



**Universiteit Utrecht**

# The psychometric properties of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Dutch translation (PID-5)

Masterthesis Clinical Psychology

Laura Lemaire

5882036

Local supervisor: H. Berghuis, Clinical Psychologist

Supervisor Utrecht University: B. Mitima-Verloop, MSc

Wordcount: 5000

Date: July 19, 2020

Utrecht University

Master Clinical Psychology

## Abstract

The current categorical classification system for personality disorders (PDs) has various limitations and therefore the Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders (AMPD) in Section III emerged. The Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5) is a self-report questionnaire to map the maladaptive personality traits of this model. The instrument has been researched in different countries, but the Dutch translation of the PID-5 has not been studied yet. This was the goal of the current study. The study was conducted in a combined Dutch sample of two Dutch mental health institutions ( $N = 750$ ). The reliability, convergent validity and factor structure of the PID-5 was studied. The results showed a good reliability at the domain level (range = .89-.93) and reasonable reliability at the trait-level (range = .75-.92). With regards to the validity of the PID-5, the traits of the PID-5 overall correlated with instruments that measure other aspects of personality dysfunctioning (severity) and the six PDs in the DSM-5 Section III (although mostly small to moderate correlations). Some assigned traits did not correlate with specific PDs (i.e., the traits *Intimacy avoidance* and *Restricted affectivity* and Obsessive-compulsive PD (OCPD)) and some non-assigned traits had high correlations with specific PDs (e.g., the trait *Manipulativeness* and Narcissistic PD (NPD)), suggesting rearrangement in trait profiles for PDs. The study found evidence for a five-factor model (*Negative affectivity*, *Detachment*, *Antagonism*, *Disinhibition* and *Psychoticism*), although some traits seemed better suited at domains they were not originally assigned to. Further studies should look into additional measures of reliability and validity, employment of cut-off scores, inclusion of validity scales and research in a normal population. To conclude, it can be stated that the Dutch translation of the PID-5 has reasonable to good reliability, validity and factor structure.

**Keywords:** Personality Inventory for DSM-5; PID-5; Maladaptive personality traits; Criterion B; Personality Assessment; Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders; Dimensional system

## Introduction

A personality disorder (PD) refers to a rigid pattern of traits, leading to a distorted look at oneself and the environment, with reduced capacity to adapt behavior. This often leads to various problems in daily lives (APA, 2014). The categorical classification system of PDs, as represented in DSM-5 section II (APA, 2013), has several shortcomings: high comorbidity between PDs, arbitrary cut-off points, temporal instability and heterogeneity in PD-symptoms (Clark, 2007; Hengartner, Zimmermann & Wright, 2018; Wright & Zimmermann, 2015; Widiger & Trull, 2007). As a result, patients are likely to receive multiple PD diagnoses or none (Krueger, 2013; Tyrer, Reed & Crawford, 2015). To overcome these shortcomings, the Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders (AMPD; APA, 2013) was introduced upon the release of the DSM-5 (Section III). In the AMPD, PDs are defined according to the following conceptualization: impairments in personality functioning (Criterion A) and the presence of maladaptive personality traits (Criterion B). Criterion B consists of 25 lower order traits, which can be integrated in five higher order domains: *Negative affectivity*, *Detachment*, *Disinhibition*, *Antagonism* and *Psychoticism*. The AMPD has retained six PDs: antisocial (ASPD), borderline (BPD), narcissistic (NPD), schizotypal (STPD), avoidant (AVPD) and obsessive-compulsive PD (OCPD). When domain-trait combinations cannot be specified under any of the PDs, but there is personality dysfunctioning, the diagnosis PD Trait Specified (PDTS) can be assigned.

The AMPD resembles other models of maladaptive personality traits, for example the Personality Pathology-5 (PSY-5; Harkness, Finn, McNulty & Shields, 2012) and the Dimensional Assessment of Personality Pathology (DAPP-BQ; Livesley & Jackson, 2009). The AMPD also resembles models of normal personality traits, for example the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R; Costa & McCrea, 1992). The traits of the AMPD give descriptions of individual differences in PDs, but also provide dimensions for the metastructure of psychopathology in the DSM-5, such as operationalized in the recently developed Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology model (HiTOP; Kotov et al., 2017). The domains *Negative affectivity* and *Detachment* resemble the *Internalizing* dimension, the domains *Disinhibition* and *Antagonism* the *Externalizing* dimension and the domain *Psychoticism* the *Thought disorder* dimension (Kotov et al., 2017; Watson & Clark, 2019).

The domains and traits of the AMPD can be measured with the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5; Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson & Skodol, 2012), as recommended by the APA. This instrument is used by clinicians to predict and assess personality traits that are in line with the dimensional perspective of personality pathology as described in Section III of the DSM-5 (APA, 2013). Although there are a variety of instruments to measure personality traits, most research into the traits of the AMPD has been done with the PID-5. Al-Dajani, Gralnick and Bagby (2015) recently reviewed 30 studies that tested the psychometric properties of the PID-5. Most studies found acceptable internal consistencies, in line with the general guidelines for reliability (i.e., alphas between .80 and .95; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) and consistent with the original study (domains ranging from .84 (*Disinhibition*) to .94 (*Detachment* and *Psychoticism*) and traits ranging from .72 (*Grandiosity*) to .96 (*Eccentricity*); Krueger et al., 2012).

The structure of the PID-5 resembles the other personality models mentioned before and reflects a relevant factor structure (Wright et al., 2012). At the initial factor of this structure, all items and traits resemble the overarching personality pathology ('p'-factor) (associated with general interpersonal impairment) and further reflects the aforementioned HiTOP model. By assessing maladaptive traits, the PID-5 represents an improvement in diagnostic classification as combinations of traits differ per individual. Therefore, the PID-5 captures heterogeneous expressions of PDs (Zimmerman et al., 2014) and addresses some of the problems with the current categorical approach to the diagnoses of PDs.

Despite the aforementioned qualities of the PID-5, there are limitations as well. For example, most studies that have assessed the psychometric properties of the PID-5 included non-clinical samples, while the distribution of the maladaptive traits are different between clinical and non-clinical samples (Bastiaens et al., 2016). More studies into clinical samples are therefore needed to capture a broader range of psychopathology. Another limitation is that the psychometric properties of the authorized Dutch translation of the PID-5 (Van der Heijden, Ingenhoven, Berghuis & Rossi, 2014) are yet to be determined. The factor structure and validity of translated versions of the PID-5 has previously been researched in other languages: Arabic, Brazilian, Czech, Danish, French, German, Flemish, Italian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish and Swedish (Zimmermann, Kerber, Rek, Hopwood & Krueger, 2019). The Dutch version is used in clinical practice, therefore knowing its psychometric qualities is important.

In the present study, the psychometric properties of the Dutch translation of the PID-5 will be studied in a clinical sample of patients treated for PDs at Dutch mental health institutions. First, it is expected that the reliability is in accordance with previous studies of the PID-5 (Al-Dajani et al., 2016) and match the general guidelines for reliability (between .80 and .95). Second, it is

further hypothesized that the PID-5 is convergent with instruments that measure different but related forms of personality functioning and instruments that screen for PDs. The General Assessment of Personality Disorders-83 (GAPD-83) and the Severity Indices of Personality Functioning-118 (SIPP-118) are used as instrument that map the dysfunctioning of personality according to Criterion A (Berghuis, Kamphuis, Verheul, Larstone & Livesley, 2013; Verheul et al., 2008). Criterion A and B are conceptually different aspects of personality dysfunctioning, but studies recently found overlap (e.g, Hopwood, Good & Morey, 2018; Widiger et al., 2019; Meehan, Siefert, Sexton & Huprich, 2019). Therefore, small correlations are expected. The Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 Screening Personality Questionnaire (SCID-5-SPQ) and the Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+ (PDQ-4+) screen PDs for the current classification system. Because of previously found strong correlations (Fossati, Krueger, Markon, Borroni & Maffei, 2013; Somma, Krueger, Markon, Borroni & Fossati, 2019), strong correlations between these instruments and the PID-5 are expected. The strong correlations are especially expected for the trait profiles of the six PDs (APA, 2013) (Table 1). Third, the factor structure of the authorized Dutch translation of the PID-5 will be studied. The Dutch translations of the domains and traits resemble the original structure (Krueger et al., 2012), therefore it is expected that the instrument shows the same structure of the five higher order domains and its 25 traits.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The sample consisted of 750 patients treated for their PDs and consisted of 223 men (31.1%) and 517 women (68.9%) ( $M = 33$  years,  $SD = 10.31$ , range = 18-59) (see Table 2 for all demographical data). On the two screeners for PDs, BPD (cluster B) and OCPD (cluster C) were

most present. Cut-off scores were 2 (ASPD), 4 (PPD, SIPD, AVPD and OCPD) and 5 (STPD, BPD, HPD, NPD and DPD) (APA, 2014).

## **Procedure**

The sample was recruited at two mental health institutes in the Netherlands: *Centrum voor Psychotherapie (CvP)* ( $n = 602$ ) and *Reinier van Arkel (RvA)* ( $n = 148$ ). The reason for including both institutions was the inclusion of a clinical sample with a broad scale of personality dysfunctioning. Patients were included in this study during the period of January 2017 till March 2020 (CvP) and November 2016 till March 2020 (RvA). The CvP is a specialized institute for the treatment of PDs. Patients need to have already received treatment for their PDs at other mental health institutes and need to be referred by their general practitioner (GP) or current clinician. The RvA is a mental health institute with a care-program for PDs for patients who live in the North East region of the Netherlands. Patients need to be referred by a GP or occupational physician (treatment-history not necessary). The inclusion criteria for the current study were participants between 18 and 60 years old who were referred to either of the two institutes with assumed personality dysfunctioning. The participants were invited for an intake at CvP or RvA and needed to complete questionnaires (before the intake or at the start of the treatment). The RvA patients completed the PID-5 and the CvP patients all the instruments (i.e., PID-5, GAPD-83, SIPP-118, PDQ-4+ and SCID-5-SPQ). The participants received a link to the questionnaires by email which they could complete anywhere (alone at a quiet place was advised). An informed consent was sent along with the instruments and completing took up a maximum of two hours.

## Measurements

The *Personality Inventory for DSM-5* (PID-5; Krueger et al., 2012) is a 220-item self-report questionnaire with the items representing five maladaptive traits-domains (i.e., *Negative affectivity*, *Detachment*, *Antagonism*, *Disinhibition* and *Psychoticism*) and 25 maladaptive traits (Appendix A). The instrument measures maladaptive personality traits according to the DSM-5 AMPD (APA, 2013). In this study, the Dutch translation of the PID-5 was studied (Van der Heijden et al., 2014). The answer choices were on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). An example item is: 'Ik verander wat ik doe op basis van wat anderen willen' (English version: 'I change what I do depending on what others want'). Analyses were performed based on domain-scores, trait-scores and a total score (calculated with the sum of assigned items divided by the number of items, see Appendix A). Earlier studies on the PID-5 found adequate psychometric properties (domains ranging from .84 to .94 and traits from .72 to .96; Al-Dajani et al., 2016).

The *General Assessment of Personality Disorders-83* (GAPD-83; Berghuis et al., 2013) is an 83-item self-report questionnaire representing the two core components of personality pathology (Livesley, 2003). These components are the domains *Self-pathology* and *Interpersonal dysfunction* (see Appendix B for the facets). The answer choices were on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). An example item is: 'Ik ben bang dat er op een dag bij mij geen echte ik over zal blijven' (English: 'I am afraid that one day I will not be left with a real me'). Analyses were performed based on domain-scores and facet-scores, calculated with the sum of assigned items divided by the number of items (Appendix B). The internal consistency of the domains in previous studies were .93 (*Self-pathology*) and .98 (*Interpersonal dysfunctioning*) and the internal consistencies of the subscales ranged from .66



(*Poorly differentiated images of others*) to .92 (*Lack of meaning, purpose and direction*)

(Berghuis et al., 2013). The convergent validity of the GAPD-83 is good and the instrument has a sensitivity of .71 and specificity of .66. In the current study, the internal consistencies of the domains were .95 (*Self-pathology*) and .85 (*Interpersonal dysfunction*) and the facets ranged from .57 (*Fragmentary self-other representations*) to .85 (*Defective sense of self*).

The *Severity Indices of Personality Functioning-118* (SIPP-118; Verheul et al., 2008) is a 118-item self-report questionnaire with the items representing five domains of maladaptive personality functioning (i.e., *Self-control, Identity integration, Responsibility, Relational capacities* and *Social concordance*) (see Appendix C for the facets). The answer choices were on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). An example item is: 'Ik vind het moeilijk om genegenheid voor anderen te tonen' (English version: 'It is hard for me to show affection to other people'). Analyses were performed based on domain-scores and facet-scores, calculated with the sum of assigned items divided by the number of items (Appendix C). The internal consistencies in previous studies ranged from .69 to .84 (Verheul et al., 2008) and the questionnaire has good test-retest reliability (.87 to .95) and good concurrent, convergent and discriminant validity. In the current study, the internal consistencies of the domains ranged from .86 (*Self-control*) to .89 (*Social concordance* and *Identity integration*) and the facets ranged from .69 (*Purposefulness*) to .87 (*Aggression regulation*).

The *Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+* (PDQ-4+; Hyler et al., 1988; Dutch translation: Akkerhuis, Kupka, Van Groenestijn & Nolen, 1996) is a 99-item self-report questionnaire to screen PDs according to the DSM-IV-TR (for this study Paranoid PD (PPD), Schizoid PD (SIPD), Histrionic PD (HPD), Dependent PD (DPD), STPD, NPD, BPD, ASPD, AVPD and OCPD were included). The answer choices were on a 2-point Likert-type scale (0 =

no and 1 = yes). An example item is: ‘Ik vermijd het werken met anderen die mij zouden kunnen bekritisieren’ (English version: ‘I avoid working with others who may criticize me’). Analyses were performed based on domain-scores, calculated with the sum of assigned items divided by the number of items (Appendix D). Earlier studies found low internal consistencies ranging from .46 to .70 (Fossati et al., 1998) and low predictive power (De Reus, Van der Berg & Emmelkamp, 2013). Nevertheless, the PDQ-4+ can be effectively used as screening-instrument, as it overdiagnoses the presence of PDs but adequately predicts the absence of one (Bos, Van Velzen & Meesters, 2005). The internal consistencies in the current study ranged from .39 (STPD) to .97 (ASPD).

The *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 Screening Personality Questionnaire* (SCID-5-SPQ; Arntz, Kamphuis & Derks, 2017) is a 106-item self-report questionnaire to screen PDs according to the DSM-5 (same PDs as PDQ-4+). The answer choices were on a 2-point Likert-type scale (0 = no and 1 = yes). An example item is: ‘Bent u voor het regelen van belangrijke zaken in uw leven, zoals de financiën, zorg voor de kinderen, of uw woonsituatie, van anderen afhankelijk?’ (English: are you dependent on others for arranging important things in your life, such as finances, care for the children, or your living situation?). Analyses were performed based on domain-scores, calculated with the sum of assigned items divided by the number of items (Appendix E). The instrument has a good test-retest reliability (Cronbach’s alpha of .88) and good convergent validity (Bender, Zimmermann & Huprich, 2018). The internal consistencies in the present study ranged from .38 (SIPD) to .77 (BPD).

## **Analysis**

The data were processed and analyzed using International Business Machines – Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 25.0 (IBM SPSS 25.0; IBM, 2017). First, the data was inspected by means of a t-test between the CvP sample and the RvA sample. Second, the internal consistencies were measured with Cronbach's alpha. Third, the convergent validity was examined with Pearson correlation-analyses between the traits of the PID-5 and the domains of the GAPD-83 and SIPP-118 and between the traits of the PID-5 and the PDs of the PDQ-4+ and SCID-5-SPQ. As mentioned before, attention was focused on the trait profiles of the six PDs in the DSM-5 Section III (see again Table 1). And last, the factor structure of the PID-5 was measured by means of a Principal Components Analysis (PCA). There were missing values for marital status, education and PDs (part of the CvP sample completed the PDQ-4+ and the other part the SCID-5-SPQ, the RvA sample none).

## Results

### Data-inspection

Comparing the two samples (Table 3), there was a significant difference between the RvA and CvP sample on the average scores on three of the five PID-5 domains, i.e. *Negative affectivity*, *Detachment* and *Psychoticism*. However, the effect sizes of these differences were small (Cohen's  $d \leq .30$ ). Regarding the PID-5 traits, for 9 out of the 25 traits were statistically significant differences on the mean scores between both samples. However, also these effect sizes of the differences were small (Cohen's  $d \leq .40$ ), with one trait showing a moderate effect size (*Depressivity*, Cohen's  $d = .57$ ). Regarding age and marital status, there were statistically significant differences on the average scores between both samples. For marital status the effect size of the difference was small (Cohen's  $d = .37$ ), but there was a moderate effect size for age

(Cohen's  $d = .67$ ) (RvA sample somewhat older). In all cases, the differences in scores were considered too marginal to have a clinical significance. Therefore, the two samples were combined in the analyses. As mentioned before, another argument for combining the sample was the clinical scope of the sample thus achieved (clinical, day-clinical and part-time day-clinical).

### **Internal consistency**

To measure the internal consistency of the PID-5, Cronbach's alpha was measured for the five domains, 25 traits and the total scale. As can be seen in Table 4, the alphas of the domains ranged from .89 (*Disinhibition*) to .93 (*Detachment*). The alphas of the traits ranged from .75 (*Irresponsibility* and *Unusual beliefs and experiences*) to .92 (*Eccentricity*). The internal consistency of the PID-5 total-score was .97.

### **Convergent validity**

The convergent validity of the PID-5 was measured with Pearson correlations by analysing the association of the PID-5 traits with the domains of the GAPD-83 and SIPP-118 and the dimensional scores of the PDQ-4+ and SCID-5-SPQ. Correlation analyses at the .01 and .05 level were measured. Between the PID-5 and GAPD-83, small significant correlations were found in 14 out of 50 correlations ( $.10 < r < .30$ ,  $M = .20$ , range = .12-.27). Further, 20 out of 50 correlations showed moderate significant associations ( $.30 < r < .50$ ,  $M = .40$ , range = .30-.46). In 7 out of 50 correlations strong significant correlations were present ( $r > .50$ ,  $M = .58$ , range = .51-.69). The GAPD-83 domain *Self-pathology* was most strongly related to the PID-5 trait *Depressivity* ( $r = .65$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the domain *Interpersonal dysfunctioning* was most strongly related to *Withdrawal* ( $r = .69$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

For the association between the PID-5 and SIPP-118 (Table 6), 54 out of 125 correlations showed small significant correlations ( $.10 < r < .30$ ,  $M = .19$ , range = .10-.29). Moderate significant correlations were found 50 out of 125 correlations ( $.30 < r < .50$ ,  $M = .38$ , range = .30-.49). In 10 out of 125 correlations strong significant correlation were present ( $r > .50$ ,  $M = .60$ , range = .50-.74). The SIPP-118 domain *Self-control* was most strongly associated with the PID-5 traits *Hostility* ( $r = .63$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and *Impulsivity* ( $r = .61$ ,  $p < .01$ ), the domain *Identity integration* with the trait *Depressivity* ( $r = .61$ ,  $p < .01$ ), the domain *Responsibility* with the trait *Irresponsibility* ( $r = .73$ ,  $p < .01$ ), the domain *Relational capacities* with the trait *Withdrawal* ( $r = .45$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the domain *Social concordance* with the trait *Hostility* ( $r = .74$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Regarding the PDQ-4+ (Table 7), small significant correlations were found in 119 out of 250 correlations ( $.12 < r < .30$ ,  $M = .20$ , range .12-.29). Moderate significant correlations were found in 61 out of 250 correlations ( $.30 < r < .50$ ,  $M = .38$ , range = .30-.49). Strong significant correlations were found 20 out of 250 correlations ( $r > .50$ ,  $M = .54$ , range = .50-.75). The strongest correlations were found between ASPD and the traits *Deceitfulness* ( $r = .61$ ,  $p < .01$ ), *Impulsivity* ( $r = .61$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and *Irresponsibility* ( $r = .61$ ,  $p < .01$ ), between PPD and *Suspiciousness* ( $r = .75$ ,  $p < .01$ ), between SIPD and *Withdrawal* ( $r = .68$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and between DPD and *Separation Insecurity* ( $r = .60$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Regarding the SCID-5-SPQ (Table 8), small significant correlations were found in 104 out of 250 correlations ( $.10 < r < .30$ ,  $M = .20$ , range .12-.29). Moderate significant associations were found 59 out of 250 correlations ( $.30 < r < .50$ ,  $M = .36$ , range = .30-.49). In 15 out of 250 correlations strong significant correlations were present ( $r > .50$ ,  $M = .53$ , range = .50-.67), in particular between PPD and *Suspiciousness* ( $r = .67$ ,  $p < .01$ ), HPD and *Attention seeking* ( $r = .66$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and DPD and *Separation insecurity* ( $r = .62$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

The PDs have specific trait-profiles (asterisk in Table 7 and Table 8). For example, AVPD is defined with the traits *Anxiousness*, *Withdrawal*, *Intimacy avoidance* and *Anhedonia*. Table 7 and 8 show that the strongest correlations between the PDs and PID-5 traits were found for the presumed PD-trait profiles. However, some notable differences were found. There were low correlations between OCPD and the traits *Intimacy avoidance* ( $r = .09, p = .11$  PDQ-4+;  $r = -.02, p = .73$  SCID-5-SPQ) and *Restricted affectivity* ( $r = -.02, p = .77$  PDQ-4+;  $r = -.03, p = .69$  SCID-5-SPQ) and strong correlations between NPD and *Manipulativeness* ( $r = .52, p < .01$  PDQ-4+;  $r = .51, p < .01$  SCID-5-SPQ).

### **Factor structure**

To explore the factor structure of the PID-5 (Table 9), a PCA with Oblique (Oblimin) rotation using the traits of the PID-5 was conducted. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was .86. With parallel analysis, the average eigenvalues from random correlation-matrices were compared with the eigenvalues of the data of the current study. Five factors (with eigenvalues exceeding 1) were identified as underlying the 25 traits and accounted for 61.7% of the variance. Of the traits, 19 out of 25 had the highest loadings on factors they originally belong to. Of note, the traits *Emotional lability*, *Hostility*, *Rigid perfectionism* and *Suspiciousness*, in the AMPD originally belonging to the domains *Negative affectivity*, *Detachment*, and *Disinhibition* respectively, had the highest loadings on Factor 1, mainly representing the domain *Psychoticism*. The trait *Restricted affectivity*, originally belonging to the domain *Negative affectivity*, had the highest loading on Factor 3, representing the domain *Detachment*. The trait *Depressivity*, originally belonging to the domain *Detachment*, had the highest loading on Factor 5, representing the

domain *Negative affectivity*. The AMPD combines some traits among multiple domains; the traits *Hostility*, *Depressivity*, *Suspiciousness* and *Restricted affectivity* belong to a primary and a secondary domain (APA, 2013). In the current analysis, the above-mentioned traits have the highest loadings on their secondary domain, i.e. *Hostility* on *Antagonism*, *Depressivity* on *Negative affectivity* and *Suspiciousness* and *Restricted affectivity* on *Detachment*.

## **Discussion**

In the current study, the psychometric properties of the Dutch translation of the PID-5 were measured in a clinical sample ( $N = 750$ ). Hypothesized was that the internal consistency of the PID-5 was consistent with the general guidelines and alphas found in the original PID-5 study (Krueger et al., 2012). Further expected was that the PID-5 was convergent with the GAPD-83, SIPP-118, PDQ-4+ and SCID-5-SPQ (stronger with the PDQ-4+ and SCID-5-SPQ). Last, it was expected that the factor structure resembled the original PID-5 structure (Krueger et al., 2012).

### **Internal consistency of the PID-5**

In accordance with the hypothesis, high internal consistencies of the PID-5 domains were found ( $> .89$ ). This was also found in previous studies (e.g., Krueger et al., 2012; Al-Dajani et al., 2016). Regarding the traits, issues emerged where some traits showed internal consistencies slightly below the general guidelines. Earlier studies demonstrated these issues with reliability at the trait-level as well (e.g., Al-Dajani et al., 2016; Krueger et al., 2012; Quilty et al., 2013; Wright et al., 2012). These findings suggest reasonable reliability; good reliability at the domain-level and (minimal) issues at the trait-level.

## **Convergent validity**

As expected, correlations were found between the PID-5 and GAPD-83, SIPP-118, PDQ-4+ and SCID-5-SPQ. Small correlations between the PID-5 and GAPD-83 and SIPP-118 were measured, although there were some stronger correlations. The high correlations can be explained by the fact that the instruments all assess pathological personality (wherefore some correlation would be expected) and the found overlap in Criterion A and B in previous studies (Livesley et al., 1998; Hopwood et al., 2018).

Not in accordance with the hypothesis were the mostly found small correlations between the PID-5 and PDQ-4+ and SCID-5-SPQ. This can be explained by the fact that there are assigned and non-assigned traits for PDs. The results showed strong associations between PD-trait profiles, suggesting that the PID-5 measures specific types of PDs (also found in Bastiaens et al., 2016; Hopwood et al., 2012, Yam & Simms, 2014; Fossati et al., 2013). This means the PDs can be represented in a dimensional approach. However, not all assigned and non-assigned traits correlated as predicted, as was also found in previous studies (e.g., Bastiaens et al., 2016; Yam & Simms, 2014; Berghuis, Ingenhoven, Van der Heijden, Rossi & Schotte, 2019). For example, the non-assigned trait *Suspiciousness* and BPD showed strong associations. This high association might be explained by the fact that this trait was a criterion for BPD in the DSM-5 Section II, but not in Section III (APA, 2013). Another example are the low correlations between the traits *Intimacy avoidance* and *Restricted affectivity* and OCPD, although they are assigned traits (also found in Anderson, Snider, Sellbom, Krueger & Hopwood, 2014). Also notable were the correlations between the traits *Callousness*, *Hostility*, *Eccentricity* and *Manipulativeness* and NPD (also found in Miller, Gentile, Wilson & Campbell, 2013; Wright et al., 2013). This finding



suggests that NPD focusses mainly on the Grandiosity-Exhibitionism factor and less on the Vulnerability-Sensitivity factor (Wink, 1991). For the classification of NPD, the vulnerability-features are not explicitly outlined, which has been criticized (Kernberg, 2007; Pincus, 2013). Some of the traits had negative associations with PDs (e.g., *Risk taking*, *Manipulativeness*, *Grandiosity* and *Attention seeking* for AVPD and *Intimacy avoidance* for NPD). This can be explained by the fact that AVPD is associated with interpersonal anxiety (Holt, Heimberg & Hope, 1992) and NPD is, opposite to avoidance of attention, associated with the seeking of attention (Miller et al., 2013) (also found in the current study).

### **Factor structure of the PID-5**

The present study found a five factor-solution duly resembling the original structure (Krueger et al., 2012), the AMPD (APA, 2013) and previous studies (Al-Dajani et al., 2016). As expected, the traits belong to five domains (representing *Negative affectivity*, *Detachment*, *Antagonism*, *Disinhibition* and *Psychoticism*), where especially the domains *Detachment*, *Antagonism*, and *Disinhibition* resemble what has been found in the earlier studies. Not all traits had the highest loadings on their main domain. The traits *Emotional lability*, *Hostility*, *Suspiciousness* and *Rigid perfectionism* had higher loadings on the factor representing the domain *Psychoticism*. This is odd, seeing that other studies found rather low loadings of these traits on the domain (Van den Broeck et al., 2014; De Clercq et al., 2014; Wright & Simms, 2014). As other studies did not find these results, the finding might be explained by translation-bias. An alternative explanation might be that the factor representing the domain *Psychoticism* resembles the ‘p’-factor for general psychopathology (Wright et al., 2012; Caspi et al., 2014). This ‘p’-factor, as is ‘g’-factor for intelligence, means that all the domains and traits resemble

general interpersonal impairment. The traits *Hostility*, *Depressivity*, *Suspiciousness* and *Restricted affectivity* had the highest loadings on their secondary domain. The above-mentioned studies generally found the same results. Overall, the findings in the current study validate the five factor-structure with possible rearrangement in the trait-domain combinations.

### **Limitations and strengths**

The present study has some limitations that should be taken into account when generalizing the findings. First, not all instruments were completed by all the participants. However, as the numbers were enough per instrument, this was not considered a problem. Second, all instruments were based on self-reporting. For that reason, there is a risk of over- or underreporting. McGee Ng et al. (2015) studied to what extent the PID-5 is susceptible to the effects of over- and underreporting, where over-reporters were found to score significantly higher on PID-5 domains and traits and under-reporters significantly lower. Another reason for over- or underreporting was found by Oltmanns, Gleason, Klonsky and Turkheimer (2015). They state that patients with PDs not always have psychological insight (not seeing themselves as disturbed), which has an effect on how questionnaires are completed. Third, the study did not look into the divergent validity of the instrument. The current study solely compared the PID-5 to personality pathology and not psychopathology in general. Also, the psychometric qualities of the instruments used were not all sufficient. The PDQ-4+ and SCID-5-SPQ had low internal consistencies (for the PDQ-4+ also found in Fossati et al., 1998). Nevertheless, the instruments can still be used as screeners seeing the good sensitivity and specificity (Bos et al., 2005). The last limitation was the uneven distribution of the sample. The sample mostly consisted of high educated patients aged between 20 to 30 years old. Also, almost two-third of the sample were

women. Although the sample was large, for the interpretation of the results this means restricted generalizability to the Dutch clinical population.

Strong about the present study was the investigation in a clinical sample, as the majority of the studies have assessed the psychometric properties of the PID-5 in non-clinical samples. Therefore, more extreme levels of pathological personality had not been mapped. As such, the present study has captured a greater range of psychopathology than previous studies. Also strong about the present study was the inclusion of patients of two mental health institutions to include an as broad as possible population of patients with personality dysfunctioning.

### **Implications and future studies**

The PID-5, as instrument for the AMPD, focusses on the (currently) overlooked features of PDs (individual differences), which is important for improving assessment of maladaptive personality and providing treatments tailored to the individual (Huprich, Bornstein & Schmitt, 2011; Stepp et al., 2012; Bach, Markon, Simonsen & Krueger, 2015). More research on the clinical usefulness of the PID-5 is essential. As the purpose of the PID-5 is to provide a tool for clinical assessment and treatment, the superiority of the PID-5 to other measures of personality needs to be proved in future studies (also stated by Hopwood & Sellbom, 2013). As there is currently a risk of over- or underreporting, validity scales are needed for the PID-5. Future studies should also look into normative samples (effectively interpret scores), cut-off scores (decide elevations on traits) and low levels of traits (as the traits are defined in an unipolar direction, although some traits have negative correlations with PDs).

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, there is a shift in personality psychopathology from a categorical to a more dimensional approach (DSM-5 Section III), addressing many of the problems with the current assessment of PDs. This is important for improving assessment and treatment of personality (tailored to the individual). The Dutch translation of the PID-5, a self-report questionnaire to assess pathological personality traits according to the AMPD, has reasonable to good reliability and validity and a factor structure resembling the original structure (with some advised shifts to the secondary domains). This means the instrument can be used to measure traits according to the dimensional approach of the AMPD. More research is needed in other clinical samples and normal samples, addressing the clinical utility, employing cut-off scores, inclusion of validity scales and additional forms of reliability and validity.

### References

- Akkerhuis, G. W., Kupka, R. W., Groenestijn, M. A. C. van, & Nolen, W. A. (1996). *PDQ-4+ Vragenlijst voor Persoonlijheidskenmerken*. Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Al-Dajani, N., Gralnick, T. M., & Bagby, M. (2015). 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2015.1107572>
- American Psychiatric Association (APA) (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.)*. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>
- American Psychiatric Association (APA) (2014). *Beknopt overzicht van de criteria (DSM-5). Nederlandse vertaling van de Desk Reference to the Diagnostic Criteria from DSM-5*. Boom.
- American Psychiatric Association (APA) (2018). *What are personality disorders?*

<https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/personality-disorders/what-are-personality-disorders>

- Anderson, J., Snider, S., Sellbom, M., Krueger, R., Hopwood, C. (2014). A comparison of the DSM-5 Section II and Section III personality disorder structures. *Psychiatry Research*, *216*(3), 363-372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2014.01.007>
- Arntz, A., Kamphuis, J. H., & Derks, J. (2017). *Gestructureerd klinisch interview voor DSM-5 persoonlijkheidsstoornissen*. Uitgeverij Boom.
- Bach, B., Markon, K., Simonsen, E., & Krueger, R. F. (2015). Clinical utility of the DSM-5 alternative model of personality disorders: Six cases from practice. *Journal of Psychiatric Practice*, *21*(1), 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.pra/0000460618.02805.ef>
- Bastiaens, T., Claes, L., Smits, D., Clercq, B. de, Fruyt, F. de, Rossi, G., Vanwalleghem, D., Vermote, R., Lowyck, B., Claes, S., & Hert, M. de (2016). The construct validity of the Dutch Personality Inventory for DSM-5 personality disorders (PID-5) in a clinical sample. *Assessment*, *23*(1), 42-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191115575069>
- Bender, D. S., Zimmermann, J., & Huprich, S. K. (2018). Introduction to the Special Series on the Personality Functioning Component of the Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *100*(6), 565-570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1491856>
- Berghuis, H., Ingenhoven, T. J. M., Heijden, P. T. van der, Rossi, G. M., & Schotte, C. K. W. (2019). Assessment of pathological traits in DSM-5 personality disorders by the DAPP-BQ: How do these traits relate to the six personality disorder types of the alternative model? *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *33*(1), 49-70. [https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi\\_2017\\_31\\_329](https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2017_31_329)

- Berghuis, H., Kamphuis, J. H., Verheul, R., Larstone, R., & Livesley, J. (2013). The General Assessment of Personality Disorder (GAPD) as an instrument for assessing the core features of personality disorders. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 20(6), 544-557. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.1811>
- Bos, J. H., Velzen, C. J. M. van, & Meesters, Y. (2005). Het meten van persoonlijkheidsstoornissen: PDQ- 4+ versus SCID-II. *Nederlands Tijdschrift Psychologie*, 60(1), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03062347>
- Broeck, J. van den, Bastiaansen, L., Rossi, G., Dierckx, E., Clercq, B. de, & 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. [https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi\\_2013\\_27\\_114](https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2013_27_114)
- Caspi, A., Houts, R. M., Belsky, D. W., Goldman-Mellor, S. J., Harrington, H., Israel S., Meier, M. H., Ramrakha, S., Shalev, I., Poulton, R., & Moffitt, T. E. (2014). The p Factor: One General Psychopathology Factor in the structure of psychiatric disorders? *Clinical Psychological Science*, 2(2), 119-137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702613497473>
- Clark, L. A. (2007). Assessment and diagnosis of personality disorder: Perennial issues and an emerging reconceptualization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58(1), 227-257. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190200>
- Clercq, B. de, Fruyt, F. de, Bolle, M. de, Hiel, A. van, Markon, K. E., & Krueger, R. K. (2014). The hierarchical structure and construct validity of the PID-5 trait measure in adolescence. *Journal of Personality*, 82(2), 158-169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12042>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Neo Five-Factor Inventory*. Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Fossati, A., Krueger, R. R., Markon, K. E., Borroni, S., & Maffei, C. (2013). 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. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002674>
- Fossati, A., Maffei, C., Bagnato, M., Donati, D., Donini, M., Fiorilli, M., Novella, L., & Ansoldi, M. (1998). Brief communication: Criterion validity of the Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+ (PDQ-4+) in a mixed psychiatric sample. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 12*(2), 172-178. <https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.1998.12.2.172>
- Harkness, A. R., Finn, J. A., McNulty, J. L., & Shields, S. M. (2012). The Personality Psychopathology-Five (PSY-5): Recent constructive replication and assessment literature review. *Psychological Assessment, 24*(2), 432-443. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025830>
- Heijden, P. van der, Ingenhoven, T., Berghuis, H., & Rossi, G. (2014). *Nederlandstalige bewerking van The Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5)*. Uitgeverij Boom.
- Hengartner, M. P., Zimmermann, J., & Wright, A. G. C. (2018). Personality pathology. In V. Zeigler-Hill, T., Shackelford (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality and individual differences* (pp. 3-35). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526451245>
- Holt, C. S., Heimberg, R. G., & Hope, D. A. (1992). Avoidant personality disorder and the generalized subtype of social phobia. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101*(2), 318-325. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.101.2.318>
- Hopwood, C. J., Good, E. W., & Morey, L. C. (2018). Validity of the DSM-5 Levels of Personality Functioning Scale – Self Report. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 100*(6), 650-659. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2017.1420660>

- Hopwood, C. J., & Sellbom, M. (2013). Implications of DSM–5 personality traits for forensic psychology. *Psychological Injury and Law*, 6(1), 314–323.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12207-013-9176-5>
- Hopwood, C. J., Thomas, K. M., Markon, K. E., Wright, A. G. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2012). DSM-5 personality traits and DSM-IV personality disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 121(2), 424-432. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026656>
- Huprich, S. H., Bornstein, R. F., & Schmitt, T. A. (2011). Self-report methodology is insufficient for improving assessment and classification of axis-II personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 25(5), 557-570. <https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2011.25.5.557>
- Hyder, S. E., Rieder, R. O., Williams, J. B. W., Spitzer, R. L., Hendler, J., & Lyons, M. (1988). The Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire: Development and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 2(3), 229-237. <https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.1988.2.3.229>
- International Business Machines Corporation (IBM Corp.) (2017). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0*. IBM Corp.
- Kernberg, O. F. (2007). The almost untreatable narcissistic patient. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 55(2), 503-539.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00030651070550020701>
- Kotov, R., Krueger, R. F., Watson, D., Achenbach, T. M., Althoff, R. R., Bagby, R. M., Brown, T. A., Carpenter, W. T., Caspi, A., Clark, L. A., Eaton, N. R., Forbes, M. K., Forbush, K. T., Goldberg, D., Hasin, D., Hyman, S. E., Ivanova, M. Y., Lynam, D. R., Markon, K., ... Zimmermann, M. (2017). The Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): A dimensional alternative to traditional nosologies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 126(4), 454–477. <http://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000258>



- Krueger, R. F. (2013). Personality disorders are the vanguard of the post-DSM-5.0 era. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research and Treatment*, 4(4), 355-362.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000028>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002674>
- Livesley, W. J. (2003). *Practical management of personality disorders*. Guilford Press.
- Livesley, W.J., & Jackson, D.N. (2009). *Manual for the Dimensional Assessment of Personality Pathology-Basic Questionnaire (DAPP-BQ)*. Sigma Assessment Systems.
- McGee, Ng, S. A., Bagby, R. M., Goodwin, B. E., Burchett, D., Sellbom, M., Ayearst, L. E., Dhillon, S., Yiu, S., Yossef, S., Porath, B., & Baker, S. (2015). The effect of response bias on the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5). *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98(1), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2015.1096791>
- Meehan, K. B., Siefert, C., Sexton, J., & Huprich, S. (2019). Expanding the role of levels of personality functioning in personality disorder taxonomy: Commentary on “Criterion A of the AMPD in HiTOP”. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 101(4), 367-373.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1551228>
- Miller, J. D., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., & Campbell, W. K. (2013). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism and the DSM-5 pathological personality trait model. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95(3), 284-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.685907>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory (3rd ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Oltmanns, T. F., Gleason, M. E. J., Klonsky, E. D., & Turkheimer, E. (2005). Meta-perception for pathological personality traits: Do we know when others think that we are difficult?

*Consciousness and Cognition*, 14(1), 739-751.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2005.07.001>

Pincus, A. L. (2013). The Pathological Narcissism Inventory. In J. Ogródniczuk (Ed.), *Understanding and treating pathological narcissism* (pp. 93-110). American Psychological Association.

Quilty, L. C., Ayearst, L., Chmielewski, M., Pollock, B. G., & Bagby, R. M. (2013). The psychometric properties of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 in an APA DSM-5 field trial sample. *Assessment*, 20(3), 362-369. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191113486183>

Reus, R. J. M. de, Berg, J. F. van der, & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2013). Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire 4+ is not useful as a screener in clinical practice. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 20(1), 49-54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.766>

Somma, A., Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., Borroni, S., & Fossati, A. (2019). Item response theory analyses, factor structure, and external correlates of the Italian translation of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Short Form in community-dwelling adults and clinical adults. *Assessment*, 26(5), 839-852. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191118781006>

Stepp, S. D., Lan, Y., Miller, J. D., Hallquist, M. N., Trull, T. J., & Pilkonis, P. A. (2012). Integrating competing models of personality: Linking the SNAP, TCI, and NEO using item response theory. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research and Treatment*, 3(2), 107-126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025905>

Tyrer, P., Reed, G. M. & Crawford, M. J. (2015). Classification, assessment, prevalence, and effect of personality disorder. *Lancet*, 385(9969), 717-726.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61995-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61995-4)

Verheul, R., Andrea, H., Berghout, C., Dolan, C. C., Busschbach, J. J. V., Kroft, P. J. A. van der,

- Bateman, A. W., & Fonagy, P. (2008). Severity Indices of Personality Problems (SIPP-118): Development, factor structure, reliability and validity. *Psychological Assessment, 20*(1), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.20.1.23>
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (2019). Personality traits as an organizing framework for personality pathology. *Personality and Mental Health, 14*(1), 51-75. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmh.1458>
- Widiger, T. A., Bach, B., Chmielewski, M., Clark, L. A., DeYoung, C., Hopwood, C. J., Kotov, R., Krueger, R. F., Miller, J. D., Morey, L. C., Mullins-Sweatt, S. N., Patrick, C. J., Pincus, A. L., Samuel, D. B., Sellbom, M., South, S. C., Tackett, J. L., Watson, D., Waugh, M. H., Wright, A. G. C., ... Markon, K. E. (2019). Criterion A of the AMPD in HiTOP. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 101*(4), 345-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1465431>
- Widiger, T. A., & Trull, T. J. (2007). Plate tectonics in the classification of personality disorder: Shifting to a dimensional model. *American Psychologist, 62*(2), 71-83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.2.71>
- Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(4), 590-597. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.4.590>
- Wright, A. G. C., Pincus, A. L., Thomas, K. M., Hopwood, C. J., Markon, K. E., & Krueger, R. F. (2013). Conceptions of narcissism and the DSM-5 pathological personality traits. *Assessment, 20*(3), 339-352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191113486692>
- Wright, A. G. C., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000037>

- Wright, A. G. C., 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), 951-957. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027669>
- Wright, A. G. C., & Zimmermann, J. (2015). At the nexus of science and practice: Answering basic clinical questions in personality disorder assessment and diagnosis with quantitative modeling techniques. In S. K. Huprich (Ed.), *Personality disorders: Toward theoretical and empirical integration in diagnosis and assessment* (pp. 109-144). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14549-000>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037633>
- Zimmermann, J., Altenstein, D., Krieger, T., Holtforth, M. G., Pretsch, J., Alexopoulos, J., Spitzer, C., Benecke, C., Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., & Leising, D (2014). The structure and correlates of self-reported DSM–5 maladaptive personality traits: Findings from two German-speaking samples. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 28*(4), 518-540. [https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi\\_2014\\_28\\_130](https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2014_28_130)
- Zimmermann, J., Kerber, A., Rek, K., Hopwood, C. J., & Krueger, R. F. (2019). A brief but comprehensive review of research on the Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders. *Current Psychiatry Reports, 21*(9), 92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-019-1079-z>

Table 1  
Trait profiles of the PD in the DSM-5 Section III

<b>Traits</b>	<b>ASPD</b>	<b>AVPD</b>	<b>BPD</b>	<b>NPD</b>	<b>OCPD</b>	<b>STPD</b>
Anhedonia		X				

Anxiousness		X	X		
Attention seeking				X	
Callousness	X				
Cognitive and perceptual dysregulation					X
Deceitfulness	X				
Depressivity			X		
Distractibility					
Eccentricity					X
Emotional lability			X		
Grandiosity				X	
Hostility	X		X		
Impulsivity	X		X		
Intimacy avoidance		X			X
Irresponsibility	X				
Manipulativeness	X				
Perseveration					X
Restricted affectivity					X
Rigid perfectionism					X
Risk taking	X		X		
Separation insecurity			X		
Submissiveness					
Suspiciousness					X
Unusual beliefs and experiences					X
Withdrawal		X			X

*Note.* ASPD = Antisocial personality disorder; AVPD = Avoidant PD; BPD = Borderline PD; NPD = Narcistic PD; OCPD = Obsessive-compulsive PD; STPD = Schizotypal PD. According to the DSM-5 Section III (APA, 2013)

Table 2  
*Demographic data of the sample (N = 750): gender/age, education attainment, marital status and personality disorders*

	<i>N</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<b>Gender/age</b>		
Men	233 ( <i>M</i> = 35, <i>SD</i> = 10.65)	31.1
Women	517 ( <i>M</i> = 32, <i>SD</i> = 9.97)	68.9
Total	750 ( <i>M</i> = 33, <i>SD</i> = 10.31)	100
<b>Education</b>		

Primary education/preparatory secondary education	116	15.5
Secondary vocational education	242	32.3
Graduate school/university	211	28.1
Total	569	75.9
Missing	181	24.1
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	125	16.7
Divorced	49	6.5
Unmarried	487	64.9
Widow/widower	2	0.3
Missing	87	11.6
<b>Personality disorders*</b>		
Paranoid	254	33.3
Obsessive-compulsive	394	51.7
Borderline	379	49.7
Dependent	227	29.8
Schizotypal	230	30.2
Histrionic	52	6.8
Schizoid	213	28.0
Avoidant	176	23.1
Narcissistic	63	8.3
Antisocial	53	7.0
Missing	159	20.9

*Note.* \* Unofficial diagnoses based on the screeners Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+ and Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 Personality Disorders Questionnaire

Table 3

*Means (M), standard deviations (SD) and effect sizes of differences between the RvA sample and the CvP sample*

	<b>Mean score RvA (n = 148)</b>	<b>Mean score CvP (n = 602)</b>	<b>Significance p</b>	<b>Effect size Cohen's d</b>
<b>Demographic data</b>				
Age	37.99 (9.78)	31.36 (10.02)	.00	.67
Gender	1.68 (.47)	1.69 (.46)	.84	.02
Marital status	2.93 (1.07)	3.34 (1.16)	.00	.37
Education	2.27 (.73)	2.13 (.72)	.07	.19
<b>PID-5 domains</b>				
Negative affectivity	1.60 (.58)	1.48 (.41)	.01	.24
Detachment	1.28 (.59)	1.44 (.46)	.00	.30
Antagonism	.52 (.48)	.54 (.38)	.57	.05

Disinhibition	1.21 (.54)	1.16 (.39)	.33	.11
Psychoticism	.82 (.49)	.72 (.46)	.03	.21
<b>PID-5 traits</b>				
Anhedonia	1.65 (.72)	1.92 (.62)	.00	.40
Anxiousness	1.87 (.66)	1.97 (.66)	.10	.15
Attention seeking	.77 (.63)	.75 (.66)	.69	.03
Callousness	.36 (.44)	.27 (.34)	.02	.23
Cognitive and perceptual dysregulation	.74 (.45)	.71 (.47)	.50	.07
Deceitfulness	.54 (.56)	.51 (.51)	.50	.06
Depressivity	1.44 (.69)	1.82 (.64)	.00	.57
Distractibility	1.69 (.67)	1.71 (.71)	.79	.03
Emotional lability	1.67 (.77)	1.70 (.77)	.73	.04
Eccentricity	1.03 (.74)	.93 (.67)	.11	.14
Grandiosity	.41 (.49)	.28 (.40)	.00	.29
Hostility	1.11 (.71)	.95 (.63)	.01	.24
Impulsivity	1.12 (.83)	.86 (.77)	.00	.32
Intimacy avoidance	.85 (.78)	.86 (.72)	.83	.01
Irresponsibility	.67 (.52)	.72 (.60)	.29	.09
Manipulativeness	.59 (.60)	.50 (.57)	.12	.15
Perseveration	1.49 (.59)	1.49 (.61)	.80	.00
Restricted affectivity	1.03 (.65)	1.17 (.67)	.02	.21
Rigid perfectionism	1.33 (.70)	1.31 (.72)	.80	.03
Risk taking	1.09 (.56)	1.06 (.59)	.65	.05
Separation insecurity	1.19 (.74)	1.21 (.76)	.76	.03
Submissiveness	1.48 (.81)	1.57 (.80)	.26	.11
Suspiciousness	1.37 (.69)	1.19 (.68)	.00	.26
Unusual beliefs and experiences	.58 (.48)	.39 (.46)	.00	.40
Withdrawal	1.24 (.69)	1.23 (.68)	.90	.01

*Note.* PID-5 = Personality Inventory for DSM-5; CvP = Centrum voor Psychotherapie; RvA = Reinier van Arkel. PID-5: 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree); RvA = 1, CvP = 2; Gender: 1 = man, 2 = woman; Marital status: 1 = married, 2 = divorced, 3 = missing, 4 = unmarried, 5 = widow/widower; Education: 1 = primary education/preparatory secondary education, 2 = secondary vocational education, 3 = graduate school/university

Table 4

*Items, means (M), standard deviations (SD) and internal consistencies of the domains and traits of the PID-5 in a clinical sample (N=750)*

<b>Scales</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b><i>M</i></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>
<b>Negative affectivity</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>74.85</b>	<b>21.62</b>	<b>.91</b>
Emotional lability	7	11.85	5.41	.88
Anxiousness	9	13.64	4.55	.78
Hostility	10	9.84	6.50	.87
Perseveration	9	13.43	5.45	.80
Restricted affectivity	7	7.98	4.69	.81
Separation insecurity	7	8.47	5.31	.85
Submissiveness	4	6.0	3.21	.87
<b>Detachment</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>65.01</b>	<b>21.84</b>	<b>.93</b>
Withdrawal	10	12.29	6.81	.90
Anhedonia	8	14.55	5.01	.80
Depressivity	14	24.43	9.39	.92
Intimacy avoidance	6	5.31	4.20	.79
Suspiciousness	7	8.43	4.44	.78
<b>Antagonism</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>21.01</b>	<b>16.33</b>	<b>.93</b>
Manipulativeness	5	2.60	2.89	.80
Deceitfulness	10	5.48	5.08	.84
Grandiosity	6	1.82	2.54	.75
Attention seeking	8	6.02	5.25	.88
Callousness	14	4.33	5.00	.84
<b>Disinhibition</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>54.45</b>	<b>17.93</b>	<b>.89</b>
Irresponsibility	7	5.26	4.02	.75
Impulsivity	6	5.60	4.59	.88
Distractibility	9	15.38	6.31	.88
Rigid perfectionism	10	13.14	7.14	.89
Risk Taking	14	15.07	7.68	.86
<b>Psychoticism</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>24.41</b>	<b>15.38</b>	<b>.92</b>
Unusual beliefs and experiences	8	3.43	3.74	.75
Eccentricity	13	12.36	8.92	.92
Cognitive and perceptual dysregulation	12	8.63	5.61	.78
<b>Total</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>239.22</b>	<b>69.64</b>	<b>.97</b>

*Note.* PID-5 = Personality Inventory for DSM-5

Table 5



*Correlations between the PID-5 (N = 750) and GAPD-83 (N = 602) in a clinical sample*

	Self-Pathology	Interpersonal dysfunctioning
Anhedonia	<b>.52</b>	.41
Anxiousness	.46	.07
Attention seeking	.20	-.05
Callousness	.25	<b>.51</b>
Cognitive and perceptual dysregulation	<b>.57</b>	.25
Deceitfulness	.37	.30
Depressivity	<b>.65</b>	.27
Distractibility	.42	.21
Eccentricity	<b>.58</b>	.40
Emotional lability	.46	.05
Grandiosity	.18	.18
Hostility	.40	.41
Impulsivity	.31	.12
Intimacy avoidance	.25	.38
Irresponsibility	.36	.32
Manipulativeness	.22	.19
Perseveration	<b>.54</b>	.18
Restricted affectivity	.26	.38
Rigid perfectionism	.31	.03
Risk taking	.04	-.03
Separation insecurity	.36	-.06
Submissiveness	.40	-.04
Suspiciousness	.45	.33
Unusual beliefs and experiences	.31	.15
Withdrawal	.44	<b>.69</b>

*Note.* All correlations of > .11 significant at the .01 level. PID-5 = Personality Inventory for DSM-5; GAPD-83 = General Assessment of Personality Disorders-83

Table 6

*Correlations between the PID-5 (N = 750) and SIPP-118 (N = 602) in a clinical sample*

	Self-Control	Identity Integration	Responsibility	Relational Capacities	Social Concordance
Anhedonia	.08	.46	.11	.41	.10
Anxiousness	.35	.46	.17	.29	.20
Attention seeking	.35	.14	.27	.03	.28
Callousness	.34	.16	.31	.13	.47
Cognitive perceptual dysregulation	.39	.49	.38	.32	.30
Deceitfulness	.41	.29	<b>.53</b>	.13	.35
Depressivity	.31	<b>.61</b>	.29	.40	.12



Deceitfulness	<b>.61</b> *	.40 *	.03	- .05	.28	.31	.48	.49	.09	.01	.18	.08
Depressivity	.19	.02	.41	.42	.46 *	.36 *	.03	- .02	.09	.02	.32	.28
Distractibility	.36	.21	.22	.14	.20	.31	.18	.21	.20	.13	.27	.24
Eccentricity	.30	.28	.21	.17	.42	.45	<b>.58</b>	.28	.40	.28	<b>.52</b> *	.44 *
Emotional lability	.15	.13	.25	.08	<b>.54</b> *	<b>.59</b> *	.29	.25	.26	.17	.23	.31
Grandiosity	.31	.32	- .23	- .16	.14	.12	<b>.52</b> **	<b>.53</b> **	.18	.02	.15	.08
Hostility	.41 *	.31 *	.13	.05	<b>.51</b> **	<b>.51</b> **	.41	<b>.52</b>	.27	.15	.38	.24
Impulsivity	<b>.61</b> *	.39 *	.03	- .08	.44 **	<b>.54</b> **	.27	.38	.12	- .10	.17	.20
Intimacy avoidance	.01	.05	.21 *	.27 *	.12	- .03	- .02	- .24	.09 *	- .02 *	.26	.09
Irresponsibility	<b>.61</b> *	.38 *	.09	.12	.28	.32	.26	.34	.02	- .14	.17	.15
Manipulativeness	.47 *	.34 *	- .11	- .25	.19	.24	<b>.52</b>	<b>.51</b>	.08	.03	.12	.04
Perseveration	.30	.10	.34	.13	.38	.26	.36	.24	.43 *	.41 *	.35	.20
Restricted affectivity	.14	.08	.13	.27	.04	- .06	.06	- .01	- .02 *	- .03 *	.20 *	.15 *
Rigid perfectionism	- .05	- .02	.27	.16	.28	.25	.20	.18	<b>.53</b> **	<b>.56</b> **	.30	.22
Risk taking	.48 *	.36 *	- .29	- .28	.28 **	.25 **	.19	.28	- .01	- .12	- .04	.03
Separation Insecurity	.12	- .04	.30	.05	.38 *	.33 *	.25	.37	.12	.07	.12	.19
Submissiveness	- .00	- .13	.34	.34	.21	.10	- .00	- .06	.11	.22	.16	.17
Suspiciousness	.21	.18	.37	.18	.47	.41	.32	.24	.29	.20	<b>.55</b> *	.44 *
Unusual beliefs and experiences	.20	.17	.01	- .06	.29	.41	.26	.31	.15	.19	.43 *	<b>.50</b> *
Withdrawal	.07	.10	<b>.50</b> *	<b>.56</b> *	.29	.10	.05	- .13	.10	.06	<b>.56</b> *	.32 *

*Note.* Correlations > .12 significant at the .05 level; correlations > .16 significant at the .01 level. \* trait belonging to personality disorder (PD) according to DSM-5 Section III, \*\* obligatory trait belonging to PD. PID-5 = Personality Inventory for DSM-5; PDQ-4+ = Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+; GAPD-83 = General Assessment of Personality Disorders-83. ASPD =

Antisocial personality disorder, AVPD = Avoidant PD, BPD = Borderline PD, NPD = Narcissistic PD, OPD = Obsessive-compulsive PD, STPD = Schizotypal PD

Table 8

*Correlations between the PID-5 (N = 750) and the remaining personality disorders (DSM-5 section II) of the PDQ-4+ (N = 364) and SCID-5-SPQ (N = 238) in a clinical sample*

	PPD		SIPD		HPD		DPD	
	PDQ	SCID	PDQ	SCID	PDQ	SCID	PDQ	SCID
Anhedonia	.24	.14	<b>.55*</b>	.36*	-.16	-.14	.27	.13
Anxiousness	.39	.25	.16	.12	.17	.21	.49*	.32*
Attention seeking	.10	.10	-.25	-.20	<b>.58*</b>	<b>.66*</b>	.21	.21
Callousness	.29	.27	.20	.09	.15	.20	.01	.07
Cognitive and perceptual dysregulation	.37	.28	.15	.09	.30	.36	.16	.31
Deceitfulness	.22	.18	.15	-.02	.37	.44	.23	.20
Depressivity	.33	.23	.34	.35	.01	.08	.40	.31
Distractibility	.21	.19	.15	.07	<b>.58</b>	.28	.40	.28
Eccentricity	.38	.34	.27	.16	.29	.37	.23	.22
Emotional lability	.29	.34	.00	-.01	.38*	.47*	.35*	.30*
Grandiosity	.10	.13	-.02	-.11	.33	.40	.07	.13
Hostility	<b>.52*</b>	<b>.55*</b>	.21	-.04	.27	.32	.17	.12
Impulsivity	.27	.25	-.03	.02	.42	.45	.22	.21
Intimacy avoidance	.17	.02	.33	.47	-.14	-.21	-.03	-.09
Irresponsibility	.19	.10	.12	.07	.29	.31	.28	.20
Manipulativeness	.20	.12	.03	-.01	.40*	<b>.51*</b>	.21	.14
Perseveration	.33	.18	.15	.02	.31	.24	.45	.38
Restricted affectivity	.16	.07	.38*	.33*	-.20	-.24	.01	-.03
Rigid perfectionism	.29	.31	.12	.02	.12	.09	.23	.24
Risk taking	.03	.10	-.14	-.05	.16	.34	-.09	-.07
Separation insecurity	.28	.19	-.10	-.12	.35	.42	<b>.60</b>	<b>.61</b>
Submissiveness	.12	.06	.09	.11	.15	.12	.49*	.32*
Suspiciousness	<b>.75*</b>	<b>.67*</b>	.25	.16	.19	.20	.26	.24
Unusual beliefs and experiences	.25	.28	.13	.08	.26	.38	.11	.28
Withdrawal	.37	.27	<b>.68*</b>	.48*	-.15	-.20	.16	-.04

*Note.* Correlations > .12 significant at the .05 level; correlations > .16 significant at the .01 level. \* trait belonging to personality disorder (PD). PID-5 = Personality Inventory for DSM-5; PDQ-4+ = Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+; GAPD-83 = General Assessment of Personality Disorders-83. PPD = Paranoid personality disorder; SIPD = Schizoid PD; HPD = Histrionic PD;

DPD = Dependent PD

Table 9

*Factor loadings of the 25 traits of the PID-5 in a clinical sample (N = 750)*

<b>Scales</b>	<b>Factor 1</b>	<b>Factor 2</b>	<b>Factor 3</b>	<b>Factor 4</b>	<b>Factor 5</b>
<b>Negative affectivity</b>					
Emotional lability	<b>.61</b>		-.32		
Anxiousness	.39				<b>.61</b>
Hostility	<b>.53</b>	-.31			
Perseveration	.42				.48
Restricted affectivity		-.32	<b>.76</b>		
Separation insecurity			-.33		<b>.65</b>
Submissiveness					<b>.71</b>
<b>Detachment</b>					
Withdrawal	.31		<b>.74</b>		
Anhedonia			<b>.62</b>		.45
Depressivity			.39		<b>.58</b>
Intimacy avoidance			<b>.64</b>		
Suspiciousness	<b>.61</b>				
<b>Antagonism</b>					
Manipulativeness		<b>-.81</b>			
Deceitfulness		<b>-.71</b>		.30	
Grandiosity		<b>-.75</b>			
Attention seeking		<b>-.71</b>	-.35		
Callousness		<b>-.64</b>	.33		
<b>Disinhibition</b>					
Irresponsibility				<b>.71</b>	
Impulsivity				<b>.74</b>	
Distractibility				<b>.51</b>	.32
Rigid perfectionism	<b>.60</b>			-.45	
Risk taking				<b>.60</b>	-.31
<b>Psychoticism</b>					
Unusual beliefs and experiences	<b>.69</b>				
Eccentricity	<b>.62</b>				
Cognitive and perceptual dysregulation	<b>.57</b>				

*Note.* Direct oblimin rotation. Only loadings > .30 are displayed in the table and unique loadings (> .50) are in bold. PID-5 = Personality Inventory for DSM-5. Factor 1 = Psychoticism; Factor 2 = Antagonism; Factor 3 = Detachment; Factor 4 = Disinhibition; Factor 5 = Negative affectivity

## **Appendixes**

**Appendix A** – *Personality Inventory for DSM-5 questionnaire and domain/traits*

**DSM-5\* Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst**  
[PID-5-NL]

*Paul van der Heijden, Theo Ingenhoven, Han Berghuis & Gina Rossi (2014)*

Dit is een lijst met eigenschappen die mensen over zichzelf zouden kunnen zeggen.  
Wij zijn geïnteresseerd in hoe u zichzelf zou beschrijven.  
Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden.  
U kunt uzelf zo eerlijk mogelijk beschrijven.  
Wij houden uw antwoorden vertrouwelijk.  
Neem uw tijd en lees elke stelling aandachtig en kies het antwoord dat u het beste omschrijft.

Naam \_\_\_\_\_

Datum \_\_\_\_\_

Code \_\_\_\_\_

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
1	Ik haal niet zoveel plezier uit dingen zoals anderen dat lijken te doen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Veel mensen zijn er op uit om mij te pakken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Mensen zouden mij als roekeloos beschrijven.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Ik heb het gevoel dat ik mij volledig impulsief gedraag.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Ik heb vaak ideeën die te ongewoon zijn om aan anderen uit te leggen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Ik verlies de draad in gesprekken omdat andere zaken mijn aandacht trekken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Ik vermijd risicovolle situaties.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Wat mijn emoties betreft vinden anderen mij een kil persoon.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Ik verander wat ik doe op basis van wat anderen willen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Ik geef er de voorkeur aan om niet te dicht bij mensen te komen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Ik raak vaak betrokken bij vechtpartijen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1 | 14

**DSM-5\* Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst**  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
12	Ik word doodsbang als er niemand zou zijn die van mij houdt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Brutaal en onvriendelijk zijn is gewoon een deel van wie ik ben.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Ik doe dingen om er zeker van te zijn dat anderen mij opmerken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	Ik doe gewoonlijk wat anderen vinden dat ik zou moeten doen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Gewoonlijk doe ik dingen impulsief, zonder na te denken over de gevolgen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	Tegen beter weten in kan ik het niet laten om overhaaste beslissingen te nemen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Mijn emoties veranderen soms zonder goede reden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	Ik trek mij er helemaal niets van aan als anderen door mij lijden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20	Ik ben erg op mijzelf.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21	Ik zeg vaak dingen die anderen raar of vreemd vinden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22	Ik doe dingen altijd in een opwelling.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	Ik heb nergens echt interesse in.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24	Andere mensen lijken mijn gedrag vreemd te vinden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25	Andere hebben me gezegd dat ik op een erg vreemde manier over dingen nadenk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	Ik geniet bijna nooit van het leven.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Ik heb vaak het gevoel dat wat ik doe van geen enkel belang is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28	Ik snauw mensen af voor kleine dingen waarmee ze me irriteren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
29	Ik kan mij nergens op concentreren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30	Ik ben een energiek persoon.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31	Anderen zien mij als onverantwoordelijk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32	Ik kan gemeen zijn als het moet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33	Mijn gedachten gaan vaak in een vreemde of ongewone richting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34	Men heeft mij erop gewezen dat ik te veel tijd besteed aan het nagaan of alles precies op de juiste plaats ligt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35	Ik vermijd risicovolle sporten en activiteiten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36	Ik vind het soms moeilijk om een onderscheid aan te geven tussen dromen en het werkelijke leven.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37	Soms heb ik de vreemde gewaarwording dat delen van mijn lichaam dood aanvoelen of niet echt van mijzelf zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38	Ik word snel kwaad.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39	Als het gaat om gevaarlijke dingen doen, heb ik geen grenzen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40	Eerlijk gezegd ben ik gewoonweg belangrijker dan andere mensen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41	Ik verzin verhalen over gebeurtenissen die helemaal niet waar zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42	Mensen vertellen vaak dingen over mij die ik doe zonder dat ik mij daarvan iets kan herinneren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43	Ik doe dingen op zo'n manier dat anderen mij wel moeten bewonderen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
44	Het is vreemd, maar soms lijken gewone voorwerpen er anders uit te zien dan normaal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45	Ik heb niet erg langdurige emotionele reacties op gebeurtenissen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46	Het is moeilijk voor mij om een bezigheid te stoppen, zelfs als daar het moment voor is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47	Ik ben niet goed in vooruit plannen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
48	Ik doe veel dingen die anderen riskant vinden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
49	Mensen vertellen me dat ik mij te veel richt op kleine details.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
50	Ik maak me vaak zorgen over alleen zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
51	Ik heb kansen gemist omdat ik te druk bezig was om iets precies goed te doen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52	Mijn gedachten slaan volgens anderen vaak nergens op.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53	Ik verzin vaak dingen over mezelf om zo mijn zin te krijgen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54	Het kan mij niet echt schelen om te zien dat anderen worden gekwetst.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55	Mensen kijken mij vaak aan alsof ik iets heel vreemds heb gezegd.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
56	Mensen hebben niet in de gaten dat ik overdreven aardig tegen hen doe om iets gedaan te krijgen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57	Ik zou liever een slechte relatie hebben dan alleen te zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
58	Ik denk gewoonlijk na alvorens te handelen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59	Ik zie vaak levendige beelden, zoals in een droom, wanneer ik in slaap val of wakker aan het worden ben.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4 | 14



DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
60	Ik blijf dingen op dezelfde wijze aanpakken, ook al werkt dat niet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
61	Ik ben erg ontevreden met mezelf.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
62	Ik heb veel sterkere emotionele reacties dan bijna alle andere mensen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
63	Ik doe wat anderen mij zeggen te doen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
64	Ik kan er niet tegen om alleen gelaten te worden, zelfs niet voor een paar uur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
65	Ik heb uitzonderlijke kwaliteiten die weinig anderen bezitten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
66	De toekomst ziet er voor mij compleet hopeloos uit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
67	Ik hou ervan om risico's te nemen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
68	Ik kan doelen niet bereiken omdat andere dingen mijn aandacht trekken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
69	Als ik iets wil doen laat ik mij er niet van weerhouden omdat het misschien wel gevaarlijk is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
70	Anderen lijken te denken dat ik nogal raar of vreemd ben.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
71	Mijn gedachten zijn vreemd en onvoorspelbaar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
72	Het maakt me niets uit wat andere mensen voelen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
73	Je moet wel eens op iemands tenen gaan staan om in het leven te krijgen wat je wil.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
74	Ik houd ervan om de aandacht van andere mensen te krijgen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
75	Ik doe er alles aan om groepsactiviteiten te vermijden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
76	Ik kan slinks zijn als ik dan krijg wat ik wil.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
77	Soms wanneer ik naar een bekend voorwerp kijk, lijkt het net alsof ik het voor de eerste keer zie.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
78	Het is moeilijk voor mij om van de ene naar de andere activiteit om te schakelen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Ik maak me vaak zorgen over vreselijke dingen die zouden kunnen gebeuren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
80	Ik vind het moeilijk om hoe ik iets doe te veranderen, zelfs als het niet goed loopt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
81	De wereld zou beter af zijn als ik dood ben.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
82	Ik houd afstand van mensen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
83	Ik heb vaak geen controle over mijn gedachten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
84	Ik word niet emotioneel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
85	Ik heb er een hekel aan als anderen zeggen wat ik moet doen, zelfs bij mensen die de leiding hebben.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
86	Ik schaam mij erg over hoe ik mensen heb teleurgesteld op allerlei kleine manieren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
87	Ik vermijd alles dat maar enigszins gevaarlijk zou kunnen zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
88	Ik vind het moeilijk om specifieke doelen na te streven, zelfs voor een korte periode.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
89	Ik kies ervoor om in mijn leven geen liefdesrelaties aan te gaan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
90	Ik zou een ander nooit kwaad berokkenen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
91	Ik laat mijn emoties niet nadrukkelijk zien.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
92	Ik heb een opvliegend karakter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
93	Ik maak me vaak zorgen dat er iets ergs zal gebeuren door de fouten die ik in het verleden heb gemaakt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
94	Ik heb enkele ongewone kwaliteiten, zoals soms precies weten wat iemand anders aan het denken is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
95	Ik word erg zenuwachtig wanneer ik over de toekomst nadenk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
96	Ik maak me zelden zorgen over iets.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
97	Ik geniet ervan om verliefd te zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
98	Ik verkies zekerheid boven het nemen van onnodige risico's	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
99	Ik heb soms dingen gehoord die anderen niet kunnen horen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
100	Ik raak gefixeerd op bepaalde zaken en kan er niet mee stoppen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
101	Mensen zeggen mij dat het moeilijk is om mijn gevoelens in te schatten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
102	Ik ben een zeer emotionele persoon.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
103	Anderen zullen van mij profiteren als ze daar de kans voor krijgen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
104	Ik voel me vaak een mislukkeling.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
105	Ik vind het gewoon niet aanvaardbaar als ik iets niet volledig perfect doe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
106	Ik heb vaak ongewone ervaringen, zoals de aanwezigheid van iemand voelen die er niet echt is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
107	Ik ben er goed in om mensen te laten doen wat ik wil dat ze doen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
108	Ik beëindig relaties als ze intiem worden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
109	Ik maak me altijd zorgen over iets.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
110	Ik maak me over bijna alles zorgen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
111	Ik hou er van om in een menigte op te vallen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
112	Ik vind het geen probleem om af en toe kleine risico's te nemen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
113	Ik gedraag mij vaak brutaal en trek zo de aandacht van anderen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
114	Ik ben beter dan bijna iedereen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
115	Mensen klagen over mijn behoefte om alles tot in de puntjes geregeld te hebben.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
116	Ik zorg er altijd voor dat ik mensen die mij onrecht aandoen terug pak.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
117	Ik ben altijd op mijn hoede dat iemand mij probeert te bedriegen of te kwetsen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
118	Ik heb moeite om mijn aandacht te blijven richten op wat moet gebeuren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
119	Ik praat veel over zelfmoord.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
120	Ik ben gewoon niet erg geïnteresseerd in het hebben van seksuele relaties.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
121	Ik kan dingen vaak maar moeilijk loslaten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
122	Ik word gemakkelijk emotioneel, vaak door erg kleine redenen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
123	Zelfs als andere mensen er gek van worden, sta ik erop dat alles wat ik doe absoluut perfect is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
124	Ik ben bijna nooit tevreden met mijn dagelijkse bezigheden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
125	De anderen vleien helpt mij om te krijgen wat ik wil.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
126	Soms moet je overdrijven om vooruit te komen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
127	Alleen zijn in het leven, dat is het ergste dat ik vrees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
128	Ik loop vast in een bepaalde manier om iets te doen, zelfs wanneer het duidelijk is dat het niet zal werken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
129	Ik ben vaak nogal onzorgvuldig met mijn eigen en andermans zaken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
130	Ik ben een zeer angstig persoon.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
131	Mensen zijn van nature betrouwbaar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
132	Ik ben snel afgeleid.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
133	Het lijkt erop dat anderen me altijd oneerlijk behandelen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
134	Ik aarzel niet om iemand te bedriegen als mij dat vooruit helpt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
135	Ik controleer dingen meerdere keren om er zeker van te zijn dat ze perfect zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
136	Ik houd er niet van om tijd met anderen door te brengen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
137	Ik voel me gedwongen om door te gaan met dingen, zelfs wanneer het niet zinvol is om dat te doen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
138	Ik weet nooit welke kant mijn emoties telkens weer op zullen gaan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
139	Ik heb dingen gezien die er niet echt waren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
140	Het is belangrijk voor mij dat de dingen op een bepaalde manier gedaan worden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
141	Ik verwacht altijd dat het ergste gaat gebeuren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
142	Ik probeer de waarheid te vertellen, zelfs wanneer het moeilijk is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
143	Ik geloof dat sommige mensen met hun gedachten dingen kunnen laten bewegen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
144	Ik kan mij niet erg lang op iets concentreren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
145	Ik laat mij niet in met liefdesrelaties.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
146	Ik vind het niet belangrijk om vrienden te maken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
147	Ik zeg zo weinig mogelijk wanneer ik met mensen om ga.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
148	Als persoon ben ik waardeeloos.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
149	Ik zou bijna alles doen om iemand te weerhouden mij te verlaten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
150	Soms kan ik andere mensen beïnvloeden enkel en alleen door mijn gedachten naar hen te versturen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
151	Voor mij ziet het leven er erg deprimerend uit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
152	Ik denk op een vreemde manier over dingen waardoor de meeste mensen het niet kunnen begrijpen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
153	Het kan me niet schelen wanneer ik met mijn gedrag anderen kwets.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
154	Soms voel ik me "gecontroleerd" door de gedachten van iemand anders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
155	Ik haal echt alles uit mijn leven.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
156	Ik maak beloftes waarvan ik niet echt de intentie heb om ze na te komen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
157	Er is niets waardoor ik me goed ga voelen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
158	Ik raak door allerlei zaken gemakkelijk geïrriteerd.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
159	Ik doe wat ik wil ongeacht hoe onveilig dat zou kunnen zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
160	Ik vergeet vaak mijn rekeningen te betalen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
161	Ik houd er niet van om te nauw betrokken te raken bij mensen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
162	Ik ben er goed in om mensen op te lichten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
163	Alles lijkt zinloos voor mij.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
164	Ik neem nooit risico's.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
165	Ik word emotioneel bij de geringste aanleiding.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
166	Het is niet echt een punt dat ik anderens gevoelens kwets.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
167	Ik toon nooit emoties aan anderen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
168	Ik voel me vaak gewoonweg ellendig.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
169	Als persoon ben ik niets waard.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
170	Ik ben gewoonlijk nogal vijandig.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
171	Ik ben er wel eens vandoor gegaan om mijn verantwoordelijkheden uit de weg te gaan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
172	Er is mij al meermalen gezegd dat ik een aantal vreemde trekken of gewoontes heb.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
173	Ik ben graag iemand die opgemerkt wordt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
174	Ik ben altijd angstig of gespannen over nare dingen die zouden kunnen gebeuren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
175	Ik wil nooit alleen zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
176	Ik blijf proberen om zaken te perfectioneren, zelfs wanneer ik ze al zo goed mogelijk gemaakt heb.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
177	Ik heb zelden het gevoel dat mensen die ik ken mij proberen te gebruiken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
178	Ik weet dat ik vroeg of laat zelfmoord zal plegen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
179	Ik heb veel meer bereikt dan bijna iedereen die ik ken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
180	Ik kan altijd nog mijn charme inzetten om mijn zin te krijgen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
181	Mijn emoties zijn onvoorspelbaar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
182	Ik ga niet met mensen om, tenzij het moet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
183	Andermans problemen kunnen mij niets schelen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
184	Ik reageer weinig op zaken die anderen emotioneel lijken te raken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
185	Ik heb verschillende gewoontes die anderen excentriek of vreemd vinden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
186	Ik vermijd sociale gebeurtenissen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
187	Ik verdien een speciale behandeling.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
188	Ik word echt kwaad wanneer mensen mij beledigen, ook al is dat maar in lichte mate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
189	Ik word zelden enthousiast over iets.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
190	Ik vermoed dat zelfs mijn zogenaamde vrienden me vaak verraden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
191	Ik hunker naar aandacht.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
192	Soms denk ik dat iemand anders gedachten uit mijn hoofd aan het weghalen is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
193	Bij tijden voel ik mij losgekoppeld van de wereld of van mijzelf.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
194	Ik zie vaak ongebruikelijke verbanden tussen dingen die de meeste mensen ontgaan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
195	Ik denk er niet bij na dat ik gewond zou kunnen raken als ik dingen doe die mogelijk gevaarlijk zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
196	Ik kan er eenvoudigweg niet tegen wanneer dingen niet op hun juiste plek liggen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
197	Ik moet vaak omgaan met mensen die minder belangrijk zijn dan ikzelf.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
198	Ik geef mensen soms een tik om hen eraan te herinneren wie er de baas is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
199	Ik ben snel afgeleid, zelfs door kleine dingetjes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
200	Ik geniet ervan om mensen die de leiding hebben belachelijk te maken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
201	Ik sla afspraken of vergaderingen gewoon over wanneer ik niet in de stemming ben.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
202	Ik probeer te doen wat anderen willen dat ik doe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
203	Ik ben liever alleen dan dat ik een liefdesrelatie heb.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
204	Ik ben erg impulsief.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
205	Ik heb vaak gedachten die wat mij betreft logisch zijn, maar waarvan anderen zeggen dat ze vreemd zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
206	Ik gebruik mensen om te krijgen wat ik wil.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
207	Ik zie niet in waarom ik me schuldig zou moeten voelen over dingen die ik gedaan heb en waarmee ik andere mensen heb gekwetst.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13 | 14

DSM-5<sup>®</sup> Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst  
[vervolg]

		Helemaal niet waar of vaak onwaar	Soms niet waar of eerder onwaar	Soms waar of eerder waar	Vaak waar of helemaal waar
208	Ik zie er meestal het nut niet van in om vriendelijk te zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
209	Ik heb enkele echt vreemde ervaringen gehad die zeer moeilijk uit te leggen zijn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
210	Ik kom altijd mijn verplichtingen na.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
211	Ik houd ervan om de aandacht naar mezelf toe te trekken.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
212	Ik voel me een groot deel van de tijd schuldig.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
213	Ik dwaal vaak af en kom dan plotseling weer bij en beseft dan dat er veel tijd verstreken is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
214	Liegen is voor mij erg gemakkelijk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
215	Ik haat het om risico's te nemen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
216	Ik ben gemeen en kortaf tegen iedereen die dat verdient.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
217	De dingen om mij heen voelen vaak als onwerkelijk aan, of juist als realistischer dan gewoonlijk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
218	Ik verdraai de waarheid als dat in mijn voordeel is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
219	Het is gemakkelijk voor mij om van anderen te profiteren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
220	Ik heb een vaste manier om dingen te doen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

© 2014 Van der Heijden, P., Ingenhoven, T., Berghuis, H., & Rossi, G.  
p/a Uitgeverij Boom, Amsterdam. Nederlandsstalige bewerking  
van *The Personality Inventory for DSM-5® (PID-5) – Adult*, 2011.

*The Personality Inventory for DSM-5®*, (Copyright © 2011), is reproduced and  
translated for use in this study with permission from the American Psychiatric Association,  
represented by Boom publishers Amsterdam.

Deze vragenlijst kan zonder toestemming worden gebruikt door klinici voor  
toepassing bij hun eigen cliënten. Elke andere toepassing, waaronder elektronisch  
gebruik, vergt schriftelijke toestemming van Boom uitgeverij Amsterdam BV.

14 | 14

Table 10

*Higher order domains and underlying traits of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (broken down by items)*

<b>Domains</b>	<b>Traits</b>	<b>Items</b>
Negative affect	Anxiousness	79, 93, 95, 96R, 109, 110, 130, 141, 174
	Emotional lability	18, 62, 102, 122, 138, 165, 181
	Hostility	28, 32, 38, 85, 92, 116, 158, 170, 188, 216
	Perseveration	46, 51, 60, 78, 80, 100, 121, 128, 137
	Restricted affectivity	8, 45, 84, 91, 101, 167, 184
	Separation insecurity	12, 50, 57, 64, 127, 149, 175
	Submissiveness	9, 15, 63, 202
Detachment	Anhedonia	1, 23, 26, 30R, 124, 155R, 157, 189
	Depressivity	27, 61, 66, 81, 86, 104, 119, 148, 151, 163, 168, 169, 178, 212
	Intimacy avoidance	89, 97R, 108, 120, 145, 203
	Suspiciousness	2, 103, 117, 131R, 133, 177R, 190
	Withdrawal	10, 20, 75, 82, 136, 146, 147, 161, 182, 186
Antagonism	Attention seeking	14, 43, 74, 111, 113, 173, 191, 211
	Callousness	11, 13, 19, 54, 72, 73, 90R, 153, 166, 183, 198, 200, 207, 208
	Deceitfulness	41, 53, 56, 76, 126, 134, 142R, 206, 214, 218
	Grandiosity	40, 65, 114, 179, 187, 197
Disinhibition	Manipulativeness	107, 125, 162, 180, 219
	Distractibility	6, 29, 47, 68, 88, 118, 132, 144, 199
	Impulsivity	4, 16, 17, 22, 58R, 204
	Irresponsibility	31, 129, 156, 160, 171, 201, 210R
	Rigid perfectionism	34, 49, 105, 115, 123, 135, 140, 176, 196, 220
	Risk taking	3, 7R, 35R, 39, 48, 67, 69, 87R, 98R, 112, 159, 164R, 195, 215R
Psychoticism	Eccentricity	5, 21, 24, 25, 33, 52, 55, 70, 71, 152, 172, 185, 205
	Cognitive and perceptual dysregulation	36, 37, 42, 44, 59, 77, 83, 154, 192, 193, 213, 217
	Unusual beliefs and experiences	94, 99, 106, 139, 143, 150, 194, 209

*Note.* Derived from Krueger et al. (2012). R = reverse coded

**Appendix B – General Assessment of Personality Disorders-83 domains and facets**

Table 11

*Higher order domains and underlying facets of the General Assessment of Personality Disorders-83 (broken down by items)*

<b>Domains</b>	<b>Facets</b>	<b>Items</b>
Self-Pathology	Poorly delineated boundaries	26, 32, 38, 46
	Lack of self-clarity	5, 7, 23, 35

	Sense of inner emptiness	21, 28, 45, 48
	Context-dependent self-definition	19, 27, 40, 79
	Poorly differentiated images of others	4, 29, 34, 42
	Lack of historicity and continuity	10, 16, 24, 65
	Fragmentary self-other representations	1, 58, 63, 83
	Self-state disjunctions	25, 50, 69, 77
	False self-real self-disjunction	15, 31, 51, 80
	Lack of authenticity	49, 57, 67, 74
	Defective sense of self	61, 68, 73
	Poorly developed understanding of human behavior	8, 11, 14, 52
	Lack of autonomy and agency	12, 20, 39, 62
	Lack of meaning, purpose and direction	41, 43, 47, 56
	Difficulty setting and attaining goals	37, 54, 76, 82
Interpersonal dysfunction	Intimacy and attachment	2, 17, 70
	Affiliation	6, 30, 53, 55, 66
	Prosocial	3, 9, 13, 33, 59, 60, 64, 71, 72, 81
	Cooperativeness	18, 22, 36, 44, 75, 78

*Note.* Derived from Berghuis et al. (2013)

### **Appendix C – Severity Indices of Personality Functioning-118 domains and facets**

Table 12

*Higher order domains and underlying facets of the Severity Indices of Personality Functioning-118 (broken down by items)*

<b>Domains</b>	<b>Facets</b>	<b>Items</b>
Self-control	Emotion regulation	17, 30, 52, 67, 79, 92, 106
	effortful control	2, 31, 41, 53, 68, 80, 107
	stable self-image	4, 43, 55, 69, 82, 94, 109
	self-reflective functioning	5, 19, 56, 83, 95, 110, 118
	aggression regulation	3, 18, 32, 42, 54, 81, 93, 108
Identity integration	Enjoyment	10, 24, 47, 61, 73, 86, 100
	purposefulness	9, 23, 35, 46, 60, 72, 114
	self-respect	6, 20, 33, 57, 70, 84, 96, 111
	frustration tolerance	1, 16, 29, 40, 51, 66, 78, 105
Relation capacities	Enduring relationships	13, 27, 37, 75, 88, 102, 116
	intimacy	12, 26, 36, 49, 63, 87, 99
	feeling recognized	7, 21, 34, 44, 58, 71, 97, 112
Responsibility	Responsible industry	14, 38, 50, 64, 76, 90, 103
	trustworthiness	15, 28, 39, 65, 77, 91, 104, 117
Social concordance	Cooperation	11, 25, 48, 62, 74, 89, 101, 115
	respect	8, 22, 45, 59, 85, 96, 113

Note. Derived from Verheul et al. (2008)

**Appendix D – Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+ domains**

Table 13

*Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-4+ scales broken down by items*

<b>Scales</b>	<b>Items</b>
Paranoid personality disorder	11, 24, 37, 50, 61, 62, 96
Schizoid personality disorder	9, 22, 34, 47, 60, 71
Schizotypal personality disorder	10, 23, 36, 48, 60, 74
Histrionic personality disorder	4, 17, 30, 43, 55, 67
Narcistic personality disorder	5, 18, 31, 44, 57, 63, 68, 79, 92, 94
Borderline personality disorder	6, 19, 32, 45, 58, 69, 78, 91, 93, 98
Antisocial personality disorder	8, 20, 33, 46, 59, 75, 85, 99
Avoidant personality disorder	1, 13, 26, 39, 52, 83, 87
Dependent personality disorder	2, 15, 27, 40, 53, 65, 80, 82, 88
Obsessive-compulsive personality disorder	3, 16, 29, 42, 54, 66, 89

Note. Derived from Akkerhuis et al. (1996)

**Appendix E – Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 Personality Disorders Questionnaire domains**

Table 14

*Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 Personality Disorders Questionnaire domains broken down by items*

<b>Domains</b>	<b>Items</b>
Avoidant personality disorder	1 t/m 7
Dependent personality disorder	8 t/m 15
Obsessive-compulsive personality disorder	16 t/m 24
Paranoid personality disorder	25 t/m 32
Schizotypal personality disorder	33 t/m 45
Schizoid personality disorder	46 t/m 51
Histrionic personality disorder	52 t/m 59
Narcistic personality disorder	60 t/m 76
Borderline personality disorder	77 t/m 91
Antisocial personality disorder	92 t/m 106

Note. Derived from Arntz et al. (2017)

**Appendix F – Definitions of personality disorders**



Table 15

*Definitions of personality disorders*

<b>Personality disorders</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Paranoid personality disorder	A pattern of being suspicious of others and seeing them as mean or spiteful. People with paranoid personality disorder often assume people will harm or deceive them and don't confide in others or become close to them.
Schizoid personality disorder	Being detached from social relationships and expressing little emotion. A person with schizoid personality disorder typically does not seek close relationships, chooses to be alone and seems to not care about praise or criticism from others.
Schizotypal personality disorder	A pattern of being very uncomfortable in close relationships, having distorted thinking and eccentric behavior. A person with schizotypal personality disorder may have odd beliefs or odd or peculiar behavior or speech or may have excessive social anxiety.
Histrionic personality disorder	A pattern of excessive emotion and attention seeking. People with histrionic personality disorder may be uncomfortable when they are not the center of attention, may use physical appearance to draw attention to themselves or have rapidly shifting or exaggerated emotions.
Narcissistic personality disorder	A pattern of need for admiration and lack of empathy for others. A person with narcissistic personality disorder may have a grandiose sense of self-importance, a sense of entitlement, take advantage of others or lack empathy.
Borderline personality disorder	A pattern of instability in personal relationships, intense emotions, poor self-image and impulsivity. A person with borderline personality disorder may go to great lengths to avoid being abandoned, have repeated suicide attempts, display inappropriate intense anger or have ongoing feelings of emptiness.
Antisocial personality disorder	A pattern of disregarding or violating the rights of others. A person with antisocial personality disorder may not conform to social norms, may repeatedly lie or deceive others, or may act impulsively.

Avoidant personality disorder

A pattern of extreme shyness, feelings of inadequacy and extreme sensitivity to criticism. People with avoidant personality disorder may be unwilling to get involved with people unless they are certain of being liked, be preoccupied with being criticized or rejected, or may view themselves as not being good enough or socially inept.

Dependent personality disorder

A pattern of needing to be taken care of and submissive and clingy behavior. People with dependent personality disorder may have difficulty making daily decisions without reassurance from others or may feel uncomfortable or helpless when alone because of fear of inability to take care of themselves.

Obsessive-compulsive personality disorder

A pattern of preoccupation with orderliness, perfection and control. A person with obsessive-compulsive personality disorder may be overly focused on details or schedules, may work excessively not allowing time for leisure or friends, or may be inflexible in their morality and values.

---

*Note.* Derived from <https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/personality-disorders/what-are-personality-disorders> (APA, 2018)