20*	.01
Borderline	.53*	.10*	.01
Narcissistic	.48*	.07*	.12*
Avoidant	.46*	.02*	.09*
Obsessive-Compulsive	.38*	.07*	.06*

Note. N = 808.

* = $p < .001$.

Table 4

Validity of Proposed DSM-5 Personality Pathology and Trait Criteria for predicting Personality Disorders.

Personality Disorder	Overall R^2	ΔR^2	
		Criterion A Personality Pathology	Criterion B Traits
Schizotypal	.59*	.06*	.23*
Antisocial	.50*	.04*	.38*
Borderline	.49*	.04*	.15*
Narcissistic	.50*	.13*	.24*
Avoidant	.43*	.08*	.09*
Obsessive-Compulsive	.37*	.05*	.17*

Note. N = 808.

* = $p < .001$.