

No Impaired Integration in Psychopathy: Evidence from an Illusory Conjunction Paradigm

Gunschera, L. J.¹, Verschuere, B.¹, Murphy, R.A.², Temple-McCune, A.², Dutton, K.^{2,3}, Fox, E.^{2,3}

June 30th, 2022

¹ University of Amsterdam, Department of Psychology, The Netherlands

² University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology, Great Britain

³ University of Adelaide, Department of Psychology, Australia

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lukas J. Gunschera, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht 129, Amsterdam, Email: l.j.gunschera@uva.nl

University of Amsterdam Research Master thesis report. Manuscript prepared for submission to *Clinical Psychological Science*

Supervisor: Bruno Verschuere; b.j.verschuere@uva.nl

Second assessor: Eva Billen; e.billen@uva.nl

Abstract

Progress in psychopathy research has been hampered by ongoing contention about its fundamental cause. The Impaired Integration theory is a recent iteration of the attention-based accounts that postulates psychopathic deficits to be rooted in information integration abnormalities. We set out to evaluate the suggested mechanism via an innovative application of a well-established illusory conjunction paradigm. Two hundred participants were recruited by utilising a psychopathic trait maximisation technique, sampling individuals from an ex-prisoner and a population sample. We found no support for information integration deficits in psychopathic individuals ($BF_{10} = 0.156$), and the absence of a relationship between psychopathic traits and illusory conjunctions remained when accounting for confounding variables. These findings question the mechanism proposed by the Impaired Integration theory and pave the way for future research to advance our understanding of psychopathic trait aetiology by assessing specific and falsifiable mechanisms thought to bring about the observed cognitive and behavioural deficits.

Keywords: psychopathy; integration; response modulation; attention; illusory conjunctions

No Impaired Integration in Psychopathy: Evidence from an Illusory Conjunction Paradigm

Psychopathic individuals exhibit callous and unemotional tendencies with an inclination towards antisocial behaviour, reflected in prison statistics, which suggest that 16% of all convicts meet diagnostic criteria for psychopathy. At a population prevalence of less than 1%, psychopaths make up a disproportionate share of the estimated \$2.34 trillion in annual costs associated with crime in the United States (Kiehl & Hoffman, 2011). This raises the captivating question of what could cause one to behave in such detrimental ways. A question that has not only troubled fascinated viewers of popular crime shows but scholars in search of an underlying deficit. To date, said central mechanism remains elusive and competing accounts have been proposed to explain the range of observed psychopathic deficits. One line of thought focuses on attention-dependent processing deficits. The Impaired Integration theory (Hamilton et al., 2015) suggests that psychopathic individuals exhibit impairments in the processing of multicomponent perceptual information. Yet, direct behavioural evidence to support the suggested core mechanism is meagre and the present research set out to assess whether psychopathic individuals exhibit an information integration deficit.

Psychopathy entails a collection of systematically cooccurring personality traits including callous-unemotionality, lack of empathy, disinhibition, and antisocial tendencies. This constellation has retained forensic relevance for its utility in predicting severe and pervasive patterns of antisocial behaviour, criminality, and resistance to rehabilitative intervention (D'Silva et al., 2004; Hare & Neumann, 2008; Maibom, 2014), making it a prominent subject for research. In forensic settings, psychopathy is usually assessed with the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003), completed by a trained clinician based on a semi-structured interview along with official records. Although early approaches to self-report psychopathy measures were subject to criticism for validity concerns (Hare, 1985), the new generation of self-report measures has gained momentum in the assessment of psychopathic traits (Levenson et al., 1995; Lilienfeld &

Andrews, 1996), demonstrating good convergent and discriminant validity in clinical (Neal & Sellbom, 2012) and community samples (Mahmut et al., 2011). Moreover, a mounting body of evidence suggests that psychopathy is a dimensional trait (Dematteo et al., 2005; Guay et al., 2007), and exists as an accentuation of normally distributed personality traits across the general population (Benning et al., 2005; Edens et al., 2006). Assessing the psychopathic spectrum serves the validity of aetiological models beyond forensic contexts, as well as the more general impact of psychopathic traits on normative emotional and cognitive processing.

The search for a core deficit underlying this constellation of cooccurring traits dates back to early scholars, and Hervey Cleckley in his seminal work "The Mask of Sanity", popularized the notion of "some subtle but profound defect" (Cleckley, 1941, p. 403). Almost a century later, the search is ongoing and predominant accounts can be grouped into theories postulating affective, and theories postulating attentional mechanisms to underlie psychopathic deficits. Lykken's low-fear hypothesis is a prominent affective account that suggests impaired fear processing to underlie psychopathic deficits (Lykken, 1957, 1995). Psychopathic individuals are thought to experience the emotion of fear to a lesser extent. An inclination to engage in deviant behaviours may result from a lack of fear associated with negative outcomes. Alternative attention-based models of psychopathy propose that affective deficits may rather be a consequence than the cause of psychopathy (Baskin-Sommers et al., 2011; Baskin-Sommers & Brazil, 2022). The Response Modulation Hypothesis (Baskin-Sommers et al., 2011; Gorenstein & Newman, 1980; Newman et al., 2010) suggests that psychopathic individuals struggle to modulate a dominant response set in favour of processing contextual cues, such as affective responses. However, prevailing psychopathy models have been criticised for creating an artificial separation of affect and cognition (e.g., Hamilton et al., 2015). This stance is supported by findings of the situation-specific nature of psychopathy-related deficits (Arnett et al., 1997; Baskin-Sommers et al., 2011; Newman et al., 2010; Wolf et al., 2012). For instance, Newman and colleagues (2010) investigated the modulating role of attention for affective processing by manipulating the

attentional focus of participants in a fear-potentiated startle experiment. Psychopathic individuals' attention was focused on either, affect-related or unrelated information. Their results indicated that psychopathy was characterised by a reduced startle potentiation for threat when attention was directed at affect-irrelevant cues. However, this deficit characteristic of psychopathic individuals disappeared when individuals were encouraged to attend to affective information. These findings are hard to reconcile with emotion-based psychopathy accounts and call for alternative explanations for the observed modulating effect of attention (Larson et al., 2013; Scheeff et al., 2021; Tillem et al., 2021).

Attention-based theories of psychopathy postulate broad processing deficiencies which provide a compelling rationale for the abnormal performance of psychopathic individuals on non-affective tasks. A recent iteration of the attention-based aetiological accounts is the Impaired Integration theory (Hamilton et al., 2015), which aims to bridge findings of affect and cognition. The model suggests impairments in connectivity between discrete networks (i.e., default mode and salience network) to result in an attentional bottleneck (Baskin-Sommers et al., 2011, 2013; Baskin-Sommers & Brazil, 2022) which confines the amount of information that can be simultaneously attended to (Sadeh & Verona, 2008, 2012; Vitale et al., 2007). This renders individuals with elevated psychopathic traits less able to simultaneously process multicomponent information, leading them to neglect peripheral or contextual information that falls outside of the attentional spotlight (Baskin-Sommers et al., 2011, 2012; Cohen & Ivry, 1989; Hamilton et al., 2015; Hamilton & Newman, 2018; Hoppenbrouwers et al., 2015, 2016). Yet, the existing literature on the impaired integration mechanism is based on indirect evidence from neurobiological (Johanson et al., 2020; Pujol et al., 2019) and behavioural studies (e.g., Anderson et al., 2018) which suggest that mechanisms of attention may hinder the flexible distribution of cognitive resources. Hamilton and Newman (2018) investigated the impact of processing load by employing a visual search task encompassing four stimuli and a predefined target. These stimulus arrangements were presented either sequentially or simultaneously, with the latter increasing the

concurrent processing demand. The results indicated that psychopathy was associated with inferior accuracy and longer response latencies on trials requiring the simultaneous processing of visual information. The relative nature of the processing impairments of psychopathic individuals has enabled the Impaired Integration theory to account for findings of the presence and absence of prototypical affective responding deficits (Baskin-Sommers et al., 2013; López et al., 2013; Munro et al., 2007).

Consequences of this attention deficit are pronounced and can account for characteristic interpersonal deficits of psychopathy. For instance, the failure of psychopaths to consider the affective responses of others in their behaviour may result from inattention to peripheral cues (Hoppenbrouwers et al., 2016; Newman et al., 2010; Sadeh & Verona, 2008; Scheeff et al., 2021). This is thought to contribute to the predisposition psychopathy conveys for antisocial behaviour. Although the Impaired Integration model makes striking predictions regarding the behaviour of psychopathic individuals, the core mechanism is yet to be evaluated and existing findings have struggled to differentiate between the subtle differences of existing attention-based accounts. This has limited progress and with the present research, we set out to test whether psychopathy is associated with difficulties binding multicomponent stimulus information, the core prediction of the Impaired Integration theory.

The binding of multicomponent stimuli is expounded by the Feature Integration Theory, which has been cited over 15000 times since its original formulation in 1980 (Treisman & Gelade, 1980). The theory postulates that perception can be broken down into two discrete phases, one automatic and one computationally demanding. The former stage encompasses automatic and parallel registration of visual features in the visual field. It is only during the latter stage and under focused attention, that these components (e.g., colour/shape) are sequentially integrated into a coherent percept. The Feature Integration Theory has been used to explain a well-described perceptual phenomenon, illusory conjunctions (Ashby et al., 1996; Henderson & McClelland, 2020), referring to incorrect feature groupings of two presented stimuli (Treisman & Schmidt,

1982). For instance, the perception of a red circle, following the brief presentation of a green circle alongside a red square. Illusory conjunctions occur under strict experimental conditions (for a detailed discussion, see Henderson & McClelland, 2020). Since attention is needed to correctly combine stimulus features, it follows that illusory conjunctions are most likely when attention is limited. As such, illusory conjunctions resemble the suggested information integration deficit of the Impaired Integration theory.

The suggestion that illusory conjunctions occur when attentional resources are limited fundamentally aligns with the rationale of the Impaired Integration theory. The attention deficit of psychopathic individuals results in a more superficial processing style that impairs the successful integration of perceptual information. As such, the frequency of illusory conjunctions can be considered a proxy measure of attentional resources available for processing the stimuli. Preliminary evidence indicates that individuals exhibit substantial differences in their ability to integrate perceptual information, making this a promising approach to investigating the core mechanism suggested by the Impaired Integration theory (Ashby et al., 1996; Qin et al., 2016; Watanabe et al., 2005).

Taken together, while indirect evidence consistent with some predictions of the Impaired Integration theory has been presented, the core tenant – impaired integration – is yet to be examined. We measure the successful binding of multicomponent perceptual information under cognitive load with a well-established illusory conjunction paradigm. Moreover, we utilise a psychopathic trait maximisation technique, sampling one part of the sample from an ex-prisoner, and the other part from a community population. This sampling technique aims to circumvent restriction in range of psychopathy scores and allows for more robust conclusions across the levels of psychopathic traits. Based on the hypothesised information integration deficit, we predict that individuals with elevated psychopathic traits will exhibit heightened rates of illusory conjunction errors. Given the continued forensic relevance of psychopathy in predicting severe

antisocial behaviour, criminality, and resistance to rehabilitation, enhancing our understanding of the mechanism underlying observed deficits is a fruitful area of research.

Method

The study was conducted in accordance with the standard set by the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the local ethical committee of the University of Amsterdam (2022-CP-14464). We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions, all manipulations, and all measures in the study. The hypotheses, analyses, and exclusion criteria were preregistered (<https://osf.io/6mhe9>).

Commented [LG1]: Requirement from Clinical Psychological Science

Participants

Two hundred participants were recruited via the crowdsourcing platform Prolific (<https://www.prolific.com>). An a-priori power-analysis in G*power (Faul et al., 2007) indicated a sample of 199 participants to be suitable for detecting even a small effect ($f^2 = .04$) at .80 statistical power for a linear multiple regression with three predictors. Eligibility for participation was limited to male, English-speaking individuals with healthy colour perception, and access to a desktop or laptop computer. We employed a psychopathic trait maximisation technique by sampling a subgroup of our participants based on a 'yes' response to the default imprisonment pre-screener in Prolific ("Have you ever been in prison for committing a crime?"). Given the heightened prevalence of psychopathic traits in prisoner populations, our sampling procedure circumvents range restriction of our psychopathy measurement. Within a week of sampling on Prolific, we included 45 ex-prisoners, after which the remaining 155 participants were sampled based on a "No" response to the aforementioned question. The decision to limit participation to male individuals was based on the following reasons. First, males make up over 90% of prison inmates (Federal Bureau of Prisons, 2022) and will likely be overrepresented in our ex-prisoner subsample (Kiehl & Hoffman, 2011). Second, the Impaired Integration theory bases its predictions

predominantly on research conducted with males (Smith & Lilienfeld, 2015), and findings from other populations have been mixed (Newman & Schmitt, 1998; Vitale et al., 2007; Vitale & Newman, 2001). And last, some scholars have suggested that psychopathic traits are expressed different in males and females (de Vogel & Lancel, 2016; Efferson & Glenn, 2018; Miller & Lynam, 2015; Wynn et al., 2012). Therefore, we took the conservative approach of investigating the core deficit in the most researched group.

To maintain the fidelity of online responses, attention checks were added throughout the experiment. In the illusory conjunction task, this took the form of a regular trial with prolonged exposure duration (3000ms) and were presented after the 50th and 75th trial. The increased presentation duration ensured that all attentive participants could successfully indicate both, digits and target colour, of the attention check trial. An additional attention check was presented upon completing the illusory conjunction task. Participants who failed more than one of the illusory conjunction trial attention checks were excluded. Following the completion of the task, participants were asked to indicate the two target letters of the preceding task. This was added to ensure that participants were searching for the correct target letters throughout the illusory conjunction task. Failing this attention check led to exclusion, regardless of performance on the other attention checks. In the three major questionnaires, the attention checks took the form of two statements directing participants to select a particular response (e.g., "This is a compliance check. Select 'Neutral' for this statement"). Based on these criteria, 49 participants were removed, and additional participants were recruited to reach the desired sample size. The final sample contained 200 males, ranging from 18 to 67 years of age ($M = 29$, $SD = 11.27$) and originating from 27 different countries. South Africa, Poland, and Mexico made up the largest proportions with 15, 15, and 10 per cent respectively.


Procedure

All participants were recruited via the crowdsourcing platform Prolific (<https://www.prolific.com>) and received instructions to disable all colour-altering filters and position themselves at a distance of 60cm from the screen. Upon providing informed consent, participants proceeded to the illusory conjunction task, involving the rapid presentation of coloured digit-letter strings (150ms). Following the completion of all 100 trials, participants proceed with the forwards and backwards digit span task (Braaten, 2018; see Supplementary Material 1). Thereafter, participants completed the questionnaire battery, encompassing the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale fourth edition short form (SRP-IV-SF; Paulhus et al., 2017), the behavioural inhibition and behavioural activation system scale (BIS/BAS, Carver & White, 1994), the Adult Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) Self-Report Scale (ASRS; DuPaul et al., 1998), and the Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale (GAD-7; Spitzer et al., 2006). Finally, participants were reimbursed with 3.5 pounds for their 30-minute time investment.

Materials

All experimental stimuli and questionnaires were presented with Inquisit (*Inquisit* 6, 2016). Information integration was quantified with an illusory conjunction task that closely resembles the formative paradigm of Treisman and Schmidt (1982). An exemplar trial is depicted in Figure 1. Each trial commenced with the brief presentation of a central fixation cross on a light-grey background (#fafaf9), followed by the presentation of a digit-letter string, consisting of three distinctly coloured letters flanked by two black digits (ranging from 1 to 9). The digits subtended a visual angle of 0.6° horizontally and 1° vertically. Letter colours were randomly selected without replacement. The eight possible colours were selected for maximum discriminability, while minimizing saturation and luminance differences (#1f77b4, #ff7f0e, #2ca02c, #d62728, #9467bd, #8c564b, #e377c2, #17becf). The letter-strings consisted of one target (X, N) and two distractor letters (H, S, T, O). The target location was counterbalanced within each of the four 25 trial blocks,

and letters were sampled without replacement. The letters were presented at a visual angle of 0.8° horizontally and 1.2° vertically. Altogether, the digit-letter string subtended 8° visual angle.

Figure 1*Example illusory conjunction task trial*

Note. The size of displayed stimuli is enhanced for discernibility purposes. The example below illustrates how conjunction and feature errors were quantified. A conjunction error occurs when the colour of a distractor is incorrectly combined with the target letter (i.e., the participant indicates red or purple as the target's colour). A feature error occurs when a non-presented colour is reported as the target's colour (e.g., the participant indicates brown as the target's colour).

Psychopathy is assessed with the SRP-IV-SF (Paulhus et al., 2017) which comprises 29 self-report items (e.g., "I rarely follow the rules") that are answered on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly"). The SRP's four facets mirror the suggested four-factor structure of the PCL-R (Hare, 2003) and the instrument has demonstrated strong convergent validity with the PCL-R, and its psychometric properties have been well established in community (Gordts et al., 2017; Mahmut et al., 2011; Watt & Brooks, 2012; Williams et al., 2007) and incarcerated samples (Sandvik et al., 2012).

Additional measures to control for confounds and assess the validity of the aforementioned tasks include the backwards and visual digit span task (Braaten, 2018), the BIS/BAS scale (Carver & White, 1994), the ASRS (DuPaul et al., 1998), and the GAD-7 (Spitzer et al., 2006), all of which are described in detail in Supplementary Material 1.

Data Analysis

Our confirmatory analysis assessed the primary hypothesis that psychopathic traits explain substantial variation in illusory conjunction rates. First, a chance correction was applied to the observed conjunction error rate. This correction is displayed in Equation 1, and mathematically equivalent to that of Henderson and McClelland (2020). More sophisticated methods of measuring illusory conjunctions have been presented elsewhere (Ashby et al., 1996). These estimation methods require the estimation of additional error types with low incidence rates. Here, we use a simpler method to correct observed illusory conjunctions, an approach that likely underestimates the true illusory conjunction effect (Henderson & McClelland, 2020).

Equation 1

$$T_{ConjunctionErrors} = E_{ConjunctionErrors} - \frac{targets}{features} * \frac{E_{FeatureErrors} * features}{features - distractors - targets}$$

Note. T = true, E = estimated. For a detailed derivation of the above formula see Henderson and McClelland (2020). The variables 'targets', 'features', and 'distractors' remain constant across the experiment and take the values one, eight, and two, respectively.

The 'true' conjunction error rates were assessed with a Bayesian multiple linear regression. The predictor psychopathy total score was added to assess the primary hypothesis that psychopathic traits and illusory conjunctions are associated. Subsequently, the predictors age, working memory capacity, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and anxiety were added to

the null model to investigate whether the said control variables affect the predicted relationship between psychopathy and illusory conjunctions. More specifically, in the case of the regression models including one or more control variables, the null hypothesis states that psychopathy does not predict illusory conjunction rates beyond the included control variable(s), whereas the alternative hypothesis states that psychopathy does add substantial explanatory power. Throughout all analyses, we utilized a Jeffreys Zellner-Siow prior of .354 and a beta-binomial (1,1) distribution as the model prior. All analyses were performed in JASP (Version 0.16.2; JASP Team, 2022) and the BayesFactor (Morey et al., 2021) and Bayesian Adaptive Sampling (Clyde et al., 2022) packages in the R computing environment. We inspected the model-averaged Bayes Factors, comparing the model including total psychopathy scores to the null model. The model-averaged Bayes Factors are reported to quantify how much more probable the observed data are under the model that includes the predictor psychopathy total scores. Additional control variables and interactions were assessed in the exploratory analyses.

Results

Before turning to the main results, we present the descriptive statistics (see Table 1) and correlations (see Figure 2) of the measured variables. A detailed description and assessment of the variables and assumptions relevant to our linear Bayesian regression analyses is publicly available (<https://osf.io/6vkvx8/>). The dependent variable *illusory conjunction rate* and the covariate *psychopathy total score* are of primary interest to the analyses. Our data indicate substantial between-individual variation in both, illusory conjunction rates ($M_{estimated} = .26$; $SD_{estimated} = .12$) and psychopathy scores ($M = 60.13$; $SD = 14.01$). Expressed as a proportion of all errors, illusory conjunctions make up 55% which exceeds the rate of feature errors and places it well above the guessing rate of 12%. We performed a chance correction on the raw error rates to account for inflation due to guessing (see Equation 1). Thereafter, the illusory conjunction rate ($M_{true} = .22$; $SD_{true} = .11$) remained substantial, with participants averaging one


illusory conjunction every five trials. This suggests that we were able to successfully induce illusory conjunctions during the rapid presentation of multicomponent stimuli, an important precondition for our later analyses. All subsequent analyses utilised the chance-corrected scores exclusively.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for the illusory conjunction task, SRP-IV-SF, and control variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	Cronbach's alpha	<i>p</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
IC	0.22	0.11	0 - .58	/	100	0.66	0.37
Psychopathy							
Total	60.13	14.01	29 - 98	.869	29	0.11	-0.18
Interpersonal	16.48	5.02	7 - 32	.759	7	0.17	-0.39
Callous	15.28	4.29	7 - 28	.656	7	0.18	-0.37
Lifestyle	16.58	4.54	7 - 30	.720	7	0.00	-0.28
Antisocial	11.8	3.61	8 - 25	.548	8	1.19	1.41
Other							
Age	31.65	11.27	18 - 67	/	/	1.19	0.83
WMC	8.02	2.17	3.5 - 15.5	.926	/	1.27	1.83
ASRS	6.11	4.02	0 - 17	.814	18	0.46	-0.47
GAD-7	6.78	5.59	0 - 21	.809	7	0.82	-0.18
BIS Subscale	19.96	3.58	9 - 28	.507	6	-0.12	-0.13

Note. Reported illusory conjunction (IC) rates are chance-corrected. The number of items per scale are denoted by *p*. Split-half reliability was computed separately for the illusory conjunction task. Using 5000 random splits, the spearman-brown corrected reliability estimate was .87 (95% CI [.84, .89]).

Figure 2*Correlation matrix*

Note. The Pearson's correlations between the variables are depicted in the lower triangle, with * denoting findings at $p < 0.05$ level (2-tailed), ** denoting findings at $p < 0.01$ level (2-tailed), and *** denoting findings at $p < 0.001$ level (2-tailed). The density distributions are displayed on the diagonal. The scatterplots between two variables are displayed in the upper triangle. The following abbreviations were used to enhance readability: illusory conjunction rate (IC rate); psychopathy total score (PSY); interpersonal facet score (IPM); callous affect facet score (CA); erratic lifestyle facet score (ELS); antisocial behaviour facet score (ASB); working memory capacity (WMC); attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD); generalized anxiety disorder (GAD); behavioural inhibition system (BIS).

We performed several Bayesian linear regressions (<https://osf.io/6mhe9>) to investigate the hypothesis that psychopathic traits explain substantial variation in the illusory conjunction rate, and whether said explanatory value holds when accounting for potential confounds. We utilized a default JZS prior of 0.354, which assigns a fat-tail normal distribution to the regression coefficients. For model priors, we used a uniform beta-binomial distribution with both, alpha and beta set to one. The results are summarised in Table 2, and we present the Bayesian linear regressions in order of increasing complexity below.

The Bayesian linear regression examining the hypothesis that psychopathic traits explain substantial variation in illusory conjunction rates found strong evidence against the hypothesis ($r = 0.00$; $SD = .00$; 95% CI [.00, .00]), with a corresponding Bayes Factor of 0.156 ($R^2 = .00$). The corresponding sensitivity analyses compared the posterior distributions based on the range of possible priors. This analysis revealed that regardless of the utilised prior, the data speak in moderate to strong favour of the null hypothesis. Subsequent Bayesian linear regressions revealed further evidence against the null hypothesis that psychopathic traits explain substantial variation in illusory conjunction rates when accounting for the control variables age ($BF_{10} = 0.234$; $R^2 = .001$), working memory capacity ($BF_{10} = 0.294$; $R^2 = .028$), attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder ($BF_{10} = 0.313$; $R^2 = .031$), or general anxiety ($BF_{10} = 0.348$; $R^2 = .042$).

Table 2

Bayesian linear regressions

Model	P(M)	P(M data)	BF_M	M	R_2
Null Model	.500	.865	6.425	.219	.000
Psychopathy	.500	.135	0.156	.000	.000
Null Model (incl. age)	.500	.810	4.274	.219	.001
Psychopathy	.500	.190	0.234	.000	.001
Null Model (incl. age, WMC)	.500	.773	3.397	.219	.028
Psychopathy	.500	.227	0.294	.000	.028
Null Model (incl. age, WMC, ADHD)	.500	.865	3.194	.219	.031
Psychopathy	.500	.135	0.313	.000	.031
Null Model (incl. age, WMC, ADHD, GAD)	.500	.742	2.873	.219	.042
Psychopathy	.500	.258	0.348	.000	.042

Note. The above models are ordered in increasing complexity, with another control variable added to the null model at each iteration.

To explore potential explanations for the abovementioned findings, we performed several supplementary analyses that are briefly described in the following paragraphs. For an exhaustive presentation of these analyses, we refer to the OSF (<https://osf.io/snfrp/>).

First, we performed a quartile split on the psychopathy total scores and compared the first and fourth quartiles with a Bayesian t -test. The results support the null hypothesis ($BF_{10} = 0.214$), suggesting that there is no difference in illusory conjunction rates between the two quartiles ($M_1 = .222$, $M_4 = .212$, $SD_1 = .110$, $SD_4 = .118$). A follow-up prior sensitivity analysis revealed this finding to be stable across a range of prior specifications.

Second, we performed separate Bayesian linear regressions for the facets of the SRP-IV-SF. Our data for the interpersonal ($BF_{10} = 0.155$), affective ($BF_{10} = 0.155$), lifestyle ($BF_{10} = 0.160$), and antisocial facets ($BF_{10} = 0.177$) were more likely under the null hypothesis that the respective facet scores do not explain substantial variance in the observed illusory conjunction rates.

Third, we performed a paired sampled Bayesian t -test to assess whether participants exhibited differential performance on the two target letters. Our findings indicate that performance on target letter N ($M = .132$, $SD = .061$) and X ($M = .135$, $SD = .066$) trials did not differ ($BF_{10} = 0.116$).

Fourth, we entered individual trial-level data for illusory conjunctions into a latent factor analysis (Brazil et al., 2017; Driessen et al., 2021). The unbiased factor loadings were correlated with the psychopathy total scores. This approach provides a more data-driven method of cleaning the data, instead of using subjective approaches that rely on a standard deviation cut-off to remove outliers. The Bayesian linear regression for psychopathy scores and the latent variable yield strong evidence in favour of the null hypothesis ($BF_{10} = 0.165$).

Discussion

The Impaired Integration theory is an attention-based account of psychopathy that has been put forward to account for both emotion and attention deficits in psychopathy. This framework makes interesting predictions at the behavioural, cognitive, and neurobiological levels. The present research examines the central premise of the Impaired Integration theory that "psychopathy is characterized by difficulty rapidly binding components of multidimensional sensory stimuli" (Hamilton et al., 2015, pp. 777-778).

Our findings did not lend support to the proposition that psychopathy is rooted in an information integration deficit. On the contrary, our findings revealed that psychopathic traits are not indicative of impairments in information integration accuracy, as reflected in the rate of illusory conjunctions. Moreover, the observed pattern remained stable across the interpersonal, affective, lifestyle, and antisocial psychopathy facets, suggesting that our results cannot be explained by differential associations of the specific psychopathy facets. Overall, these results provided behavioural evidence that psychopathy may not be rooted in an information integration deficit, in

contrast to indirect evidence from neurobiological studies that tends to align with predictions of the Impaired Integration theory (Johanson et al., 2020).

Psychopathy has been associated with a range of neurobiological abnormalities (Johanson et al., 2020), and findings regarding the default mode and salience network have supported predictions of the Impaired Integration theory. Abnormalities in those two broad networks have been observed across a range of studies (for a meta-analysis, see Deming & Koenigs, 2020). While there are some indications that general resting-state data may be predictive of brain activity during task performance (Tavor et al., 2016), it remains questionable whether changes during task engagement may alter the dynamics of implicated brain networks. More recent network approaches have advanced our understanding of the neurobiological abnormalities in psychopathic individuals (Dotterer, 2018; Stam & Reijneveld, 2007). In one of the first applications of graph theoretical analyses in psychopathy, Philippi and colleagues (2015) found network structures of psychopathic individuals to be less coordinated with fewer connections between distant hubs. Auxiliary evidence for reduced connectivity between neural networks of psychopathic individuals comes from Lindner and colleagues (2018), who found psychopathic traits to be associated with abnormal topology in the salience and default mode network.

However, there are several reasons to be cautious when interpreting these findings. First, abnormalities in the salience and default mode networks emerge from the broad literature documenting wide-ranging neurobiological abnormalities of psychopathic individuals. Hence, abnormalities are not exclusive to the regions implicated in the suspected impaired integration deficit (Blair, 2013; Blair & Mitchell, 2009; Johanson et al., 2020) and may or may not reflect an impaired integration mechanism. Second, these network findings remain correlational and are limited in determining the direction of relations between network nodes. As such, conclusions about functionality are speculative and future research assessing the direction of observed connections is needed to test more specific predictions of the theory. Third, imaging studies have

not reliably replicated structural abnormalities, and the heterogeneity across neurobiological findings makes interpretation in regard to specific theories premature (Koenigs et al., 2011). Finally, it is common to explore various analysis pipelines in search of the 'best results' (Lindquist, 2020; Paret et al., 2022). In the absence of appropriate preregistration and reporting standards, this can cause systematic inflation of type 1 error and incorrect inferences (Flournoy et al., 2020; Verschuere et al., 2021). Taken together, the scientific literature pointing to an impairment in information integration as the root cause of psychopathy is limited at best, and not supported by our present findings.

Beyond the Impaired Integration theory, our findings speak to attention-based psychopathy accounts in general. This follows from the fact that these accounts tend to make similar predictions. The attentional bottleneck account, for instance, suggests that psychopathic individuals' have an exaggerated bottleneck which constraints the amount of information that can be simultaneously processed (Baskin-Sommers et al., 2011; Baskin-Sommers & Brazil, 2022). While an exaggerated bottleneck does not speak to the integration of information specifically, it does suggest that psychopathic individuals exhibit greater difficulties with complex processing tasks. In the case of our illusory conjunction task, psychopathic individuals devote their attention to the primary task, the correct identification of the digits. Given that this leaves fewer attentional resources for letter and colour processing, the bottleneck account would predict heightened illusory conjunction error rates in psychopathic individuals. As such, our findings are not only incompatible with the Impaired Integration account, but also oppose the predictions of other attention-based theories of psychopathic trait aetiology.

Nevertheless, we need to acknowledge that our conclusions are rooted in the assumption that illusory conjunctions reflect attention-dependent feature binding errors (Treisman & Gelade, 1980). This assumption has not remained uncontested, and Donk (1999) went as far as to suggest that the perceptual system makes no binding errors, with illusory conjunctions constituting confusions of target and nontarget, rather than the insufficient allocation of attention during the

binding of perceptual stimuli. This viewpoint does not only challenge the central proposition of the Feature Integration Theory (Treisman & Gelade, 1980) but the interpretation of our present findings. If illusory conjunctions are not the consequence of perceptual system malfunctions, we would have been mistaken to utilise them as a proxy measure of information integration capacity. However, Quinlan (2003) reviewed the evidence pertaining to the debate and concluded that the evidence in favour of true illusory conjunctions is overwhelming. Although the debate was never formally resolved, compelling evidence in favour of true illusory conjunctions has been presented since then (Botella et al., 2001; Emrich & Ferber, 2012; Henderson & McClelland, 2020; Prinzmetal, 2015; Prinzmetal et al., 2002; Vul et al., 2019). Therefore, we consider the theoretical possibility of illusory conjunctions not reflecting perceptual binding errors to be unlikely.

The present findings are subject to several limitations. First, data largely came from a crowdsourced community sample. While existing evidence has made a compelling argument to consider psychopathy to be dimensional (Dematteo et al., 2005; Guay et al., 2007) and exist as an accumulation of personality traits (Benning et al., 2005; Edens et al., 2006), a limited range in psychopathy scores may prevent conclusions about the high extreme. Nonetheless, psychopathy scores in our sample ranged from 29 to 98, and a comparison of illusory conjunction rates between the highest and lowest psychopathy scoring quartile revealed evidence in favour of no difference ($d = 0.035$, $BF_{10} = 0.214$; <https://osf.io/snfrp/>).

Furthermore, our results are limited by the characteristics of the novel methodology that aimed to quantify integration deficits. Given that our task included one level of difficulty, we were unable to demonstrate within-individual differences in illusory conjunction rates, contingent on the processing demands of the task. Therefore, we cannot escape the possibility that information integration in the present paradigm is a global capacity that varies between but lacks variation within individuals. The extant literature on feature integration has demonstrated little interest in individual differences per se (Carr et al., 1998; Watanabe et al., 2005) but there are promising

indications that feature integration is dependent on task difficulty (Henderson & McClelland, 2020; Prinzmetal, 2015; Vul et al., 2019).

At last, various confounding variables may affect the performance of individuals on the processing of multicomponent stimulus strings. This being the first examination of feature binding as a function of psychopathic traits, we incorporated a limited set of control variables that may confound the suspected relationship. These variables were age, working memory capacity as a proxy of the corresponding IQ facet, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, and general anxiety as a proxy of overall mental health. Future studies may consider additional confounds such as more comprehensive assessments of psychological distress to further our understanding of information integration of psychopathic individuals.

Conclusion

In summary, the present research constitutes the first examination of the central proposition of the Impaired Integration theory, a psychopathy-related impairment in the binding of perceptual information. This suspected deficit was quantified by illusory conjunctions, defined as attention-dependent errors in the binding of stimulus features. Our results indicated that psychopathic traits were unrelated to individual differences in the ability to integrate perceptual information. These findings challenge the proposition that psychopathy is rooted in an information integration deficit and mark an important examination of the core mechanism of the Impaired Integration theory. This research paves the way for future studies to advance our understanding of psychopathic trait aetiology by assessing and specifying falsifiable mechanisms thought to bring about the observed cognitive and behavioural deficits.

References

- Anderson, N. E., Maurer, J. M., Steele, V. R., & Kiehl, K. A. (2018). Psychopathic traits associated with abnormal hemodynamic activity in salience and default mode networks during auditory oddball task. *Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Neuroscience*, 18(3), 564–580. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-018-0588-2>
- Arnett, P. A., Smith, S. S., & Newman, J. P. (1997). Approach and avoidance motivation in psychopathic criminal offenders during passive avoidance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1413–1428. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.6.1413>
- Ashby, F. G., Prinzmetal, W., Ivry, R., & Maddox, W. T. (1996). A formal theory of feature binding in object perception. *Psychological Review*, 103(1), 165–192. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.103.1.165>
- Baskin-Sommers, A. R., & Brazil, I. A. (2022). The importance of an exaggerated attention bottleneck for understanding psychopathy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2022.01.001>
- Baskin-Sommers, A. R., Curtin, J. J., & Newman, J. P. (2011). Specifying the attentional selection that moderates the fearlessness of psychopathic offenders. *Psychological Science*, 22(2), 226–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610396227>
- Baskin-Sommers, A. R., Curtin, J. J., & Newman, J. P. (2013). Emotion-modulated startle in psychopathy: clarifying familiar effects. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 122(2), 458–468. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030958>
- Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Blonigen, D. M., Hicks, B. M., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Estimating facets of psychopathy from normal personality traits: a step toward community epidemiological investigations. *Assessment*, 12(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191104271223>
- Blair, R. J. R. (2013). Psychopathy: cognitive and neural dysfunction. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 15(2), 181–190. <https://doi.org/10.31887/dcns.2013.15.2/rblair>

- Blair, R. J. R., & Mitchell, D. G. V. (2009). Psychopathy, attention and emotion. *Psychological Medicine*, 39(4), 543–555. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708003991>
- Botella, J., Barriopedro, M. I., & Suero, M. (2001). A model of the formation of illusory conjunctions in the time domain. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 27(6), 1452–1467. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.27.6.1452>
- Braaten, E. B. (2018). Wechsler intelligence scale for children. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Intellectual and Developmental Disorders*. New York: Psychological Corporation. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483392271.n537>
- Brazil, I. A., Mathys, C. D., Popma, A., Hoppenbrouwers, S. S., & Cohn, M. D. (2017). Representational uncertainty in the brain during threat conditioning and the link with psychopathic traits. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 2(8), 689–695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2017.04.005>
- Carr, V. J., Dewis, S. A. M., & Lewin, T. J. (1998). Illusory conjunctions and perceptual grouping in a visual search task in schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research*, 80(1), 69–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781\(98\)00050-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781(98)00050-X)
- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioural activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: the bis/bas scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(2), 319–333.
- Cleckley, H. M. (1941). *The mask of sanity*. Mosby.
- Clyde, M., Littman, M., Wang, Q., Ghosh, J., Li, Y., & van de Bergh, D. (2022). BAS: Bayesian Variable Selection and Model Averaging using Bayesian Adaptive Sampling (1.6.2). <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/BAS/index.html>
- Cohen, A., & Ivry, R. (1989). Illusory conjunctions inside and outside the focus of attention. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 15(4), 650–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.15.4.650>
- D'Silva, K., Duggan, C., & McCarthy, L. (2004). Does treatment really make psychopaths

- worse? a review of the evidence. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 18(2), 163–177.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.18.2.163.32775>
- de Vogel, V., & Lancel, M. (2016). Gender differences in the assessment and manifestation of psychopathy: results from a multicenter study in forensic psychiatric patients. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 15(1), 97–110.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2016.1138173>
- Dematteo, D., Heilbrun, K., & Marczyk, G. (2005). Psychopathy, risk of violence, and protective factors in a noninstitutionalized and noncriminal sample. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 4(2), 147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2005.10471220>
- Deming, P., & Koenigs, M. (2020). Functional neural correlates of psychopathy: a meta-analysis of mri data. *Translational Psychiatry*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/S41398-020-0816-8>
- Donk, M. (1999). Illusory conjunctions are an illusion: the effects of target-nontarget similarity on conjunction and feature errors. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 25(5), 1207–1233. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0096-1523.25.5.1207>
- Dotterer, H. L. (2018). Neural network-level examinations of psychopathy: preliminary evidence and future directions. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 3(12), 981–982. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2018.09.011>
- Driessen, J. M. A., Brazil, I. A., Lorenzo, E. D., Herwaarden, A. E., Olthaar, A. J., Potamianou, H., & Glennon, J. C. (2021). Psychopathic traits influence threat avoidance in a community sample independent of testosterone. *Personality Disorders*, 12(5), 428–436.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000481>
- DuPaul, G. J., Power, T. J., Anastopoulos, A. D., & Reid, R. (1998). *ADHD Rating Scale—IV: Checklists, norms, and clinical interpretation*. Guilford Press.
- Edens, J. F., Marcus, D. K., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Poythress, N. G. (2006). Psychopathic, not psychopath: taxometric evidence for the dimensional structure of psychopathy. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 115(1), 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.115.1.131>

- Efferson, L. M., & Glenn, A. L. (2018). Examining gender differences in the correlates of psychopathy: a systematic review of emotional, cognitive, and morality-related constructs. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 41*, 48–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.05.009>
- Emrich, S. M., & Ferber, S. (2012). Competition increases binding errors in visual working memory. *Journal of Vision, 12*(4), 12–12. <https://doi.org/10.1167/12.4.12>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: a flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Federal Bureau of Prisons. (2022). *Inmate Gender*.
https://www.bop.gov/about/statistics/statistics_inmate_gender.jsp
- Flournoy, J. C., Vijayakumar, N., Cheng, T. W., Cosme, D., Flannery, J. E., & Pfeifer, J. H. (2020). Improving practices and inferences in developmental cognitive neuroscience. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, 45*(100807).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2020.100807>
- Gordts, S., Uzieblo, K., Neumann, C., Van den Bussche, E., & Rossi, G. (2017). Validity of the self-report psychopathy scales (srp-iii full and short versions) in a community sample. *Assessment, 24*(3), 308–325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191115606205>
- Gorenstein, E. E., & Newman, J. P. (1980). Disinhibitory psychopathology: a new perspective and a model for research. *Psychological Review, 87*(3), 301–315.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.87.3.301>
- Guay, J. P., Ruscio, J., Knight, R. A., & Hare, R. D. (2007). A taxometric analysis of the latent structure of psychopathy: evidence for dimensionality. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 116*(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.116.4.701>
- Hamilton, R. K. B., & Newman, J. P. (2018). Information processing capacity in psychopathy: effects of anomalous attention. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 9*(2), 182–187. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000223>

- Hamilton, R. K. B., Racer, K. H., & Newman, J. P. (2015). Impaired integration in psychopathy: a unified theory of psychopathic dysfunction. *Psychological Review*, 122(4), 770–791. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039703>
- Hare, R. D. (1985). Comparison of procedures for the assessment of psychopathy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.53.1.7>
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *Manual for the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (2nd ed.)*. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091452>
- Henderson, C. M., & McClelland, J. L. (2020). Intrusions into the shadow of attention: a new take on illusory conjunctions. *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics*, 82(2), 564–584. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-019-01893-3>
- Hoppenbrouwers, S. S., Van der Stigchel, S., Sergiou, C. S., & Theeuwes, J. (2016). Top-down attention and selection history in psychopathy: evidence from a community sample. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 125(3), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000133>
- Hoppenbrouwers, S. S., Van der Stigchel, S., Slotboom, J., Dalmaijer, E. S., & Theeuwes, J. (2015). Disentangling attentional deficits in psychopathy using visual search: failures in the use of contextual information. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 86, 132–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.06.009>
- Inquisit* 6. (2016). Millisecond Software. <https://www.millisecond.com>
- JASP team. (2022). *JASP (Version 0.16.2) [Computer Software]*.
- Johanson, M., Vaurio, O., Tiihonen, J., & Lähteenvuo, M. (2020). A systematic literature review of neuroimaging of psychopathic traits. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.01027>
- Kiehl, K. A., & Hoffman, M. B. (2011). The criminal psychopath: history, neuroscience,

- treatment, and economics. *Jurimetrics*, 51, 355–397.
- Koenigs, M., Baskin-Sommers, A., Zeier, J., & Newman, J. P. (2011). Investigating the neural correlates of psychopathy: a critical review. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 16(8), 792–799. <https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2010.124>
- Larson, C. L., Baskin-Sommers, A. R., Stout, D. M., Balderston, N. L., Curtin, J. J., Schultz, D. H., Kiehl, K. A., & Newman, J. P. (2013). The interplay of attention and emotion: top-down attention modulates amygdala activation in psychopathy. *Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Neuroscience*, 13(4), 757–770. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-013-0172-8>
- Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(1), 151–158. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.1.151>
- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 66(3), 488–524. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6603_3
- Lindner, P., Flodin, P., Budhiraja, M., Savic, I., Jokinen, J., Tiihonen, J., & Hodgins, S. (2018). Associations of psychopathic traits with local and global brain network topology in young adult women. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 3(12), 1003–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2018.04.010>
- Lindquist, M. (2020). Pipeline choices alter neuroimaging findings. *Nature*, 582, 36–37.
- López, R., Poy, R., Patrick, C. J., & Moltó, J. (2013). Deficient fear conditioning and self-reported psychopathy: the role of fearless dominance. *Psychophysiology*, 50(2), 210–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2012.01493.x>
- Lykken, D. T. (1957). A study of anxiety in the sociopathic personality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55(1), 6–10. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047232>
- Lykken, D. T. (1995). *The antisocial personalities*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mahmut, M. K., Menictas, C., Stevenson, R. J., & Homewood, J. (2011). Validating the factor

- structure of the self-report psychopathy scale in a community sample. *Psychological Assessment*, 23(3), 670–678. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023090>
- Maibom, H. L. (2014). To treat a psychopath. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 35, 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11017-014-9281-9>
- Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2015). Psychopathy and personality: advances and debates. *Journal of Personality*, 83(6), 585–592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12145>
- Morey, R. D., Rouder, J. N., Jamil, T., Urbanek, S., Forner, K., & Ly, A. (2021). *BayesFactor*. <https://richarddmorey.github.io/BayesFactor/>
- Munro, G. E. S., Dywan, J., Harris, G. T., McKee, S., Unsal, A., & Segalowitz, S. J. (2007). Response inhibition in psychopathy: the frontal n2 and p3. *Neuroscience Letters*, 418, 149–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2007.03.017>
- Neal, T. M. S., & Sellbom, M. (2012). Examining the factor structure of the hare self-report psychopathy scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 94(3), 244–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2011.648294>
- Newman, J. P., Curtin, J. J., Bertsch, J. D., & Baskin-Sommers, A. R. (2010). Attention moderates the fearlessness of psychopathic offenders. *Biological Psychiatry*, 67(1), 66–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.07.035>
- Newman, J. P., & Schmitt, W. A. (1998). Passive avoidance in psychopathic offenders: a replication and extension. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 107(3), 527–532. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.107.3.527>
- Paret, C., Unverhau, N., Feingold, F., Poldrack, R. A., Stirner, M., Schmahl, C., & Sicorello, M. (2022). Survey on open science practices in functional neuroimaging. *NeuroImage*, 257(119306). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.119306>
- Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2017). *The SRP 4: Self-report psychopathy scale (4th ed.)*. Multi-Health Systems.
- Philippi, C. L., Pujara, M. S., Motzkin, J. C., Newman, J., Kiehl, K. A., & Koenigs, M. (2015).

- Altered resting-state functional connectivity in cortical networks in psychopathy. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(15), 6068–6078. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5010-14.2015>
- Prinzmetal, W. (2015). At the core of feature integration theory: on treisman and schmidt (1982). *From Perception to Consciousness*, 211–217. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199734337.003.0018>
- Prinzmetal, W., Ivry, R. B., Beck, D., & Shimizu, N. (2002). A measurement theory of illusory conjunctions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 28(2), 251–269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.28.2.251>
- Pujol, J., Harrison, B. J., Contreras-Rodriguez, O., & Cardoner, N. (2019). The contribution of brain imaging to the understanding of psychopathy. *Psychological Medicine*, 49(1), 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0033291718002507>
- Qin, S., Ray, N. R., Ramakrishnan, N., Nashiro, K., O'Connell, M. A., & Basak, C. (2016). Illusory conjunctions in visual short-term memory: individual differences in corpus callosum connectivity and splitting attention between the two hemifields. *Psychophysiology*, 53(11), 1639–1650. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12735>
- Quinlan, P. T. (2003). Visual feature integration theory: past, present, and future. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 643–673. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.643>
- Sadeh, N., & Verona, E. (2008). Psychopathic personality traits associated with abnormal selective attention and impaired cognitive control. *Neuropsychology*, 22(5), 669–680. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012692>
- Sadeh, N., & Verona, E. (2012). Visual complexity attenuates emotional processing in psychopathy: implications for fear-potentiated startle deficits. *Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Neuroscience*, 12(2), 346–360. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-011-0079-1>
- Sandvik, A. M., Hansen, A. L., Kristensen, M. V., Johnsen, B. H., Logan, C., & Thornton, D. (2012). Assessment of psychopathy: inter-correlations between psychopathy checklist revised, comprehensive assessment of psychopathic personality - institutional rating scale,

- and self-report of psychopathy scale-iii. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 11(4), 280–288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2012.746756>
- Scheeff, J., Schneidt, A., & Schönenberg, M. (2021). Does attentional focus modulate affective information processing in male violent offenders with psychopathic traits? *Journal of Neuroscience Research*, 99(11), 2763–2773. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jnr.24941>
- Smith, S. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2015). The response modulation hypothesis of psychopathy: a meta-analytic and narrative analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(6), 1145–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000024>
- Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. W., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the gad-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 166(10), 1092–1097.
- Stam, C. J., & Reijneveld, J. C. (2007). Graph theoretical analysis of complex networks in the brain. *Nonlinear Biomedical Physics*, 1, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1753-4631-1-3>
- Tavor, I., Parker Jones, O., Mars, R. B., Smith, S. M., Behrens, T. E., & Jbabdi, S. (2016). Task-free mri predicts individual differences in brain activity during task performance. *Science*, 352(6282), 216–220. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad8127>
- Tillem, S., Weinstein, H., & Baskin-Sommers, A. R. (2021). Psychopathy is associated with an exaggerated attention bottleneck: eeg and behavioral evidence from a dual-task paradigm. *Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Neuroscience*, 21(4), 881–893. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-021-00891-z>
- Treisman, A. M., & Gelade, G. (1980). A feature-integration theory of attention. *Cognitive Psychology*, 12(1), 97–136. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(80\)90005-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(80)90005-5)
- Treisman, A. M., & Schmidt, H. (1982). Illusory conjunctions in the perception of objects. *Cognitive Psychology*, 14(1), 107–141. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(82\)90006-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(82)90006-8)
- Verschuere, B., Yasrebi-De Kom, F. M., van Zelm, I., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2021). A plea for preregistration in personality disorders research: the case of psychopathy. *Journal of*

- Personality Disorders*, 35(2), 161–176. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2019_33_426
- Vitale, J. E., Brinkley, C. A., Hiatt, K. D., & Newman, J. P. (2007). Abnormal selective attention in psychopathic female offenders. *Neuropsychology*, 21(3), 301–312.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.21.3.301>
- Vitale, J. E., & Newman, J. P. (2001). Response perseveration in psychopathic women. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 110(4), 644–647. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.110.4.644>
- Vul, E., Rieth, C. A., Lew, T. F., & Rich, A. N. (2019). The structure of illusory conjunctions reveals hierarchical binding of multipart objects. *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics*, 82(2), 550–563. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-019-01867-5>
- Watanabe, H., Yoshikawa, A., Kinutani, M., & Ohtsuki, F. (2005). Temporal-illusory conjunction in schizophrenia. *Priory Medical Journals*.
<https://www.priory.com/psych/draftWatanabe.htm>
- Watt, B. D., & Brooks, N. S. (2012). Self-report psychopathy in an Australian community sample. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 19(3), 389–401.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2011.585130>
- Williams, K. M., Paulhus, D. L., & Hare, R. D. (2007). Capturing the four-factor structure of psychopathy in college students via self-report. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 88(2), 205–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890701268074>
- Wolf, R. C., Warren, C. M., Carpenter, R. W., Zeier, J. D., & Newman, J. P. (2012). Reduced susceptibility to the attentional blink in psychopathic offenders: implications for the attention bottleneck hypothesis. *Neuropsychology*, 26(1), 102–109.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026000>
- Wynn, R., Høiseth, M. H., & Pettersen, G. (2012). Psychopathy in women: theoretical and clinical perspectives. *International Journal of Women's Health*, 4(1), 257–263.
<https://doi.org/10.2147/IJWH.S25518>