Title
Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Personality Inventory for DSM-5-BF in a Primary Care Sample.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/22z0872g

Journal
Journal of Personality Disorders, 33(6)

ISSN
0885-579X

Authors
Porcerelli, John H
Hopwood, Christopher J
Jones, John R

Publication Date
2019-12-01

DOI
10.1521/pedi_2018_32_372

Peer reviewed

Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Personality Inventory for DSM-5-BF in a Primary Care

Sample

John H. Porcerelli

University of Detroit Mercy

Christopher J. Hopwood

University of California, Davis

John R. Jones

United States Air Force

Corresponding author:

John H. Porcerelli

University of Detroit Mercy

4001 W. McNichols, Reno Hall #142

Detroit, MI 48221

(313) 993-1442

porcerjh@udmercy.edu

Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Personality Inventory for DSM-5-BF in a Primary Care Sample

The Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5; Krueger et al., 2012) was developed by the DSM-5 Personality and Personality Disorders Work Group to assess maladaptive traits that describe variation in the presentation of patients with personality disorder diagnoses. Several reviews document the emerging body of research on the instrument in general (Al-Daljani, Gralnick, & Bagby, 2016) and in specific populations and applications, including psychiatric assessment (Krueger & Markon, 2014; Krueger et al., 2014), forensic assessment (Hopwood & Sellbom, 2013), organizational assessment (Dilchert, Ones, & Krueger, 2014), basic research on the neurobiological underpinning of psychopathology (Krueger & DeYoung, 2016), and differentiating psychiatric outpatients from community controls (Bach, Maples-Keller, Bo, & Simonsen, 2016).

Several general themes are noteworthy from this body of research. First, the PID-5 has a relatively stable five-factor structure that closely resembles the Five Factor Model from normative trait psychology (Anderson, Sellbom, & Salekin (in press); Crego & Widiger, 2016; De Fruyt et al., 2013; Gore & Widiger, 2013; Griffin & Samuel, 2014; Helle et al., 2017; Morey, Krueger, & Skodol, 2013; Suzuki, Griffin, & Samuel, 2017; Thomas et al., 2013; Watson et al., 2013; Wright et al., 2012; Wright & Simms, 2014) such that Negative Affectivity (NA) is like neuroticism, Detachment (DET) is like low extraversion, Antagonism (ANT) is like low agreeableness, Disinhibition (DIS) is like low conscientiousness, and Psychoticism (PSY) is like openness. Given the relative comprehensiveness of the Five-Factor Model, it follows that PID-5 scores have the potential to capture a wide variety of issues related to psychological functioning.

Second, these domains tend to be inter-correlated, such that it is meaningful to extract a general factor representative of nonspecific personality pathology (Wright et al., 2012). This factor might be of particular value in screening situations, where the question is not so much about what kind of personality disorder a patient has, but rather the overall level of personality functioning. An emerging body of research shows that the common features of personality and other forms of psychopathology can be

summarized with a single severity estimate which is useful for clinical predictions (Caspi et al., 2014; Sharp et al., 2016; Wright et al., 2015). As conceptual views of personality and other diagnostic categories (e.g., Kotov et al., 2017) move toward a spectrum-based outlook, measures such as the PID-5-BF that provide an overall indicator of psychiatric severity will become more useful and informative in clinical settings.

Third, PID-5 scores are strongly and systematically correlated with a range of clinically relevant outcomes, including personality disorder categories (Anderson et al., 2015; Bach, Anderson, & Simonsen, 2017; Bastiaens et al., 2016; Few et al., 2013; Fossati et al.,2015; Hopwood et al., 2012; Morey, Benson, & Skodol, 2016; Yam & Simms, 2014) and symptoms (Anderson, Sellbom, & Salekin, in press), maladaptive schema (Hopwood, Schade, et al., 2013), interpersonal problems (Southard et al., 2015; Williams & Simms, 2016; Wright, Pincus, et al., 2012), psychosocial functioning (Simms & Calabrese, 2016; Wright et al., 2015), emotion regulation (Pollock et al., 2016), substance abuse (Creswell et al., 2016), relationship violence (Dowgwillo et al., 2016), post-traumatic stress (James et al., 2015), and pathological gambling (Carlotta et al., 2015). Thus PID-5 scores can be informative about a range of issues that may be relevant for patients in different kinds of settings.

Fourth, a range of alternative measures can be used to assess maladaptive traits, including other instruments (e.g., Simms et al., 2011) and other versions of the PID-5. Of particular relevance for screening situations is the 25-item Brief Form (PID-5-BF; Krueger et al., 2013), which allows clinicians to quickly score the five major domains and estimate the overall level of severity in personality pathology with the total score. Within particular settings, such as primary care, the ease of use and timeliness of a measure is important when conducting quick examinations in a 15-20 minute framework (Porcerelli & Jones, 2017).

Research on the PID-5 specifically and maladaptive traits in general has thus far been primarily used in community and clinical samples. However, there is significant potential for the use of maladaptive trait models in primary care settings to screen for significant psychopathology, both because personality pathology can impact health conditions and significantly complicate their treatment (Durvasala, 2017).

This is important because of the high prevalence rates (e.g., upwards of 30% of patients) of personality pathology that are seen in this setting (Casey & Tyrer, 1990; Moran, Jenkins, Tylee, Blizard, & Mann, 2000; Patience, McGuire, Scott, & Freeman, 1995). Moreover, an emerging body of evidence suggests that the major domains of personality and personality pathology also organize symptoms of other major mental disorders (Kotov et al., 2017; Wright & Simms, 2015). As such, using maladaptive trait constructs provides for a general screening of psychiatric issues in medical patients, such as those presenting for outpatient services in a primary care setting.

The purpose of this study was to examine the validity of the PID-5-BF as a general psychiatric screener among primary care outpatients. We had three hypotheses. First, we expected the PID-5-BF scales to be moderately correlated with one another, consistent with prior research (Wright et al., 2012) and suggestive of the possible utility of adding them up to compute an overall composite of psychological health with potential utility in screening situations. Second, we expected PID-5 domain and total scale scores to converge with indicators of psychological dysfunction from other screening measures that have been previously validated in primary care settings. Third, we expected the PID-5-BF to correlate more strongly with other measures of mental health problems than indicators of physical health and healthcare utilization.

<center>Method</center>

A total of 100 adult primary care clinic patients (74% women) ranging in age from 18 to 70 were recruited from a suburban family medicine residency training clinic on the campus of a community-based hospital. The mean age of participants was 38.62 (SD = 13.99). The majority of participants were Caucasian (66%), followed by African American (17%), Other (8%), Asian (6%), and Hispanic (3%). A total of 62% were single, separated, divorced, or widowed while 38% were married/living with partner. The majority of participants (75%) had at least some college education while 83% had annual family incomes of $60,000 or less.

A total of 313 consecutive patients were approached for participation; 118 consented to participate, 18 withdrew prior to completing the study, and 100 (32%) completed all study measures. The

most frequent reasons given for not participating were, *Not enough time to see the doctor and complete all measures* and *Not feeling well enough to participate*. Patients were provided an information sheet describing the study upon entering the clinic. If interested in participating, a research assistant obtained their consent in the waiting room. If study measures could not be completed prior to their medical appointment, a research assistant accompanied them to the exam room. If needed, measures were completed in the waiting room following their appointment. The study was approved by the IRBs of Wayne State University and University of Detroit Mercy.

Materials

Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form (PID-5-BF) is a 25 item scale that includes five maladaptive trait domains: Negative Affect (NA: emotional lability, anxiousness, and separation insecurity), Detachment (DET: withdrawal, anhedonia, and intimacy avoidance), Antagonism (ANT: manipulativeness, deceitfulness, and grandiosity), Disinhibition (DIS: irresponsibility, impulsivity, and distractibility), and Psychoticism (PSY: unusual beliefs & experiences, eccentricity, and perceptual dysregulation). Respondents rate each item on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (*very false or often false*) to 3 (*very true or often true*). PID-5-BF scores range from 0 to 75. Research supports the organization of PID-5-BF items into five correlated factors (Anderson, Sellbom, & Salekin, in press). Each domain includes 5 items. In this sample, the reliability (coefficient α) for the 5 domain scales were: NA = .73, DET = .77, ANT = .68, DIS = .73, and PSY = .81. As expected, these domains were significantly inter-correlated (Table 1), supporting the computation of a total score that had a coefficient alpha of .91.

Personality Assessment Screener (PAS; Morey, 1997) is a 22 item self-report measure derived from the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI; Morey, 1991). Ten PAS element scores were developed through factor analysis of the PAI item pool. They include: Negative Affect (NA), Acting Out (AO), Health Problems (HP), Psychotic Features (PF), Social Withdrawal (SW), Hostile Control (HC), Suicidal Thinking (ST), and Alienation (AN), Alcohol Problems (AP), and Anger Control (AC). Respondents rate each item on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (*false*) to 3 (*very true*). Total scores range from 0 to 66. A total score of 19 is the cut-off for significant psychopathology. Test–retest reliability of PAS subscales and

total score, ranges from .66 to .92 in a community sample (M = .79) (Morey, 1997). Evidence of convergent and discriminant validity, comparing the PAS with measures of personality and psychopathology, is also reported in the PAS manual and in Porcerelli, Kurtz, Cogan, Markova, & Mickens (2012) with a primary care sample of urban women. Internal consistency (coefficient α) for the PAS element and total scores were: NA = .69, AO = .58, HP = .65, PF = .71, SW = .76, HC = .31, ST = . 81, AN = .66, AP = .38, and AC = .65.

Early Memory Index (EMI). The EMI (Shedler, Karliner, & Katz, 2003) is a 9-item rating scale of covert mental health that is applied to early memory narratives. For this study, four early memories were obtained: earliest childhood memory, earliest memory of mother and father, and high-point memory. Each memory is rated on each EMI item using a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*not applicable*) to 5 (*highly applicable*). EMI items include: 1) Predominant affect tone is positive, 2) Predominant affect tone is negative, 3) The memories have predominantly positive outcomes, 4) The memories have predominantly negative outcomes, 5) Others are depicted as benevolent, 6) Subject comes across as confident, self-assured, 7) Subject comes across as ignored, deprived, not cared for, 8) Others are depicted as malevolent, and 9) Caregivers are portrayed as abandoning or underproductive. The items were originally developed to assess experiences of self and other as well as feeling tone of relationships. For ease of coding, items that were the mirror opposite of other items (item 2, 4, and 8) were not used. Reliability and validity of the EMI has been reported by Shedler et al. (2003) and Porcerelli et al. (2015). After reverse coding, a total mean score of the 6 items was used for data analysis. The 6 EMI Mental Health items yielded an alpha coefficient of .91. Two graduate students trained in coding the EMI independently coded all narratives and achieved excellent interrater agreement (ICC[2,1] = .82). Higher mean EMI scores indicated greater mental health.

General Health & Healthcare Utilization. The general health item from the Medical Outcomes Study Short Form (SF-20; Stewart, Hays, & Ware, 1988) was used to assess overall health. The item is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (*poor health*) to 1 (*excellent health*). Scores were revered so that higher scores were related to better health. Three items from the Multidimensional Health

Profile, Health Functioning Scale (Karoly, Ruehlman, & Lanyon, 2005) were used to assess healthcare

utilization: office (outpatient visits), emergency department (ED) visits, and overnight hospitalizations.

Items were rated for the frequency in the past year on 6-point scales ranging from 1 (*0 visits*), 2 (*1 visit*), 3

(*2 visits*), 4 (*3–5 visits*), and 5 (*5 or more*). The three utilization items yielded an alpha coefficient of .49.

Validity data for the general health and utilization items are reported in their respective manuals.

<div align="center">Results</div>

All study variables were relatively normally distributed with none of the skewness or kurtosis

values exceeding the recommended cut-offs of greater than 2.0 and 7.0, respectively (Curran, West, &

Finch, 1996). Inter-correlations of the PID-5-BF subscale and total scores, reported in Table 1, supported

our first hypothesis. PID-5-BF inter-correlations ranged from .43 to .71 ($p < .0001$).

Convergent validity coefficients reported in Table 2 supported our second hypothesis. The PID-5-

BF domain and total scores significantly correlated with the PAS total scores. Correlations ranged from .

49 to .71 ($p < .01$ with Bonferroni correction). Of the 66 correlations between the PID-5-BF domains and

PAS subscales and total score, 43 reached a medium ($p = .30$) or large effect size ($p = .50$). Overall, the

PID-5-BF total score performed well, strongly and significantly correlating with the PAS total score, EMI

Mental Health score and 7 of 10 PAS subscale scores. Nonsignificant correlations between the

externalizing domains of the PID-5-BF (Antagonism and Disinhibition) and internalizing PAS element

scores (Negative Affect, Social Withdrawal, and Alienation) provided discriminant validity of both

measures. Likewise, the externalizing domains of the PID-5-BF also failed to significantly correlate with

the Mental Health score of the EMI. As in previous research (Few et al., 2013; Hopwood et al., 2012) , the

correlates with Psychoticism suggest that this scale is a fairly general marker of problems.

Four of 6 correlations between PID-5-BF and a free response measure of mental health, the EMI

mental health score, were negatively and significantly correlated at $p < .01$ with Bonferroni correction.

Our third hypothesis of discriminant validity was also supported through nonsignificant correlations

between PID-5-BF domains and measures of overall health and healthcare utilization – outpatient visits,

emergency department visits, and overnight hospitalizations (within the past year).

Discussion

The ability to effectively differentiate or identify potentially problematic personality dysfunction is essential for the clinician in the primary care setting. In particular, healthcare utilization can be improved when correctly identifying those patients that would benefit from psychological treatment rather than further medical testing and repeating frustrating doctor's visits. As mentioned previously, those with personality pathology or other severe and complicated forms of psychopathology can be high utilizers of healthcare resources.

As such, the findings from this study suggest that the PID-5-BF offers a valuable screening measure for psychopathology in primary care settings. Not only did the PID-5-BF correlate as expected with another validated self-report measure of personality/psychopathology, it significantly correlated with a free-response measure of mental health. These multi-method findings guard against the interpretation that the associations between the PID-5-BF and measures used in the study were inflated due to method variance. A strong negative correlation between the PID-5-BF total score and EMI-MH is representative of the sensitivity the PID-5-BF to pathological covert mental health issues. While the current data did not show a correlation between the PID-5-BF indices and healthcare utilization, it can still be valuable in conjunction with other established measures of pathology commonly used in primary care (e.g., PHQ-9, GAD-7).

Given the associations identified here with the EMI and PAS, the PID-5-BF is a viable alternative to other psychopathology screeners. Scoring for the PID-5-BF is brief and intuitive, in contrast to more elaborate measures (e.g., EMI), and it is freely available via the American Psychiatric Association (DSM-5, APA, 2013), in contrast to proprietary measures (e.g., PAS). Within the primary care setting, where speed and ease of use are important features of screening measures, the PID-5-BF fulfills these requirements without loss of clinically relevant information pertaining to psychopathology.

While mental health screeners that account for personality are not always indicated with every primary care visit, there are significant advantages to using instruments that are sensitive to a wide range of psychiatric constructs in screening situations. For instance, adding personality screening to the

evaluation of patients with depressive symptoms can help healthcare providers determine which patients can be treated in a limited primary care setting and which need to be referred out to mental health specialists. The same is true for chronic pain patients. Although there is little empirical support the concept of a pain-prone personality, patients with chronic pain do have a higher prevalence of psychiatric issues than the general population (Gatchel, Robinson, Block, & Benedetto, 2017; Weiseberg & Keefe, 1997). Psychiatric issues are also common in primary care clinics (Dubovsky & Kiefer, 2014). The patient-provider relationship can be significantly improved when healthcare providers have a better understanding of psychiatric symptoms with the potential to interfere with treatment and can communicate that understanding to other providers. Knowledge of the interpersonal styles and behavioral problems common to various forms of personality and psychopathology can minimize unnecessary polypharmacy and help providers respond in a patient-centered way.

In order for personality assessment instruments to be adopted by primary care physicians and psychologists they must be brief, easy to use, and perceived as helpful to the task of assessment, management and/or referral. Future research could focus on obtaining provider opinions of the usefulness of personality screeners in primary care as well as studies to determine the added value of their use above and beyond the more common and narrower screening instruments such as the PHQ-9 and GAD-7.

These finding will need to be replication given the limitation of a having a small sample size and a significantly greater number of female than male participants.

References

Al-Dajani, N., Gralnick, T. M., & Bagby, R. M. (2016). A psychometric review of the Personality Inventory for DSM–5 (PID–5): Current status and future directions. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *98*(1), 62-81.

Anderson, J. L., & Sellbom, M. (2015). Construct validity of the DSM–5 section III personality trait profile for borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *97*(5), 478-486.

Anderson, J. L., Sellbom, M., & Salekin, R. T. (In press). Utility of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5-Brief Form (PID-5-BF) in the measurement of maladaptive personality and psychopathology. *Assessment*.

Anderson, J. L., Sellbom, M., Wygant, D. B., Salekin, R. T., & Krueger, R. F. (2014). Examining the associations between DSM-5 section III antisocial personality disorder traits and psychopathy in community and university samples. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *28*(5), 675-697.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, J. L., Sellbom, M., & Salekin, R. T. (in press). Utility of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5–Brief Form (PID-5-BF) in the measurement of maladaptive personality and psychopathology. Assessment.

Bach, B., Anderson, J., & Simonsen, E. (2017). Continuity between interview-rated personality disorders and self-reported DSM–5 traits in a Danish psychiatric sample. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *8*(3), 261-267.

Bach, B., Maples-Keller, J. L., Bo, S., & Simonsen, E. (2016). The alternative DSM–5

personality disorder traits criterion: A comparative examination of three self-report forms

in a Danish population. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, &Treatment, 7*(2), 124-

137.

Bastiaens, T., Smits, D., De Hert, M., Vanwalleghem, D., & Claes, L. (2016). DSM-5 Section III

personality traits and Section II personality disorders in a Flemish community sample. *Psychiatry

Research, 238*, 290-298.

Carlotta, D., Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., Borroni, S., Frera, F., Somma, A., ... & Fossati, A. (2015).

Adaptive and maladaptive personality traits in high-risk gamblers. *Journal of Personality

Disorders, 29*(3), 378-392.

Casey, P. R., & Tyrer, P. (1990). Personality disorder and psychiatric illness in general practice. *The

British Journal of Psychiatry, 156*(2), 261-265.

Caspi, A., Houts, R. M., Belsky, D. W., Goldman-Mellor, S. J., Harrington, H., Israel, S., ... & Moffitt, T.

E. (2014). The p factor: One general psychopathology factor in the structure of psychiatric

disorders. *Clinical Psychological Science, 2*(2), 119-137.

Crego, C., & Widiger, T. A. (2016). Convergent and discriminant validity of alternative measures

of maladaptive personality traits. *Psychological Assessment, 28*(12), 1561-1575.

Creswell, K. G., Bachrach, R. L., Wright, A. G., Pinto, A., & Ansell, E. (2016). Predicting problematic

alcohol use with the DSM–5 alternative model of personality pathology. *Personality Disorders:

Theory, Research, and Treatment, 7*(1), 103-111.

Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and

specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 1(1)*, 16-29.

De Fruyt, F., De Clercq, B., De Bolle, M., Wille, B., Markon, K., & Krueger, R. F. (2013). General and maladaptive traits in a five-factor framework for DSM-5 in a university student sample. *Assessment*, *20*(3), 295-307.

Dilchert, S., Ones, D. S., & Krueger, R. F. (2014). Maladaptive personality constructs, measures, and work behaviors. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *7*(1), 98-110.

Dubovsky, A. N., & Kiefer, M. M. (2014). Borderline personality disorder in the primary care setting. *Medical Clinics*, *98*(5), 1049-1064.

Dowgwillo, E. A., Ménard, K. S., Krueger, R. F., & Pincus, A. L. (2016). DSM-5 pathological personality traits and intimate partner violence among male and female college students. *Violence and Victims*, *31*(3), 416-437.

Durvasula, R. S. (2017). Personality Disorders and Health: Lessons Learned and Future Directions. *Behavioral Medicine*, *43*(3), 227-232.

Few, L. R., Miller, J. D., Rothbaum, A. O., Meller, S., Maples, J., Terry, D. P., ... & MacKillop, J. (2013). Examination of the Section III DSM-5 diagnostic system for personality disorders in an outpatient clinical sample. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *122*(4), 1057-1069.

Fossati, A., Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., Borroni, S., & Maffei, C. (2015). Reliability and validity of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5) predicting DSM-IV personality disorders and psychopathy in community-dwelling Italian adults. *Assessment*, *20*(6), 689-708.

Gatchel, R. J., Robinson, R. C., Block, A. R., & Benedetto, N. N. (2017). Assessment of pain in primary care settings. In M. Maruish (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychological Assessment in Primary Care Settings* (2nd ed) (pp. 411 – 428). New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Gore, W. L., & Widiger, T. A. (2013). The DSM-5 dimensional trait model and five-factor models of general personality. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *122*(3), 816-821.

Griffin, S. A., & Samuel, D. B. (2014). A closer look at the lower-order structure of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5: Comparison with the Five-Factor Model. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *5*(4), 406-412.

Helle, A. C., Trull, T. J., Widiger, T. A., & Mullins-Sweatt, S. N. (2017). Utilizing interview and self-report assessment of the Five-Factor Model to examine convergence with the alternative model for personality disorders. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 8*(3), 247-254.

Hopwood, C. J., Schade, N., Krueger, R. F., Wright, A. G., & Markon, K. E. (2013). Connecting DSM-5 personality traits and pathological beliefs: Toward a unifying model. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 35*(2), 162-172.

Hopwood, C. J., & Sellbom, M. (2013). Implications of DSM-5 personality traits for forensic psychology. *Psychological Injury and Law, 6*(4), 314-323.

Hopwood, C. J., Thomas, K. M., Markon, K. E., Wright, A. G., & Krueger, R. F. (2012). DSM-5 personality traits and DSM–IV personality disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 121*(2), 424.

James, L. M., Anders, S. L., Peterson, C. K., Engdahl, B. E., Krueger, R. F., & Georgopoulos, A. P. (2015). DSM-5 personality traits discriminate between posttraumatic stress disorder and control groups. *Experimental Brain Research, 233*(7), 2021-2028.

Karoly, P., Ruehlman, L. S., & Lanyon, R. (2005). The assessment of adult health careorientations: Development and preliminary validation of the Multidimensional Health Profile   Health Functioning Index (MHP-H) in a national sample. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings, 12(1)*, 79-91.

Kotov, R., Krueger, R. F., Watson, D., Achenbach, T. M., Althoff, R. R., Bagby, R. M., ... & Eaton, N. R. (2017). The Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): A dimensional alternative to traditional nosologies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *126*(4), 454-477.

Krueger, R. F., Derringer, J., Markon, K. E., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. E. (2012). Initial construction of a maladaptive personality trait model and inventory for DSM-5. *Psychological Medicine*, *42*(9), 1879-1890.

Krueger, R. F., Derringer, J., Markon, K. E., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. E. (2013). The personality inventory for DSM-5—brief form (PID-5-BF)—adult. *American Psychiatric Association: Author*.

Krueger, R. F., & DeYoung, C. G. (2016). The RDoC initiative and the structure of psychopathology. *Psychophysiology*, *53*(3), 351-354.

Krueger, R. F., Hopwood, C. J., Wright, A. G., & Markon, K. E. (2014). DSM-5 and the path toward empirically based and clinically useful conceptualization of personality and psychopathology. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *21*(3), 245-261.

Krueger, R. F., & Markon, K. E. (2014). The role of the DSM-5 personality trait model in moving toward a quantitative and empirically based approach to classifying personality and psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *10*, 477-501.

Lowe, B., Wahl, I., Rose, M., Spitzer, C., Glaesmer, H., Wingenfeld, K., … Brahler, E. (2010).A 4-item measure of depression and anxiety: Validation and standardization of the patient health questionnaire-4 (PHQ-4) in the general population. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 122(1-2)*, 86–95.

Moran, P., Jenkins, R., Tylee, A., Blizard, R., & Mann, A. (2000). The prevalence of personality disorder among UK primary care attenders. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *102*(1), 52-57.

Morey, L. C. (1991). *Personality Assessment Inventory professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Morey, L. C. (1997). *Personality Assessment Screener professional manual*. Odessa, FL:

    Psychological Assessment Resources.

Morey, L. C., Benson, K. T., & Skodol, A. E. (2016). Relating DSM-5 section III personality traits to

    section II personality disorder diagnoses. *Psychological Medicine, 46*(3), 647-655.

Morey, L. C., Krueger, R. F., & Skodol, A. E. (2013). The hierarchical structure of clinician ratings of

    proposed DSM–5 pathological personality traits. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 122*(3), 836.

Pollock, N. C., McCabe, G. A., Southard, A. C., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2016). Pathological personality traits

    and emotion regulation difficulties. *Personality and Individual Differences, 95*, 168-177.

Patience, D. A., McGuire, R. J., Scott, A. I., & Freeman, C. P. (1995). The Edinburgh Primary Care

    Depression Study: personality disorder and outcome. *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 167*(3),

    324-330.

Porcerelli, J. H., Cogan, R., Melchior, K. A., Jasinski, M. J., Richardson, L. Fowler, S., Morris,

    P., & Murdoch, W. (2015). Convergent validity of the Early Memory Index in two

    primary care samples. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 94(3), 262-266.*

Porcerelli, J. H., Kurtz, J. E., Cogan, R., Markova, T., & Mickens, L. (2012). Personality

    Assessment Screener in a Primary Care Sample of urban women. *Journal of Personality

    Assessment, 94(3)*, 262-266.

Porcerelli, J. H. & Jones, J. R. (2017). Uses of Psychological Assessment in Primary Care Settings. In M.

    Maruish (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychological Assessment in Primary Care Settings* (2nd ed) (pp. 75 –

    94). New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Sharp, C., Wright, A. G., Fowler, J. C., Frueh, B. C., Allen, J. G., Oldham, J., & Clark, L. A. (2016). The

    structure of personality pathology: Both general ('g') and specific ('s') factors? *Journal of

    Abnormal Psychology, 124*(2), 387-398.

Shedler, J., Karliner, R., & Katz, E. (2003). Cloning the clinician: A method for assessing

    illusory mental health. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 59(6),* 635–650.

Simms, L. J., & Calabrese, W. R. (2016). Incremental validity of the DSM-5 Section III

   personality disorder traits with respect to psychosocial impairment. *Journal of*

   Personality Disorders, *30*(1), 95-111.

Simms, L. J., Goldberg, L. R., Roberts, J. E., Watson, D., Welte, J., & Rotterman, J. H. (2011).

   Computerized adaptive assessment of personality disorder: Introducing the CAT–PD

   project. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *93*(4), 380-389.

Southard, A. C., Noser, A. E., Pollock, N. C., Mercer, S. H., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). The interpersonal

   nature of dark personality features. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *34*(7), 555-586.

Stewart, A. L., Hays, R. D. & Ware, J. E.. (1988). The MOS short-form general health survey:

   reliability and validity in a patient population. *Medical Care, 26(7)*, 724–732.

Suzuki, T., Griffin, S. A., & Samuel, D. B. (2017). Capturing the dsm-5 alternative personality disorder

   model traits in the five-factor model's nomological net. *Journal of Personality, 85*(2), 220-231.

Thomas, K. M., Yalch, M. M., Krueger, R. F., Wright, A. G., Markon, K. E., & Hopwood, C. J. (2013).

   The convergent structure of DSM-5 personality trait facets and five-factor model trait

   domains. *Assessment*, *20*(3), 308-311.

Van den Broeck, J., Bastiaansen, L., Rossi, G., Dierckx, E., De Clercq, B., & Hofmans, J. (2014).

   Hierarchical structure of maladaptive personality traits in older adults: Joint factor analysis of the

   PID-5 and the DAPP-BQ. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *28*(2), 198-211.

Watson, D., Stasik, S. M., Ro, E., & Clark, L. A. (2013). Integrating normal and pathological

   personality: Relating the DSM–5 trait dimensional model to general traits of personality.

   Assessment, 20(3), 312–326

Weisberg, J. N., & Keefe, F. J. (1997). Personality disorders in the chronic pain population: Basic

   concepts, empirical findings, and clinical implications. *Pain Forum, 6*(1), 1-9.

Williams, T. F., & Simms, L. J. (2016). Personality disorder models and their coverage of

    interpersonal problems. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *7*(1),

    15-27.

Wright, A. G., Hopwood, C. J., Skodol, A. E., & Morey, L. C. (2016). Longitudinal validation of general

    and specific structural features of personality pathology. *Journal of Abnormal*

    Psychology, *125*(8), 1120-1134.

Wright, A. G., Pincus, A. L., Hopwood, C. J., Thomas, K. M., Markon, K. E., & Krueger, R. F. (2012). An

    interpersonal analysis of pathological personality traits in DSM-5. *Assessment*, *19*(3), 263-275.

Wright, A. G., & Simms, L. J. (2014). On the structure of personality disorder traits: Conjoint analyses of

    the CAT-PD, PID-5, and NEO-PI-3 trait models. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and*

    Treatment, *5*(1), 43.

Wright, A. G., & Simms, L. J. (2015). A metastructural model of mental disorders and pathological

    personality traits. *Psychological Medicine*, *45*(11), 2309-2319.

Wright, A. G., & Simms, L. J. (2014). On the structure of personality disorder traits: Conjoint

    analyses of the CAT-PD, PID-5, and NEO-PI-3 trait models. *Personality Disorders:*

    Theory, Research, and Treatment, *5*(1), 43-54.

Wright, A. G., Thomas, K. M., Hopwood, C. J., Markon, K. E., Pincus, A. L., & Krueger, R. F. (2012).

    The hierarchical structure of DSM-5 pathological personality traits. *Journal of Abnormal*

    Psychology, *121*(4), 951.

Yam, W. H., & Simms, L. J. (2014). Comparing criterion-and trait-based personality disorder diagnoses in

    DSM-5. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *123*(4), 802-808.

Table 1

PID-5-BF Total Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-Correlations

	M	*SD*	NA	DET	ANT	DIS	PSY
NA	5.33	3.67					
DET	3.72	3.36	.71				
ANT	2.08	2.55	.43	.48			
DIS	2.57	2.68	.56	.48	.58		
PSY	3.65	3.62	.71	.67	.50	.57	
TOT	16.97	12.75	.86	.84	.70	.75	.87

Note. All correlations are significant at *p* < .0001.
PID-5-BF = Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form; NA = Negative Affect; DET = Detachment; ANT = Antagonism; DIS = Disinhibition; PSY = Psychoticism; TOT = Total score.

Table 2

PID-5-BF Correlations with Validity Coefficients

	PAS-NA	PAS-OA	PAS-HP	PAS-PF	PAS-SW	PAS-HC	PAS-ST	PAS-AN	PAS-AP	PAS-AC	PAS-T
NA	.58**	.20	.37**	.51**	.26	.12	.49**	.31	.05	.49**	.63**
DET	.39**	.20	.32	.49**	.39**	.07	.48**	.40**	.08	.32	.59**
ANT	.23	.33	.28	.37**	.01	.40**	.44**	.33	.36*	.26	.50**
DIS	.29	.48**	.20	.41**	.00	.22	.39**	.28	.21	.35*	.49**
PSY	.42**	.36*	.33	.50**	.24	.12	.63**	.37*	.19	.34*	.62**
TOT	.49**	.35*	.36*	.57**	.24	.18	.64**	.44**	.21	.44**	.71**

EMI Mental Health	SF-20 General Health	MHP-H Outpatient Visits	MHP-H Emergency Department Visits	MHP-H Overnight Hospitalization
-.44**	-.29	.01	.17	.10
-.43**	-.22	-.05	.24	.22
-.20	-.24	.05	.20	.10
-.25	-.23	.15	.13	-.01
-.42**	-.25	.03	.24	.15
-.44**	-.28	.01	.20	.16

Note. * = *p* < .05 with Bonferroni correction (.05/96 = .0005, two-tailed), ** = *p* < .01 with Bonferroni correction (.01/96 = .0001, two-tailed).

PID-5-BF = Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form; NA = Negative Affect; DET = Detachment; ANT = Antagonism; DIS = Disinhibition; PSY = Psychoticism; TOT = Total score; PAS = Personality Assessment Screener. PAS-NA = Negative Affect; PAS-AO = Acting Out; PAS-HP = Health Problems; PAS-PF = Psychotic Features; PAS-SW = Social Withdrawal; PAS-HC = Hostile Control; PAS-ST = Suicidal Thinking; PAS-AN = Alienation; PAS-AP = Alcohol Problems; PAS-AC = Anger Control; PAS-T = Total score; EMI = Early Memory Index Mental Health; SF-20 = Short Form-20; MHP-H = Multidimensional Health Profile - Health Functioning scale. Outpatient Visits, Emergency Department Visits, and Overnight Hospitalizations within the past year.