

### Correction to Hecht et al. (2016)

In the article “Parsing the Heterogeneity of Psychopathy and Aggression: Differential Associations Across Dimensions and Gender” by Lisa K. Hecht, Joanna M. Berg, Scott O. Lilienfeld, and Robert D. Litzman (*Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 2016, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 2–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/per0000128>), there was an error in Table 3 and in the fifth paragraph of the **Results**.

The first row of Table 3, “Step 3” results were switched for “Primary × Gender” and “Secondary × Gender” under the “Reactive aggression” column. The correct data for “Primary × Gender” under the “Reactive aggression” column are:  $\beta: -.07$ ;  $t: -1.00$ . The correct data for “Secondary × Gender” under the “Reactive aggression” column are:  $\beta: .16$ ;  $t: 2.41^*$ .

The fifth paragraph of the “**Results**” section, “**Explaining Reactive and Proactive Aggression From Dimensions of PPI-R Psychopathy**” reflected the error in Table 3. The paragraph should read as follows:

After accounting for demographic variables, LSRP psychopathy contributed an additional 4.7% of the variance for RA (see Table 3). Primary Psychopathy was negatively ( $\beta = -.12$ ,  $t = -2.95$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and Secondary Psychopathy positively ( $\beta = .26$ ,  $t = 7.39$ ,  $p < .001$ ) associated with RA. In addition, the association between LSRP Secondary Psychopathy and RA was significantly moderated by gender ( $\beta = .16$ ,  $t = 2.41$ ,  $p < .05$ ). As shown in Figure 1, examination of simple slopes revealed that the association between Secondary Psychopathy and RA was significantly stronger for women ( $\beta = .30$ ,  $p < .001$ ) than for men ( $\beta = .15$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Thus, although higher levels of Secondary Psychopathy predicted higher levels of RA in both men and women, the magnitude of this association was stronger for women.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/per0000225>