Supplemental Materials

**Table S1.**

*Bivariate Correlations among APSD Subscales and Manifest Model Variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | APSD Facet | | | |
|  | | Impulsivity | Callous-Unemotional | Narcissism |
| Age | | .17\*\* | .06 | .12\* |
| Gendera | | –.09 | –.21\*\* | –.09 |
| Perceived Family SES | | –.06 | –.04 | .15\*\* |
| Perceived Parental Neglect | | .12\* | .40\*\* | .18\*\* |
| Perceived School Social Competition | | .10\* | .25\*\* | .34\*\* |
| Perceived Neighborhood Violence | | .26\*\* | .22\*\* | .21\*\* |
| Good at getting what want | | .21\*\* | .02 | .38\*\* |
| Get what I need, even if others don’t | | .03 | –.09 | .17\*\* |
| Get others to do as I say | | .21\*\* | .10\* | .38\*\* |
| Have power over others | | .14\*\* | .11\* | .38\*\* |
| In charge in groups | | .04 | –.06 | .15\*\* |
| Get what I want dealing with others | | .13\* | .02 | .25\*\* |
| Dating Frequency | | .14\*\* | .13\* | .17\* |
| Dating Partners | | .21\*\* | .08 | .23\* |
| Sexual Partners | | .22\*\* | .11\* | .12\* |
| Mean (SD) | | 0.74 (0.38) | 0.56 (0.33) | 0.43 (0.34) |

*Note. N* = 396. APSD = Antisocial Process Screening Device (Frick & Hare, 2001); SES = Socioeconomic Status. aGender coded as 1= Boy, 2 = Girl.

\**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01.

**Figure S1.**

*Significant Direct and Indirect Paths for Environments, Facets of Psychopathy, and Socially Adaptive Outcomes*
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*Note.* Model Fit: *χ2*(89) = 172.48, *p* < .001; CFI = .943; RMSEA = .049, 90% CI [.038, .059]; SRMR = .040. Solid line reflects significant direct paths whereas dashed line reflects significant direct and indirect paths; Control variables (age, gender), disturbances, and errors are not shown for simplicity of presentation. Values represent correlations or standardized path coefficients. Significant indirect effects were found to social power through narcissism from perceived family socioeconomic status (*b* = .061, *se* = .024, β = .052, 95% *CI* [.020, .117]), perceived school social competition (*b* = .170, *se* = .044, β = .104, 95% *CI* [.095, .266]), and perceived neighborhood violence (*b* = .082, *se* = .036, β = .051, 95% *CI* [.022, .164]).