Mental Health Literacy, Sub-Clinical Personality Disorders and Job Fit.

Adrian Furnham[1,2] and Kelly Petropoulou[1]

(1) Research Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology,
University College London, 26 Bedford Way, London, WC1H0AP

(2) Norwegian Business School (BI), Nydalveien, Olso, Norway

Corresponding author: a.furnham@ucl.ac.uk

Key Words: Personality Disorders; Job Fit; Mental Health Literacy

Abstract

Background: This study looked at lay theories of how people with sub-clinical personality disorders experience the world of work.

Aims: The aim was to investigate the paradox that subclinical and clinical personality disorders are seen as beneficial for success, rather than a handicap in certain jobs.

Methods: In all, 230 participants read 14 vignettes derived from Oldham and Morris's (1991) book describing DSMIII personality disorders for a popular audience. Participants were invited to suggest what type of work each disordered person may be successful at, as well as six ratings of their social adjustment.

Results: There was a tendency for people to believe those with OCD to be suited to Accountancy, Narcissism and Paranoia to General Management, Histrionic PD to being an Actor and Schizotypal an Artist. Surprisingly Paranoid and Sadistic people were judged to be good managers and Histrionic, Passive Aggressive and Schizotypal the worst. People in Cluster C were judged as best managers, but those in cluster B as better adjusted.

Conclusions: Results show that lay people believe that certain "dark-side" traits associated with personality disorders, particularly dependency and OCD are thought to be beneficial for success rather than failure in many jobs.

Introduction

3

There are a number of studies on the relationship between personality disorders (PDs) and success and failure at work (Furnham 2015; Oldham & Morris, 1991). They tend to show that, paradoxically, some of the PDs, when not at extremes (i.e. subclinical), help people at work to get promoted and function well, though in the long term the disorder may be a problem (Kaiser, LeBreton, & Hogan, 2015). Thus the "dark-side" of personality can be either beneficial (Furnham, 2008) or harmful (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004; Furnham, Crump & Ritchie, 2013).

This study is about Personality Disorders Mental Health Literacy (MHL) and the concept of job fit. It seeks to look at how people with different PDs are judged to be potentially successful at work and the occupations they are most suited to. This is important for those concerned with selection and the extent to which they have insights into sub-clinical PDs.

Mental Health Literacy

The term 'mental health literacy' (MHL) was introduced by Jorm and colleagues to mean "…knowledge and beliefs about mental disorders which aid recognition, management or prevention…" (Jorm et al, 1997 pp. 182). This includes the ability to recognise specific disorders, knowledge about the causes and risk factors, and knowledge of the appropriate help available. The area has attracted a great deal of research (Lee et al., 2017; Wickstead & Furnham, 2017).

There have been a few studies concerning MHL with respect to personality disorders, some concentrating almost exclusively on psychiatric literacy concerning a specific disorder like Psychopathy (Anti-Social Personality Disorder) (Furnham, Daoud & Swami, 2009), Borderline disorder (Furnham & Dadabehoy, 2012) or the conduct disorders (Furnham & Carter Leno, 2012). The results suggest that people are poorly informed about the PDs and hence make bad judgements about them (Furnham & Petropoulou, 2017).

For example, Furnham, Abajian and McClelland (2011) found, contrary to predictions, that Obsessive-Compulsive disorder was identified as a personality disorder by only 41% of the participants whereas Schizotypal was identified as a disorder by 65% of participants and Borderline by 86% of participants. They predicted that a high proportion of participants would be able to recognize that a psychological problem existed, but that a much smaller number would be able to label it correctly – which was also found to be the case. Paranoid Personality Disorder was correctly identified by 29% of participants, and Obsessive-Compulsive by 25%; but fewer than 10% could correctly identify the remaining disorders. They also found that the

likelihood of judging a problem would correlate negatively with how well adjusted the individual in question would be perceived to be.

This study focuses on all the PDs and not so much the labelling of the disorder but judgements about how those with the (sub-clinical) disorder will succeed in the workplace. This is clearly an important issue for people at work, be they managers, colleagues or sub-ordinates of those that work with people with PDs.

Personality Disorders

Over the past twenty years a number of popular books have appeared that have attempted to describe and explain the personality disorders in popular terms. One of the first attempts was by Oldham and Morris (1991) which became a best seller and has been updated and revised. Other books have attempted similar things such as De Haan and Kazosi (2014). All these writers have changed the disorder terms to make them more "understandable" to the layman. In this study we developed vignette descriptions based on Oldham and Morris (1991) which have been used in other studies (Furnham & Petropoulou, 2017).

These personality disorders have been grouped into different clusters: A: Odd/Eccentric (Paranoid, Schizoid, and Schizotypal); B: Dramatic/Emotional/Erratic (Antisocial, Borderline, Histrionic, and Narcissistic) and C: Anxious/Fearful (Avoidant, Dependent and Obsessive-Compulsive). These three clusters have also been described as moving Against (Bold, Mischievous, Colourful, Imaginative), Toward (Diligent, Dutiful), and Away From (Excitable, Cautious, Skeptical, Reserved, Leisurely) others (Hogan & Hogan, 2009).

There has been research that suggests what sector is most likely to be suitable for each type of personality disorder, always when sub-clinically present. For example Furnham, Hyde and Trickey (2014) have shown that individuals with personality characteristics that fall under the personality disorders of Cluster A and B are more likely to be successful in private sector jobs whereas individuals from Cluster C are better suited for jobs in the public sector. It has been suggested that the reason why this happens is because Cluster C professionals fit more into jobs that provide them with clear rules and order, which is not the case with those from Clusters A and B who tend to be more individualistic and be able to sometimes go against some rules.

This Study

In this study we use vignettes designed to help people understand PDs. Each vignette described a particular PD in the work place. Rather than attempt to diagnose/label the vignette person's

problem this study looks at what people think will be an ideal job for people with different PDs and how they will adjust to the world of work. It was predicted that Cluster B and C but not A (Moving Against, Moving Toward not Moving Away) of PDs will be seen as more successful at work. Thus, it was predicted on the basis of previous studies that: Obsessive Compulsive, Narcissistic, Histrionic, Anti-social, Aggressive and Schizotypal will be seen as successful at work. Dependent, Paranoid, Avoidant, Schizoid, Depressive, Passive-Aggressive and Self-defeating will be seen as unsuccessful at work.

Moreover, the study looked at whether career success was negatively correlated with work success. The reason why these two very similar aspects were split into two different questions is because while some individuals are very good at performing day-to-day tasks that are required by their position, which makes them good at their work, they fail to display the social skills required for a successful career. A career is viewed as successful when it includes multiple promotions as well as other factors, someone who performs their tasks correctly may lack the necessary talents such as the ability to network and possessing political savvy (Furnham, 2015; Kaiser et al., 2008; 2015).

We also asked participants in what sort of jobs each vignette candidate would most likely "be good at". Regarding the content analysis of the jobs that participants assigned to each of the candidates, it was hypothesised that Candidates B (Narcissistic), D (Histrionic), H (Antisocial), J (Schizoid) and M (Aggressive) would more frequently be associated with management positions than the rest of the Candidates. Candidate I (Schizotypal) would most frequently be assigned to artistic professions. Finally, Candidate E (Paranoid) would be mostly identified as a lawyer as suggested by previous research.

Method

Participants

There were 230 participants, 123 of which were female. Their mean age was 36.34 years (S.D=14.98) (minimum of 18; maximum of 63). Of these, 176 (77%) were employed or retired, and the rest were university students. Demographic information showed that 162 (71%) participants had a university degree.

Questionnaire

The descriptions of the 14 Candidates were created using Oldham and Morris' book '*New personality Self-Portrait: Why You Think, Work, Love and Act the Way You Do'*. This book includes 14 personality styles which represent the non-clinical versions of 14 personality disorders. Each chapter had a description of the PD type at work. Our vignettes paraphrased the basic characteristics that Oldham and Morris attribute to each personality style, emphasising the more positive and adaptive sides of their character. This task was initially performed by the second author based closely on each chapter which describes the essential characteristics of each type, their relationships with others, their self-concept, their work-related behaviour, and how best to deal with them.

Once complete two experts on PDs were able to correctly classify them. Further they have been used in other studies (Furnham & Petrepoulou, 2017).

Insert Table 1 here

After each vignette the participant was asked the following questions:

What sort of job do you think he will be particularly good at?
………………………………………………………………………………………………

Do you think he will make a good manager at work?   *Not at all* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Extremely*

Do you think you would like to work for him?   *Not at all* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Extremely*

Do you think he will have a very successful work career?   *Not at all* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Extremely*

In general, how happy do you think he is?   *Not at all* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Extremely*

In general, how successful at his work do you think he is?   *Not at all* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Extremely*

How satisfying do you think his personal relationships are? *Not at all* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Extremely*

Procedure

After acquiring ethical approval by the University's committee of ethics, participants were sent a link to complete the questionnaire online using Qualtrics software, or were given a hard copy of the questionnaire to fill. Instructions were given on the questionnaire as well as the suggested time it required (25 minutes).

Results

Content Analysis

A content analysis of frequencies was conducted in order to find which jobs were considered the most appropriate ones for each candidate by the participants. The five jobs that were mostly assigned to each candidate are presented in the table below. Percentages were calculated using the exact number of answers each candidate, which varied slightly, excluding missing values from the 230 participants. Descriptions were grouped: manager, supervisor, boss were all classified as management; and creative, designer, artist all classified as artist.

Insert Table 2 here

From the above table what is obvious is that most of the participants considered the Aggressive candidate to be "particularly good" at a management-related job, followed by the Narcissist candidate which complies with previous research. What was interesting however is that the Paranoid candidate was also considered to make a particularly good manager. Moreover, except for the Aggressive and the Narcissistic candidates, none of the rest of those that were hypothesized, were primarily associated with Management. Specifically, Candidate D (Histrionic) was mostly considered as a good actor, H (Antisocial) a sales person and J (Schizoid) an I.T. person. In all 24% of participants assigning the Schizotypal candidate to an artist's job.

One of the most expected findings was the fact that the OCD candidate was considered to potentially be a good accountant which has been displayed in other forms in various research. The reason for that is because individuals with OCD are often characterized as very persistent and detail-oriented which appear as essential traits for an accountant who needs to be very vigilant in their work which focuses on micro-details.

ANOVAs

Insert Table 3 here

A one-way repeated measures ANOVA was carried out in order to investigate which of the 14 personality disorders described in the vignettes, was considered to make the best manager at work. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3. All were significant and the

table shows the results of the post-hoc analyses. There were many significant effects between PDs, with the highest rated one being the Aggressive personality disorder. (Wilk's Lambda=.17, $F(13,202)=78.31$, $p<.005$, partial eta squared=.83).

The analysis for Q2 (like to work for) showed the candidate who received the significantly highest mean score from participants was the Paranoid candidate, who was also very high in the ratings of the first question (Wilk's Lambda=.22, $F(13,203)=55.59$, $p<.05$, partial eta squared= .78).

The findings of the ANOVA for Q3 ("Successful at Work") were significant (Wilks' Lambda=.22, $F(13,203)=56.43$, $p<.05$, partial eta squared= .78). The Paranoid candidate was found to be the one of the most potentially successful candidates.

The analyses for the remaining questions were also significant: (Q4)("How happy")(Wilks' Lambda=.26, $F(13,204)=44.99$, p<.05, partial eta squared=.74); (Q5)("How successful")(: Wilks' Lambda=.21, $F(13, 202)= 57.4$, $p<.05$, partial eta squared=.79); (Q6)("How successful relationships") (Wilks' Lambda=.11, $F(13,202)=123.13$, $p<.05$, partial eta squared=.89). From these analyses it was found that the Dependent candidate was considered to be the happiest, with a significant difference from the second, and with the more satisfying personal relationships of all the rest. The least happy candidate was judged to be the Obsessive-compulsive individual as well as the one with the least satisfying relationships. The Aggressive candidate was considered to be the most successful one at their work, and the Passive-Aggressive one was rated as the least efficient, which is supported by previous research.

Insert Table 4 here

These results were repeated but this time at the Cluster level using the DSM clusters and excluding a number of the disorders. These results are shown in Table 4 which indicated that participants would most like to work for a Cluster C manager, but that those in Cluster B would be most happy and those in Cluster A having the least satisfying relationships.

The six questions were then treated to a VARIMAX rotated factor analysis. Two clear factors emerged which accounted for 76.41% of the variance. The first two questions loaded on the second factor (Eigenvalue 1.84; Variance 30.79%) and the other four loaded on the first factor (Eigenvalue 2.73; Variance 45.79). The first two questions were mainly concerned with management.

Insert Table 5

The above analysis was then repeated using the two factors. Cluster C were judged as best managers and Cluster B as overall most happy and successful people

Discussion

The study addressed issues of mental health literacy in relation to perceived job fit, career success and personal life aspects. The data from a variety of studies suggests that having a PD of any sort is indeed "a handicap" with respect to work success with three caveats: First, the relationship may be curvilinear and that a marginally subclinical PD may be related to job success (Furnham, 2015; Kaiser et al., 2015); Second, that it may depend on the job, such that certain PDs may be beneficial for certain jobs or in particular organisations; Third, that if combined with other factors such as high intelligence and good looks a certain PD (i.e. Narcissism) may be an advantage.

There is growing literature on management derailment which suggests that many managers in Cluster B (Antisocial, Borderline, Histrionic, and Narcissistic) are often surprisingly successful at work. They are judged as talented and promoted to senior positions while some get detected and sacked (Furnham, 2015). On the other hand it appears that those in Clusters A and C are rarely chosen for, or indeed succeed in, management positions. It was therefore hypothesised that Cluster B types would be recognised as potentially most successful at work.

The results of our analyses were mixed, validating almost half of the initial hypotheses. Surprisingly only the Aggressive and the Narcissistic candidates were perceived as fit for a managerial position by the highest percentage of participants. These findings may be explained by a closer look at three vignettes, which were written to show the most positive, rather than negative aspect of the disorder

Aggressive: This candidate takes charge. He is comfortable with power, authority, and responsibility. He operates best within a traditional power structure where everyone knows their place and the lines of the authority are clear. He is highly disciplined and imposes rules of order that he expects others in their charge to follow. He is highly goal-directed. He takes a practical, pragmatic approach to accomplishing their objectives. He does what is necessary to get the job done. He is neither squeamish nor fainthearted. He can function well and bravely in difficult and dangerous situations without being distracted by fear or horror. He likes action

and adventure. He is physically assertive and enjoys playing competitive sports, especially contact sports.

Narcissistic: This candidate believes in himself and in his abilities. He has no doubt that he is unique and special. He expects others to treat them well at all times. He is unabashedly open about his aspirations and possibilities. He is able to take advantage of the strengths and abilities of other people in order to achieve his goals. He is an able competitor, loves getting to the top and enjoys staying there. He identifies with people of high rank and status. He is able to visualize himself as the most accomplished in their field. He has a keen awareness of his thoughts and feelings and his overall inner state of being. He accepts compliments, praise and admiration gracefully and with self-possession.

Paranoid: This candidate possesses a resilient independence. He keeps his own counsel, requires no outside reassurance or advice, makes decisions easily, and can take care of himself. He is careful in his dealings with others, preferring to size up a person before entering into a relationship. He is a good listener, with an ear for subtle tone. He is feisty and does not hesitate to stand up for himself, especially when they are under attack. He takes criticism very seriously, without becoming intimidated. He places a high premium on fidelity and loyalty. He works hard to earn it, and never takes it for granted.

The Schizotypal candidate was indeed mostly fit in artistic professions. Also 23% of the participants judged that Candidate E (Paranoid) would be best fit in a management related position compared to 18% who assigned him as a lawyer. Correlations between ratings of different questions showed that career success was strongly and positively related to work success, perceived happiness and satisfactory personal relationships. Moreover, exploratory analysis showed that for different personality disorders, different individual characteristics of participants such as personality traits, ideology and gender played a role in the ratings they gave.

Perhaps one of the most interesting findings was that the Paranoid candidate was rated second in participants' beliefs about career success. This is in opposition to previous research mentioned earlier on in the paper, where it is most commonly found that those who score high on the Paranoid trait are usually among the least successful ones. This study showed that not only the Paranoid candidate was perceived to potentially have a successful career, but also, participants claimed they would like to work for him more than they would like to work for anyone else. Additionally he was assigned to a management position by 23% of the participants

which again suggests that an individual with sub-clinical paranoid traits is trusted with high-responsibility roles.

This finding is likely to derive from one of the major strengths of our study which was the fact that participants were not told that the candidates described in the vignettes had any personality disorder. It would have been most interesting to have a control group in which participants' saw the diagnostic label (i.e. Narcissist) attached to the vignette.

Nevertheless, this study also had its limitations. To begin with, all the candidates were described as male using "he". Consequently assuming that all candidates were male might have caused some biases, other than those we tried to prevent. Another limitation that should be considered is the fact that the question on whether participants would like to work for each candidate was placed after the open-ended question regarding what job they would assign to the candidate. Therefore it can be assumed that participants answered question two keeping in mind their own job, as well as the one they had just assigned to the candidate. Moreover, the fact that ratings were made on the basis of vignettes that described candidates' personalities in general and not relating to the work environment, potentially creates a gap between participants' ratings and their actual behaviour. In other words, results indicated that participants are more willing to work for a Paranoid individual rather than for a Narcissist but in reality, the characteristics described in the vignettes may have little baring on how these individuals would really act on their jobs.

Overall, the findings of the study suggest that "Moving Away" and "Moving Toward" might actually lead to more benefits in the workplace as opposed to "Moving Against" people. This is because some of them were rated as slightly and non-significantly less successful at work but were also seen as more desirable to work for. Therefore, personal relationships and social interactions might be more important for the workplace. However, one must emphasise that the study does not suggest that having a personality disorder is better than living without one but that some of the traits associated to them are more accepted by lay people and may have more beneficial outcomes than others.

The most important implication of this study is that it encourages people with personality disorders to acknowledge them and actually benefit from them. It provides evidence that when taking away the label that comes with personality disorders, others around them can appreciate the positive aspects of this disorder which are usually overlooked. However, the study describes the disorders in their sub-clinical level, therefore it is essential to make sure that individuals

with personality disorders are able to control them with the help of appropriate interventions in order to selectively keep the positive personality traits that come with their disorder. Respectively, these findings enhance the awareness of lay people in the sense that they give them the chance to see the personality without the labels, thus use this knowledge to increase their flexibility towards people with personality disorders especially those that they interact with in the workplace.

Future studies could be based on the aforementioned implication, and let participants know in the end of the study that the vignettes actually depicted sub-clinical versions of the most commonly known personality disorders. Adopting a qualitative character, these studies could ask participants to elaborate on their ratings for each participant or even ask whether they believe that adding a personality disorder label would have altered their judgment. Finally, focusing on the finding that the candidates who were rated to be the most and the least happy, were also rated to have the most and the least satisfactory relationships, future studies could investigate the relationship between personality disorders and personal relationships as it has often been shown by research that personality disorders result in inability to create and sustain happy and successful relationships.

In conclusion, this study investigated the judgments of lay people with regards to individuals with personality disorders. Along with future research that derives from it, this study can be used as a means of increasing awareness on the bright-side and job-fit of personality disorders, when these are displayed in a sub-clinical level in the workplace.

References

De Haan, E. & Kasozi, A. (2014). *The Leadership Shadow: How to recognise and avoid derailment, hubris and overdrive.* London: Kogan Page.

Furnham, A. (2008). *Personality and Intelligence at Work.* London: Routledge.

Furnham, A. (2015). *Bullies and Backstabbers.* London: Bloomsbury.

Furnham, A., Crump, J., & Ritchie, W. (2013). What it takes: Ability, demographic, bright and dark side trait correlates of years to promotion. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55,* 952-956.

Furnham, A., Daoud, J., & Swami, V. (2009). "How to spot a psychopath". Lay theories of psychopathy. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 44*, 464 - 472.

Furnham, A., Abajian, N., & McClelland, A. (2011). Psychiatric Literacy and the Personality Disorders. *Psychiatry Research*, *189*, 110-114.

Furnham, A., & Dadabehoy, J. (2012). Beliefs about causes, behavioural manifestations and *treatment* of Borderline Personality Disorder. *Psychiatry Research, 197,* 307-313.

Furnham, A., & Petropoulou, K. (2017). The perceived problems of people with subclinical personality Disorders: A mental health literacy study. *Journal of Personal Relationships, 8,* e13, 1-8.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2009) *Hogan Development Survey Manual*. Tulsa, OK: HAS.

Jorm, A., Korten, A., Jacomb, P., Christensen, H., Rodgers, B., & Pollitt, P. (1997). Mental health literacy: a survey of the public's ability to recognize mental disorders and their beliefs about the effectiveness of treatment. *Medical Journal of Australia, 166,* 182–186.

Kaiser, R., Hogan, R., & Craig, S. (2008). Leadership and the fate of Organizations. *American Psychologist, 63*, 96-100.

Kaiser, R. B., LeBreton, J. M., & Hogan, J. (2015). The dark side of personality and ineffective leadership. *Applied Psychology, 64,* 55-92.

Lee, C., Furnham, A., & Merritt C. (2017). Effect of directness of exposure and trauma type on Mental Health Literacy of PTSD. *Journal of Mental Health, 26,* 257-263.

Moscoso, S., & Salgado, J. (2004). "Dark Side" personality scales as predictors of task, contextual, and job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12*, 356-362.

Oldham, J., & Morris, L. (1991). *Personality self-portrait*. New York: Bantam.

Wickstead, R., & Furnham, A. (2017). Comparing Mental Health Literacy and Physical Health Literacy: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Mental Health, 26,* 449-456.

Table 1

Associations of Candidates with personality styles and disorders

Candidate	Oldham & Morris Personality Style	Personality Disorder
A	Conscientious	Obsessive-Compulsive
B	Self-Confident	Narcissistic
C	Devoted	Dependent
D	Dramatic	Histrionic
E	Vigilant	Paranoid
F	Sensitive	Avoidant
G	Leisurely	Passive-Aggressive
H	Adventurous	Antisocial
I	Idiosyncratic	Schizotypal
J	Solitary	Schizoid
K	Mercurial	Borderline
L	Self-Sacrificing	Self-defeating
M	Aggressive	Sadistic
N	Serious	Depressive

Table 2

Content analysis of jobs assigned to each candidate

Candidate	Job 1	Job 2	Job 3	Job 4	Job 5
A: OCD (N=225)	Accounting (24%)	Management (10%)	Law (8%)	P.A./Secretary (4%)	Administrator (4%)
B: Narcissist (N= 219)	Management (23%)	Sales (12%)	CEO (10%)	Law (6%)	Marketing (6%)
C: Dependent (N= 218)	Teacher (12%)	P.A./Secretary (9%)	Social Worker (7%)	Counsellor (6%)	Manager (6%)
D: Histrionic (N=224)	Actor (29%)	Artist (16%)	Fashion Industry (10%)	Writer (5%)	Sales (5%)
E: Paranoid (N=222)	Management (23%)	Law (18%)	Military (6%)	Entrepreneur (6%)	CEO (6%)
F: Avoidant (N=219)	Clerk (11%)	Accountant (9%)	P.A./Secretary (6%)	Management (5%)	Doctor (5%)
G: Passive-Aggressive (N=217)	Artist (11%)	Freelancer/Self-employed (10%)	Clerk (8%)	Writer (7%)	Builder/Manual worker (3%)
H: Antisocial (N=219)	Sales (10%)	Extreme sports athlete (8%)	Politics (7%)	Banker (6%)	Entrepreneur (6%)
I: Schizotypal (N=217)	Artist (24%)	Writer (13%)	Astrologer/Psychic (7%)	Scientist (6%)	Alternative therapist (5%)
J: Schizoid (N=215)	I.T. (7%)	Police/Security (7%)	Researcher (7%)	Accountant (6%)	Law (6%)
K: Borderline (N=215)	Artist (15%)	Actor (9%)	Teacher (8%)	Management (5%)	Journalism (5%)
L: Self-defeating (N=219)	Aid worker/Humanitarian job (17%)	Social worker (12%)	Religious career (11%)	Teacher (9%)	Medical (9%)
M: Aggressive (N=219)	Management (31%)	Military (27%)	Medical (9%)	Security/Police (8%)	Athlete (6%)
N: Depressive (N=217)	Management (10%)	Medical (9%)	Legal (8%)	Teacher (8%)	Finance (7%)

Table 3

Post-hoc analysis for all the questions

Personality Disorder	Q1 Mean (SD)	Q2 Mean (SD)	Q3 Mean (SD)	Q4 Mean (SD)	Q5 Mean (SD)	Q6 Mean (SD)
A: Obsessive-Compulsive	4.21^{c} (1.58)	3.67^{d} (1.66)	$5.07^{d,e}$ (1.15)	3.96^{m} (1.21)	$4.33^{g,h,I,j}$ (1.55)	2.32^{k} (1.58)
B: Narcissist	4.31^{c} (1.59)	$3.38^{d,e}$ (1.69)	$5.58^{b,c}$ (1.20)	$5.25^{a,d}$ (1.16)	5.36^{b} (1.20)	$3.98^{e,h,i}$ (1.42)
C: Dependent	3.65^{d} (1.66)	4.69^{b} (1.67)	$4.73^{e,g}$ (1.21)	5.58^{a} (1.03)	$5.09^{b,c}$ (1.13)	6.19^{a} (.90)
D: Histrionic	2.73^{e} (1.41)	2.74^{g} (1.50)	4.38^{g} (1.31)	$4.56^{e,g,h,i}$ (1.45)	$4.40^{f,i}$ (1.24)	$3.99^{e,g}$ (1.52)
E: Paranoid	5.63^{a} (1.21)	5.32^{a} (1.34)	$5.85^{a,b}$ (.93)	$5.10^{b,c,d}$ (1.05)	5.86^{a} (.85)	4.96^{b} (1.23)
F: Avoidant	$3.46^{d,e}$ (1.60)	$3.36^{d,f}$ (1.60)	4.52^{g} (1.20)	$4.22^{g,j,l}$ (1.21)	$4.59^{f,h}$ (1.12)	$3.91^{f,g,i}$ (1.33)
G: Passive-Aggressive	2.88^{e} (1.44)	$3.07^{e,f,g}$ (1.64)	3.76^{h} (1.33)	5.53^{a} (1.07)	$4.08^{i,j}$ (1.19)	$4.88^{b,c}$ (1.33)
H: Antisocial	3.64^{d} (1.80)	$3.53^{d,f}$ (1.79)	$4.84^{e,f}$ (1.55)	$5.35^{a,b}$ (1.17)	$5.01^{b,d}$ (1.36)	$4.15^{e,f}$ (1.50)
I: Schizotypal	2.67^{e} (1.47)	2.74^{g} (1.57)	3.87^{h} (1.41)	$4.70^{e,f}$ (1.26)	$4.18^{i,j}$ (1.31)	$3.94^{f,g,h}$ (1.42)
J: Schizoid	3.00^{e} (1.64)	2.66^{g} (1.47)	4.36^{g} (1.35)	$4.15^{h,k,l,m}$ (1.31)	$4.60^{e,f,g}$ (1.29)	2.99^{j} (1.39)
K: Borderline	$4.08^{c,d}$ (2.55)	$4.12^{c,d}$ (1.64)	$4.88^{e,g}$ (1.11)	$5.33^{a,c}$ (1.13)	$4.96^{c,d,e}$ (1.13)	5.15^{b} (1.41)
L: Self-defeating	3.66^{d} (1.71)	$4.26^{b,c}$ (1.76)	$4.52^{f,g}$ (1.25)	$4.89^{d,e}$ (1.22)	$4.76^{c,d,f}$ (1.33)	5.07^{b} (1.30)
M: Aggressive	5.70^{a} (1.07)	4.79^{b} (1.46)	5.96^{a} (.90)	$5.18^{b,c,d}$ (1.10)	5.93^{a} (.82)	$4.58^{c,d}$ (1.25)
N: Depressive	4.93^{b} (1.42)	4.74^{b} (1.39)	$5.30^{c,d}$ (1.05)	$4.36^{f,I,j,k}$ (1.14)	$4.38^{f,j}$ (1.18)	$4.39^{d,e}$ (1.20)

Items sharing one or more superscripts (a, b, c, d etc.) are not significantly different (p>.05)

Table 4

Post-hoc analysis for Clusters (excluding the Passive-Aggressive, Self-defeating, Sadistic and Depressive candidates)

	Q1 Mean (SD)	Q2 Mean (SD)	Q3 Mean (SD)	Q4 Mean (SD)	Q5 Mean (SD)	Q6 Mean (SD)
Cluster A	$3.76 (.92)^{a}$	$3.55 (.92)^{b}$	$4.70 (.82)^{b}$	$4.63 (.83)^{b}$	$4.88 (.83)^{a}$	$3.95 (.87)^{b}$
Cluster B	$3.70 (1.03)^{a}$	$3.43 (1.04)^{b}$	$4.92 (.83)^{a}$	$5.13 (.83)^{a}$	$4.93 (.85)^{a}$	$4.33 (.94)^{a}$
Cluster C	$3.77 (1.11)^{a}$	$3.90 (1.12)^{a}$	$4.77 (.80)^{a,b}$	$4.58 (.78)^{b}$	$4.68 (.87)^{b}$	$4.14 (.81)^{a}$

Items sharing one or more superscripts (a, b, c) are not significantly different (p>.05)

Table 5

Post-hoc analysis for Clusters per factor (Factor 1=Q1, Q2 and Factor 2=Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, excluding the Passive-Aggressive, Self-defeating, Sadistic and Depressive candidates)

	Factor 1 Mean (SD)	Factor 2 Mean (SD)
Cluster A	3.65 (.83)[b]	4.54 (.64)[b]
Cluster B	3.56 (.93)[b]	4.84 (.68)[a]
Cluster C	3.83 (1.04)[a]	4.55 (.65)[b]

Items sharing one or more superscripts (a, b, c) are not significantly different (p>.05)