A Macropsychology Perspective on Personality: How Personality Factors Influence Society and Vice Versa

Adrian Furnham

Introduction

Macropsychology is the application of psychology to factors that influence the settings and conditions of our lives (MacLachlan, 2014; MacLachlan, Mannan, Huss, & Scholl, 2019). This chapter discusses about how the personalities of individuals can have an impact on whole societies, how the micro can affect the macro and how individuals can impact on groups, organisations and whole societies. It also considers how the culture and context in which a person grows up and lives can influence his/her personality.

Macropsychology argues that psychology could contribute in a much greater capacity to understanding or implementing social change, particularly at the macro level. The questions that a macropsychology lens encourages us to ask about personality, namely, the causes and consequences of healthy and unhealthy personality people. The micro can impact the macro, but also vice versa. In this chapter, I will consider at length how psychologists define the bright and dark side of personality. However to begin with one of the many themes in this book, I note how the personality of individuals can impact on some of the famous sustainable goals.

Personality and Sustainable Development Goals

A case could be made for how personality might impact on all the developmental goals. However, I consider just five:

A. Furnham (✉)
Norwegian Business School, Oslo, Norway
e-mail: a.furnham@ucl.ac.uk

Goal 8: Decent work and economic growth: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all. We know that successful inventors and entrepreneurs can make a huge financial contribution not only to their society but the whole world. Technical inventions can cut waste, improve lives and bring economic benefits. There is a great deal of interest in the personality and motivation of entrepreneurs so that they can be discovered and nurtured for the benefit of all.

Goal 9: Industry, innovation and infrastructure: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation. Creative individuals can drive innovation for the betterment of all. There are again many psychological studies on the identification and encouragement of creative people, particularly in the sciences and technology, whose ideas and inventions can impact so much on whole societies.

Goal 10: Reducing inequalities: Reduce income inequality within and among countries. National political leaders can and do have a considerable impact on political policies and structures in their countries. There is a very interesting literature on the abilities, personality and motivation of both historic and current political leaders which provides a picture of how they emerge in the own regions and how they can, over time, have such a considerable impact on their society and internationally.

Goal 11: Sustainable cities and communities: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. Cities and communities are governed by institutions headed up by elected and appointed leaders. There are many historical studies of leaders driven by personal, political and religious values who have had and will continue to have a massive impact on their communities.

Goal 12: Responsible consumption and production: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns: Individuals by their example and by their leadership of movements and political bodies can help pass legislation that changes the way whole societies use and consume resources.

We know that individuals, through their example and drive, can change institutions as well as whole societies. This is more than the "great man" school of psychology that seeks to explain leadership almost exclusively by the personality profile of leaders. But equally it is an attempt to suggest that we should not ignore individual differences in seeking to understand macro-events. History is replete with examples of how both good and bad individuals can impact so profoundly on their own society and indeed the history of the world.

The Description of Personality

Personality psychologists have linked personality traits to a very wide range of behaviours. Twenty years ago, Furnham and Heaven (1999) looked at the literature which examines the relationship between personality and consumption, crime,

health, ideology, leisure, relationships and work. However, the personality of individuals seems most relevant when they are in positions of leadership and power. There is growing literature on the "dark side" of leadership which illustrates how destructive an individual can be bringing down whole institutions (Furnham, 2014).

A surprising number of politicians at various times and in various countries have been ill. David Owen (2009a, 2009b) both a trained medical doctor and a high-ranking British politician has written a book subtitled *Illness in Heads of Government During the Last 100 Years*. He was interested in how various illnesses affect decision-making and also the dangers of trying to keep these illnesses secret. In doing so, he makes little distinction between physical, psychological and psychiatric illnesses. Further he showed that often critical times for their political lives and those of their country, they were essentially unfit to hold power.

This chapter will first describe BIG FIVE personality traits accepted now as the best "periodic table" description of personality. It then goes on to examine the growing literature on the relationship between "dark-side" personality disorders and leadership success and failure. The penultimate section describes the data looking at the relationship between personality and work success. Finally it is acknowledged that experiences shape personality.

The Bright Side

Inevitably a wide range in biological, psychological and sociological factors influences a person's unique profile. Personality psychologists have spent 100 years trying to come up with an agreed taxonomy. The *Big Five* is now the accepted system, and understanding the various dimensions can help understand the power of personality.

Nettle (2006) attempted a full and parsimonious description of the benefits and costs of each of the Big Five personality dimensions. These are very relevant to see how the costs or dark side of extreme personalities can have such a big impact.

Extraversion Extraverts are sociable and sensation-seeking and have more social support. They are usually more socially skilled and interpersonally confident. Their attitude to, interest in and experience of sex mean they tend to have more sexual partners, "mating successes" and offspring. However, it also means they are more prone to infidelity (Nettle, 2005), which suggests that their children are more likely to be later exposed to step-parents, which is an established risk factor in their development. They trade off accuracy for speed and are prone to accidents and errors of many kinds.

Introverts are less sociable but safer; they run the risk of a lower likelihood of finding mates and social support networkers, but leading a more secure lifestyle, which is better for child-rearing. Extraverts are rated as more interpersonally attractive because of their social confidence, fun-loving activity preferences and optimism. Most people assume that extraverts have an advantage in life because of their

social skills and self-confidence. This means that many introverts have to appear to be extraverts and are called socialised introverts who "fake extraversion" sometimes at great cost to themselves.

Neuroticism Neurotics tend to be anxious, depressed, guilt-ridden, phobic and hypochondriacal. They are less likely to have good long-standing and satisfying personal relationships and jobs. They are, however, socially vigilant, wary and risk-averse. They are very aware of subtle (and possibly threatening) social changes, which can be a strong survival mechanism in certain environments. Neurotics are very interested in their and others' emotions which can make them highly sensitive "readers of social situations".

Those very low in Neuroticism, labelled stable or highly adjusted, may have some disadvantages. They may be too trusting and eager to avoid social and physical hazards; they may underperform and strive less hard because they are afraid of failure. They may also be socially insensitive to the anxieties and worries of those around them and, therefore, have a small social support network.

Clearly Neuroticism or Low Adjustment is a serious disadvantage in life as neurotics cope poorly with stress and have low resilience. Many internalise their anxiety and depression and are less able to cause major problems for other people around them.

Openness Openness to Experience is marked by creativity, cognitive complexity, imagination and curiosity. Open individuals are attracted to the unusual and the unconventional. Openness is a good predictor of artistic and scientific achievement and innovation (Furnham, 2008). They are often thought of as creative. The flipside of novel thinking is delusions and occasionally supernatural and paranormal ideas. Creative individuals, when emotionally stable and associated with particular skills, especially in the arts, are highly attractive to others and, therefore, have many different mates and a wide relationship network.

However, those with "unusual" beliefs can easily be described as "mad", "arty-farty" and rejected by society. Moderate to high levels of creativity are associated with attractiveness partly because creativity is highly valued in many settings. It also means that they are thought of as very interesting.

Agreeableness Agreeable people are empathic, trusting, kind, well-liked, respected and valued as friends. They seek and attempt to create harmony and concord. The trait is highly valued, and being sensitive ("emotionally intelligent") to others' moods is clearly advantageous. However, being too trusting, particularly of antisocial individuals, could be counterproductive. Being excessively attentive to the needs of others rather than self may also be less adaptive. Agreeable people may be easy to exploit and unable or unwilling to assert their rights.

Paradoxically, it appears that people who are called tough-minded, critical and sceptical often do better in the professions and business than those with high Agreeableness scores. Almost always Agreeableness is rated as attractive in others. Disagreeable people are rated as egocentric, selfish and unkind.

Conscientiousness Conscientious individuals are hardworking, dutiful and orderly. They show self-control and tend to be moral. They may be achievement-orientated and highly diligent. It is no surprise then this trait is one of the clearest makers of success in educational and occupational life. Conscientious people plan for the future and are happy to work constantly for desirable long-term payoffs. People like to work and study with conscientious people. They pitch up and pitch in.

The major downside of high Conscientiousness is associated with perfectionism, rigidity and social dogmatism. Conscientiousness may also be thought of as a reaction to low ability in competitive settings. For example, Conscientiousness is negatively associated with intelligence (Moutafi, Furnham, & Paltiel, 2004). Some students may learn to compensate or "make up" for their lack of ability. Thus, Conscientiousness is associated not with what in business circles is described as "doing the right thing" but with "doing the right thing right". Managers, teachers and parents value Conscientiousness and attempt to instil it in those they know.

Nettle (2006) summarises his ideas in Table 1, which is an adaptation and extension of one of his. Nettle (2006) notes that his "trade-off" evolutionary account of traits may be useful partly because it is hypothesis-generating. Thus, for instance, Neuroticism may facilitate performance on particular perceptual motor tasks; highly open people may be either particularly culturally embraced or marginalised; conscientious people are slow to respond to affordances in the local environment; or agreeable people are often regarded as "suckers" or victims of exploitative individuals. He suggests the framework is not a "post hoc explanation of the past" but rather an engine for "predictors about the consequences of dispositional variation in the present" (Nettle, 2006, p. 629).

It may be possible that there is a reproductive niche for highly introverted or neurotic people. Equally, it may be that the highly open, low conscientious, creative persons serve a very useful evolutionary function for the group, even though they may have rather unhappy lives. However, it may be too early to judge. The marriage of dispositional and evolutionary psychology is young. It may well be that the latter approach is able to generate interesting and important hypotheses, which the latter can test empirically.

The results from the world of business suggest that successful people are high on Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Openness but low on Neuroticism and Agreeableness. There is data to suggest that there are very undesirable personality profiles such as the individual low on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, but high on Neuroticism (Furnham, 2018).

To what extent do ability and personality traits help or hinder work success and promotion? What traits are associated with those who occupy senior management roles? Do those traits which relate to leadership emergence also relate to leadership effectiveness? In short, what personality profile do you need to succeed in life and work in particular?

There have been as many speculations as studies that have investigated the relationship between the Big Five dimensions and different work outcome which could be classified as positive or negative. The table below represents some of these

Table 1 Examples of adjectives and cost-benefits defining the five factors of personality

Factor	Factor definers		Positive benefits	Negative costs
	Adjectives	Q-sort items		
Extraversion	Active Assertive Energetic Enthusiastic Outgoing Talkative	Talkative Skilled in play, humour Rapid personal tempo Facially, gesturally expressive Behave assertively Gregarious	Big social networks Relationship and mating success Explorer of opportunities Happiness	Accidents and risk-taking Impulsivity and poor decision-making Relationship instability
Neuroticism	Anxious Self-pitying Tense Touchy Unstable Worrying	Thin-skinned Brittle ego defences Self-defeating Basically anxious Concerned with adequacy Fluctuating moods	Hypervigilance Achievement-striving Emotional sensitivity Competitiveness	Poor mental health Stress sensitivity Poor physical health
Openness	Artistic Curious Imaginative Insightful Original Wide interests	Wide range of interests Introspective Unusual thought processes Values intellectual matters Judges in unconventional terms Aesthetically reactive	Social attractiveness Creativity Flexibility Change-orientated	Mental illness Social exclusion Bizarre belief system and lifestyle
Agreeableness	Appreciative Forgiving Generous Kind Sympathetic Trusting	Not critical, sceptical Behaves in a giving way Sympathetic, considerate Arouses liking Warm, compassionate Basically trustful	Psychological mindedness Social networks Strong relationships Valued group member	Vulnerable to exploitation Failure to maximise personal advantages Too conflict-avoidant Low assertiveness
Conscientiousness	Efficient Organised Planning ability Reliable Responsible Thorough	Dependable, responsible Productive Able to delay gratification Not self-indulgent Behave ethically Has high aspirational level	Long-term planning Longer life expectancy Good citizenship Dependable and dutiful team member	Obsessionality and perfectionism Rigidity with poor flexibility Slow to respond

Table 2 Possible relationships between personality traits and work outcomes

	Positive				Negative			
	Creativity	Engagement	Productivity	Promotion	Absenteeism	Accidents	Derailment	Turnover
N	+	−	−	−	+++	+	+	+
E	+	+		++	+	+++	+	+
O	+++						+	+
A		+		−	−		−	−
C		+++	+++	+++	−	−	−	−

hypotheses. This is not a meta-analysis though hopefully in time that might be done. Three points about the table are noteworthy. First, the strongest and most consistent personality correlate of work-related behaviour is Conscientiousness. The second most consistent predictor is Neuroticism (Low Adjustment). Third Extraversion seems to be related to both positive and negative work outcomes (Table 2).

What does the literature in general say about predictors of career and financial success? Psychologists have identified various traits that predict quite well business, career and education success. The first is *emotional stability or adjustment*. Its opposite is neuroticism, moodiness or instability. Emotional conflicts and proneness to anxiety, stress and worrying sap energy. This both serves to dilute career focus but also to reduce bad decision making. There are a lot of knocks, disappointments and setbacks on the way up. How you deal with each one impacts on the height and angle of the ladder you climb.

Next, there is that powerful grouping factor variously called the *work ethic/ Conscientiousness*. These are motives or traits that are manifest in people being competitive, hardworking and focussed. It is about being driven and organised but most of all self-disciplined: self-discipline starts early. Extreme forms of Conscientiousness are linked with risk aversion which can be a problem in business. It is also undesirable when, in effect, it is a compensation for not being smart enough.

There are two different but related sorts of skills you need to acquire to do well in business. The first are *socio-emotional skills*. There are lots of synonyms for this: interpersonal skills, emotional intelligence and charm. The second skill set is more about getting ahead of people: political skills and ability to negotiate and influence. The politically astute know all about the importance of reputation management. Reputation drives appraisals and references. It drives votes and the belief one is talented (see Hogan's theory later in this chapter).

Career success is all about striving for the control of resources, for power and for status. The evolutionary psychologists say it is a proxy for reproductive success. Some people are more able to attract support and attain power.

Three of the Big Five personality traits have been consistently linked to career success, namely, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism (Low Adjustment) and Openness to Experience (Curiosity) (Judge et al., 1999; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). A meta-analysis of the Big Five personality traits and career success found

Conscientiousness to be the strongest and most consistent predictor of career success across occupations and all measures of success (Barrick et al., 2001). Neuroticism (Low Adjustment) has been found to negatively relate to job performance, as low reactivity to stress and anxiety may reduce both career satisfaction and effective career management, leading to poor performance (Judge et al., 1999; Ng et al., 2005; Seibert et al., 2001). Barrick et al. (2001) found that Openness to Experience (Curiosity) was less associated with job performance than Conscientiousness or Neuroticism. However, Curiosity may still be useful for identifying potential if made more relevant to the workplace such as openness to new ideas and approaches instead of aesthetic appreciation and emotionality.

Boudreau, Boswell and Judge (2001) suggested that personality traits influenced two factors they called *motivation* (hours worked, work centrality) and *human capital* (education, tenure, international experience) which in turn influence various success measures like remuneration, promotions and satisfaction. The data suggested that of the Big Five factors, Agreeableness and Neuroticism were the most powerful, consistent and negative predictor of various measures of success.

After 2001, there have been a number of studies that have specifically looked at personality (and other) correlates of work success. A number of papers using different populations and different measures have examined trait correlates of career success. Gelissen and de Graaf (2006) studied 4000 Dutch people using income and job mobility as the index of career success. They found Extraversion was related positively to remuneration but only for men; Neuroticism was negatively related to remuneration for both genders; Conscientiousness was negatively related to women's upward status mobility; Openness to Experience was negatively related to earnings, but only for men; but Agreeableness is not related to either variable.

Dilchert and Ones (2008) looked at the relationship between personality measured at the facet level and salary in 4150 managers at different levels. There were no sex differences, and the results were strongest at the lowest and highest level. They concluded: "In sum, results allowed us to draw the following conclusions: (1) Lowest level managers/supervisors who were highly dutiful, extraverted, open to experiences, and who scored somewhat higher on emotional stability scales enjoyed higher salaries over otherwise similar managers. (2) Top executives at the highest levels of organizations received higher salaries when they were dutiful, sociable, open, and agreeable. (3) Personality variables had mostly negligible relations with salary for first-line, mid-level, and executive managers in the present sample. (4) Financial returns for all personality variables were similar among men and women, and (5) relationships between personality traits and salary were similar for those completing the personality measure in selection settings or for developmental purposes" (p. 14).

Wille, Dr Fruyt and Feys (2013) followed nearly 1000 Belgians over 15 years and showed that three traits were related to employability: people who were stable, extraverted and conscientious were more likely to stay employed. Thus the results in this area are reasonably consistent though differences occur because very different jobs are aggregated or moderator variables are not taken into consideration. They suggest that two traits tend to be negatively associated with work success,

namely, Neuroticism and Agreeableness, and three positively, namely, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Openness. Personality affects promotion and reward and power. It suggests that in all spheres, more influential people are likely to share similar profiles which in turn influence their outlook and values and the way in which they lead others.

The Dark Side

Psychologists are interested in personality traits and psychologists and psychiatrists in personality disorders. Psychiatrists like psychologists also talk about personality functioning. They talk about personality disorders that are typified by early onset (recognisable in children and adolescents) and pervasive effects (on all aspects of life) and with relatively poor prognosis (that is difficult to cure).

Both argue that the personality factors relate to *cognitive, affective and social aspects of functioning*. It is where a person's behaviour "deviates markedly" from the expectations of the individual's culture where the disorder is manifested. The psychiatric manual is very clear that "odd behaviour" is not simply an expression of habits, customs and religious or political values professed or shown by a people of particular cultural origin.

Psychiatrists and psychologists share some simple assumptions with respect to personality. Both argue for the *stability* of personality. The DSM criteria talk of "enduring pattern", "inflexible and pervasive" and "stable and of long duration". The DSM manuals note that personality orders all have a long history and have an onset no later than early adulthood. Moreover there are some gender differences: thus the antisocial disorder is more likely to be diagnosed in men, while the borderline, histrionic and dependent personality are more likely to be found in women.

The manuals are at length to point out that some of the personality disorders look like other disorders, anxiety, mood, psychotic, substance-related, etc., but have unique features. The essence of the argument is "Personality Disorders must be distinguished from personality traits that do not reach the threshold for a Personality Disorder. Personality traits are diagnosed as a Personality Disorder only when they are inflexible, maladaptive, and persisting and cause significant functional impairment or subjective distress" (p. 633).

One of the most important ways to differentiate personal style from personality disorder is flexibility. There are lots of difficult people at work but relatively few whose rigid, maladaptive behaviours mean they continually have disruptive, troubled lives. It is their *inflexible, repetitive, poor stress-coping responses* that are marks of disorder.

Personality disorders influence the *sense of self* – the way people think and feel about themselves and how other people see them. The disorders often powerfully influence *interpersonal relations at work*. They reveal themselves in how people "complete tasks, take and/or give orders, make decisions, plan, handle external and internal demands, take or give criticism, obey rules, take and delegate responsibility, and co-operate with people" (Oldham & Morris, 1991, p. 24). The antisocial,

obsessive, compulsive, passive-aggressive and dependent types are particularly problematic in the workplace.

People with personality disorders have difficulty expressing and understanding emotions. It is the intensity with which they express them and their variability that makes them odd. More importantly they often have serious problems with self-control (Furnham, 2014). Many others have been influenced by the usefulness of the DSM classification of the personality disorders. In order to explain and describe these disorders, other writers have changed the names to make them more interpretable to a wider audience. Table 3 shows the labels from different authors.

There is a higher-order threefold classification based both on theory and on research. This makes things a little easier as one can concentrate on 3 rather than 10 to 13 disorders (Table 4).

There are now many studies that have associated certain dark-side traits with work success and failure (Carson, Shanock, Heggestad, Andrew, Pugh, & Walter, 2012; Winsborough & Sambath, 2013). Many have pointed out the paradox that dark-side personality traits appear to be associated with short-term success but long-term failure in the workplace (Furnham, 2014). Some studies have looked at specific disorders, while others have looked at a large number. Hirschi and Jaensch (2015) found, as predicted, that Narcissism predicts occupational self-efficacy beliefs that gives a good impression and feelings of being special and entitled which improves the probability of success.

Khoo and Burch (2008) found that three dark-side traits were related with transformational leadership: Cautious and Bold had a negative relation, whereas Colourful had a positive one. Their findings show that under specific circumstances, obtaining high scores in some scales may have a beneficial work outcome. Davies (2004) found that transformational leadership had a negative relation with Excitable, Sceptical, Cautious, Reserved, Leisurely and Dutiful but a positive relation with Colourful and Imaginative. Benson and Campbell (2007) found that leader performance was negatively related with high scores on Excitable, Sceptical, Cautious, Leisurely, Mischievous and Imaginative.

Judge and LePine (2007) noted that personality characteristics such as Narcissism can harm the organisation when leaders view others as inferiors. On the other hand, narcissistic traits are often seen in charismatic leadership, and narcissistic leaders are often associated with vision, strength and firms' performance. Judge, Piccolo and Kosalka (2009) proposed a model of leader emergence which suggested both "bright"-side (i.e. emotional stability, Conscientiousness) and "dark"-side traits (Narcissism, Dominance, Machiavellianism) as predictors of leadership emergence and effectiveness, though moderated by various other factors.

In a British sample, Palaiou and Furnham (2014) compared 128 CEOs to a large group of 4826 senior and middle managers in terms of the HDS personality derailers. They found CEOs to have higher scores than the other group on Bold and Colourful, but lower scores on Excitable, Cautious, Leisurely and Dutiful, all with small or medium effect sizes.

It has been possible to compare various studies which have tended to reveal similar patterns across corporate and national cultures (Table 5).

Table 3 Different labels for the personality disorders

DSM-IV personality disorder	Hogan and Hogan (1997)	Oldham and Morris (1991)	Miller (2008)	Dotlich and Cairo (2003)	Moscoso and Salgado (2004)
Borderline	Excitable	Mercurial	Reactors	Volatility	Ambivalent
Paranoid	Sceptical	Vigilant	Vigilantes	Habitual	Suspicious
Avoidant	Cautious	Sensitive	Shrinkers	Excessive caution	Shy
Schizoid	Reserved	Solitary	Oddballs	Aloof	Lone
Passive-aggressive	Leisurely	Leisurely	Spoilers	Passive resistance	Pessimistic
Narcissistic	Bold	Self-confident	Preeners	Arrogance	Egocentric
Antisocial	Mischievous	Adventurous	Predators	Mischievous	Risky
Histrionic	Colourful	Dramatic	Emoters	Melodramatic	Cheerful
Schizotypal	Imaginative	Idiosyncratic	Creativity and vision	Eccentric	Eccentric
Obsessive-compulsive	Diligent	Conscientious	Detailers	Perfectionistic	Reliable
Dependent	Dutiful	Devoted	Clingers	Eager to please	Submitted

Shapers of Personality

When the House of Commons was bombed in the Second World War, Churchill said: "we shape our buildings and afterwards they shape us". While we know personality has a strong biological base and is stable over time and situations, we also know that events can shape it. The psychobiographers have listed a number of factors known to shape an individual's motivation, personality and values. They are cultural and historical background (when and where a person grew up); family origins and early years (family constellations, grandparents, parents, siblings; relationships, family politics; heroes and models for the individual); education and socialisation (intellectual climate in country, student years, examples of leadership); professional career (mentors, early career, successes and failures); leadership experience (key events, crises and how they were resolved, key political influences); and family and relationships.

Psychobiographers have noticed how early experiences "make or break" a personality making them particularly robust and resilient in adulthood or alternatively weak and vulnerable. They have noted five early events and how they influenced some very famous people (Furnham, 2014):

Bereavement (parent, sibling, child):Tchaikovsky, Sartre, Dali, van Gogh, Beethoven
Parental cruelty: Checkov, Maxwell, Disney, Dickens, Vidal
Isolation: Conrad, Einstein
Lack of fixed abode: Orwell, Kipling, Balzac
Dependence: Ruskin, Dali

Table 4 The higher-order classification of the personality disorders

DSM	Horney	Hogan	
Cluster A (odd disorders)	*Moving away from people*	*Moving away from people*	
Paranoid personality disorder: characterised by a pattern of irrational suspicion and mistrust of others, interpreting motivations as malevolent *Schizoid personality disorder:* lack of interest and detachment from social relationships, apathy and restricted emotional expression *Schizotypal personality disorder:* a pattern of extreme discomfort interacting socially, distorted cognitions and perceptions	The need for *self-sufficiency* and independence; while most desire some *autonomy*, the neurotic may simply wish to discard other individuals entirely The need for *perfection*; while many are driven to perfect their lives in the form of well-being, the neurotic may display a fear of being slightly flawed Lastly, the need to *restrict life practices* to within narrow borders; to live as inconspicuous a life as possible	Excitable	Moody and hard to please; intense but short-lived enthusiasm for people, projects or things
		Sceptical	Cynical, distrustful and doubting others' true intentions
		Cautious	Reluctant to take risks for fear of being rejected or negatively evaluated
		Reserved	Aloof, detached and uncommunicative; lacking interest in or awareness of the feelings of others
		Leisurely	Independent; ignoring people's requests and becoming irritated or argumentative if they persist
Cluster B (dramatic, emotional or erratic disorders)	*Moving against people*	*Moving against people*	
Antisocial personality disorder: a pervasive pattern of disregard for and violation of the rights of others, lack of empathy, bloated self-image, manipulative and impulsive behaviour *Borderline personality disorder:* pervasive pattern of instability in relationships, self-image, identity, behaviour and affects often leading to self-harm and impulsivity *Histrionic personality disorder:* pervasive pattern of attention-seeking behaviour and excessive emotions *Narcissistic personality disorder:* a pervasive pattern of grandiosity, need for admiration and a lack of empathy	The need for *power*; the ability to bend *wills* and achieve control over others – while most persons seek strength, the neurotic may be desperate for it The need to *exploit others*; to get the better of them. To become *manipulative*, fostering the belief that people are there simply to be used The need for *social recognition*; *prestige* and limelight The need for *personal admiration*; for both inner and outer qualities – to be valued The need for *personal achievement*; though virtually all persons wish to make achievements, as with no. 3, the neurotic may be desperate for achievement	Bold	Unusually self-confident; feelings of grandiosity and entitlement; overvaluation of one's capabilities
		Mischievous	Enjoying risk-taking and testing the limits; needing excitement; manipulative, deceitful, cunning and exploitative
		Colourful	Expressive, animated and dramatic; wanting to be noticed and needing to be the centre of attention
		Imaginative	Acting and thinking in creative and sometimes odd or unusual ways

Table 4 (continued)

DSM	Horney	Hogan	
Cluster C (anxious or fearful disorders)	*Moving towards people*	*Moving towards people*	
Avoidant personality disorder: pervasive feelings of social inhibition and inadequacy, extreme sensitivity to negative evaluation Dependent personality disorder: pervasive psychological need to be cared for by other people Obsessive-compulsive personality disorder (not the same as obsessive-compulsive disorder): characterised by rigid conformity to rules, perfectionism and control	The need for *affection and approval*; pleasing others and being liked by them The need for *a partner*; one whom they can *love* and who will solve all problems	Diligent	Meticulous, precise and perfectionistic, inflexible about rules and procedures; critical of others
		Dutiful	Eager to please and reliant on others for support and guidance; reluctant to take independent action or to go against popular opinion

Certainly growing up in a dysfunctional family will have a very different impact on an individual compared to growing up in a situation where a person feels safe, secure and cherished. Equally the current interest in generation differences suggests that the time and circumstances in which a person grows up can influence all aspects of their psychological functioning.

Thatcherism

Everyone in the United Kingdom has acknowledged how Baroness Thatcher changed the country. Thatcher*ism* is an ideology with which many people can identify. It is a heady mix of Victorian values, free market economics and individual liberty. *Three features* of Thatcherism, and of its founder, sum up the light and dark side of those who follow this path:

The first is *self-reliance*. The issue here is the emphasis on *self*. Lady Thatcher had the energy, determination and taste for hard work that would make Samuel Smiles, author of the book *Self Reliance*, envious. It was reprinted in her premiership. Mrs. Thatcher was very much *first* among equals. Self-reliance is more about individualism than collectivism. It is about personal contribution more than hard work. It is about equity over equality. Her famous "there is no such thing as society" remark epitomises this. She loathed and detested "social science" and had the name

Table 5 Three studies that have compared dark-side correlates of management success

	Winsborough and Sambath (2013)	Palaiou and Furnham (2014)	Danish data
HDS			
Excitable	−	−	
Sceptical	−		
Cautious	−	−	−
Reserved			
Leisurely		−	
Bold		+	+
Mischievous			
Colourful	++	+	+
Imaginative			+
Diligent	−		
Dutiful	−	−	−

Note: + indicates positive relation to job level. +/− = small effect size, ++/−− = medium effect size based on Cohen's (1988) guidelines

of the SSRC (Social Science Research Council) changed. She was a trained chemist (and lawyer). And to her the prefix of "social" indicated everything she disapproved of. Social housing is poor housing; social media is trivial and nasty; and sociology, social anthropology and social psychology are all pseudosciences, a heady mixture of common sense and dangerous ideology. Yet there is a darker side to self-reliance. It is the emphasis on self. Self-reliance and teamwork are not close friends. Lady Thatcher was not a great team worker. Her approach, in fact, encouraged "group-think". You were on side, right thinking, fully committed – or nothing. Self-reliance is also about ambitions, always seen to be good. About survival of the fittest. But also about law and order, to ensure those who have worked for, and earned, their rewards are protected from others less effortful. We are captains of our ship and masters of our fate.

The second feature is *moral certainty*. Both words have equal weight and equal importance. *Morality* is about right and wrong; the deserving and the undeserving poor; and the saved and the damned. It really is about ideology. She said "I am a conviction not a consensus politician". The other word is *certainty*. Certainty gives courage: it abhors ambiguity, dithering and compromise. It comes from argument and research. The chemist and the lawyer in Lady Thatcher meant she had a taste for evidence and argument. She would have, no doubt, approved of all the evidence-based disciplines now emerging. She was Hegelian in her level of argument: from thesis and antithesis comes synthesis. You present the arguments logically and clearly, weigh up the evidence and come to a conclusion. The trouble is that the skill, deviousness and experience of the speaker can overwhelm the truth of the argument. Justice and truth can be the first casualty of a brilliant advocate.

The third feature is a *taste for, but also an understanding of, power*. Thatcherism is a doctrine of change. But you need to understand how to acquire and use power to succeed at anything important. Lady Thatcher was, it seems, little interested in money, fame or recognition, only power. She understood how to "manage up". This

explains her attitudes to men and women. She knew that (some) men and few women have real power. And she knew that a heady mixture of self-assurance, femininity and rationality could mean entry to the inner circle. Climbing the greasy pole means competitiveness and pugnaciousness. You need a sword in hand and to be ever ready for the fight. Power is the ability to influence and to bring about the New Jerusalem. Some people have the political savvy to gain and hold on to power. It is about networking and people skills with an eye to how others can help you. But once acquired and used, power can also be dangerous. It can lead to isolation, detachment and even disdain for those without power. There can be contempt of "the little people" who did not make it.

Conclusion

It seems self-evident to many people that personality factors must play a part in all aspects of life: health, relationships and work success. Because it is generally accepted, the Big Five trait model is used most in this research. The results suggest that fairly consistently two traits relate most to success: low Neuroticism and high Conscientiousness. Neurotics are prone to stress, illness and often poor decision-making, while conscientious people are well organised, planful and hardworking. For the other three traits, much depends on the nature of the job. Thus in some jobs, Agreeableness is probably positively correlated with work success (counselling), whereas in others, it is negatively correlated (negotiations). The same is true of Extraversion which is usually correlated with work success because of the optimism and social skills associated with Extraversion though it is obvious that in some jobs (pilot, air traffic control), it may be Introversion which is a best predictor.

Psychologists have rightly been accused of an attribution error in the sense that they want to explain too much of a person's behaviour exclusively in terms of his or her behaviour. There are clearly many factors that account for why potentially derailing leaders make it to the top. Many have pointed out that just as you need three components for fire, namely, heat, oxygen and fuel, so you are unlikely to get leadership derailment if you do not have leaders with a derailment profile, people who are prepared to follow derailing leaders and environments which "allow it".

Most differential psychologists acknowledge three related but independent features of an individual that allow us to understand his or her behaviour: ability, motivation and personality. It is clear from history that these three factors account in part for when and where and why certain people achieve positions of power and prominence that can have a profound effect on the course of history. In this sense, there is a link between personality and macropsychology. In essence, the personality of people in business and politics can shape whole societies. The biographical studies of individuals who have shaped and changed their countries for both good and bad offer an important understanding of how individuals can have a massive and long-lasting historical impact on their own society and indeed the whole world.

References

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 9–30.

Benson, M., & Campbell, J. (2007). To be, or not to be, linear: An expanded representation of personality and its relationship to leadership performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 15*, 232–249.

Boudreau, J., Boswell, W., & Judge, T. (2001). Effects of personality on executive success in the United States and Europe. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 58*, 53–81.

Carson, M., Shanock, L., Heggestad, E., Andrew, A., Pugh, S., & Walter, M. (2012). The relationship between dysfunctional interpersonal tendencies, derailment potential behavior and turnover. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*, 291–304.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Converse, P. D., Piccone, K. A., & Tocci, M. C. (2014). Childhood self-control, adolescent behavior, and career success. *Personality and Individual Differences, 59*, 65–70.

Davies, M. (2004). *Prediction of transformational leadership by personality constructs for senior Australian organizational executive leaders*. Unpublished dissertation, Griffith University.

Dilchert, S., & Ones, D. (2008). Personality and extrinsic career success. *Zeitschrift für Personalpsychologie, 7*, 1–23.

Dotlich, D., & Cairo, P. (2003). *Why CEOs fail*. New York, NY: Jossey Bass.

Furnham, A. (2008). *Personality and intelligence at work*. London: Routledge.

Furnham, A. (2014). *Bullies and backstabbers*. London: Bloomsbury.

Furnham, A. (2018) Personality and Occupational Success. In Virgil Zeigler-Hill & Todd K. Shackelford (Eds). The SAGE Handbook of Personality and Individual Differences. *New York: Sage*, 537–551.

Furnham, A., & Heaven, P. (1999). *Personality and social behaviour*. London: Arnold.

Gelissen, J., & de Graaf, P. (2006). Personality, social background, and occupational career success. *Social Science Research, 35*, 702–726.

Hirschi, A., & Jaensch, V. K. (2015). Narcissism and career success: Occupational self-efficacy and career engagement as mediators. *Personality and Individual Differences, 77*, 205–208.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan development survey manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Judge, T., & LePine, J. (2007). The bright and dark sides of personality. In J. Langan-Fox, C. Cooper, & R. Klimoski (Eds.), *Research companion to the dysfunctional workplace* (pp. 332–355). Cheltenham: Elgar.

Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology, 52*(3), 621–652.

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*(6), 855–875.

Khoo, H., & Burch, G. (2008). The 'dark side' of leadership personality and transformational leadership. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*, 86–97.

MacLachlan, M. (2014). Macropsychology, policy and Global Health. *American Psychologist, 69*, 851–863.

MacLachlan, M., Mannan, H., Huss, T., & Scholl, M. (2019). Macropsychology: Challenging and changing social structures and systems. In D. Hoggets & K. O'Doherty (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social psychology* (pp. 116–182). London: Sage.

Miller, L. (2008). *From difficult to disturbed*. New York, NY: Amacom.

Moscoso, S. & Salgado, J. (2004) 'Dark side' personality styles as predictors of task, contextual, and job performance. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12(4), 356–62.

Moutafi, J., Furnham, A., & Paltiel, L. (2004).Why is conscientiousness negatively correlated with intelligence? *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 1013 –1022.

Nettle, D. (2005). An evolutionary approach to the extraversion continuum. *Evolution and Human Behaviour, 26*, 363–373.

Nettle, D. (2006). The evolution of personality variation in humans and other animals. *American Psychologist, 61*, 622–631.

Ng, T., Eby, L., Sorensen, K., & Feldman, D. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 367–408.

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

Owen, D. (2009a). Hubris Syndrome. *Brain, 132*, 1396–1406.

Owen, D. (2009b). *In sickness and in power*. London: Methuen.

Palaiou, K., & Furnham, A. (2014). Are bosses unique? Personality facet differences between CEOs and staff in five work sectors. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 66*, 173–196.

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 219–237.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(4), 703–742.

Wille, B., De Fruyt, F., & Feys, M. (2013).Vocational interests and Big Five traits as predictors of job instability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*, 547–558.

Winsborough, D. L., & Sambath, V. (2013). Not like us: An investigation into the personalities of New Zealand CEOs. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 65*, 87–107.