

## Chapter 4

# Dark Leadership: The Role of Leaders' Dark Triad Personality Traits

Marco R. Furtner, Thomas Maran, and John F. Rauthmann

For a long time leadership research has primarily focused on “good” leadership and has until recently ignored the “bad” or “dark side” of leadership (Higgs, 2009). Leadership research has extensively dealt in the past 30 years with the most powerful form of leadership behavior that has been described so far: the charismatic approaches of transformational and charismatic leadership. Based on its frequency and citations, transformational leadership occupies the top position in leadership research.

But from where does the fascination for charismatic leadership come from? Transformational and charismatic leadership describes a romantic and idealized form of leadership. Their models have been influenced by powerful and influential persons who shaped human history: heroes, martyrs, saints, as well as political and religious leaders. All of these people obtained the highest fame and success. All have in common that they are attributed charisma. In short, transformational leadership has a great historical model: the hero. Usually a hero has a socialized power motive with altruistic components. This means that own power and strength are not used for egoistic purposes or even abused, but employed for the benefit of the social community.

Although showing an unbroken enthusiasm for the charismatic leadership approaches, criticism emerged (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1988): How many transformational and charismatic leaders with a highly socialized power

---

M.R. Furtner, Ph.D. (✉)

Leopold-Franzens University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

University of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein

e-mail: [marco.furtner@uni.li](mailto:marco.furtner@uni.li)

T. Maran, M.Sc.

Leopold-Franzens University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

Alps Adria University of Klagenfurt, Klagenfurt am Wörthersee, Austria

J.F. Rauthmann, Ph.D.

Humboldt-University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC, USA

motive actually exist in daily business? And a second crucial question emerged to which the two most prominent representatives of charismatic leadership approaches had to give an answer: Might there also be a dark side of idealized transformational and charismatic leadership, which pursues selfish goals? Both Bernard Bass with transformational leadership and Jay Conger with charismatic leadership had to counter this criticism. Bass (1990) referred to the dark side of transformational leadership as pseudo-transformational and Conger (1990) delineated a dark side of charismatic leadership. The bright and the dark sides of charismatic leadership approaches describe two sides of the same coin. The bright and idealized side represents the prototypical prosocial hero. The dark side refers to the anti-hero, which is characterized by a selfish orientation. This is akin to the concepts of good against evil, yin and yang, bright against dark, and hero versus anti-hero—they all describe antagonistic pairs.

Although it is a positive and idealistic notion that good always triumphs over evil or that leaders should correspond to the ideal image of a hero, the reality of daily leadership is different. For example, Maccoby (2000) postulates that many leaders are narcissists. Indeed, people seem to be fascinated by narcissists. But where does this fascination of anti-heroes come from? According to Jonason, Slomski, and Partyka (2012), popular characters such as Batman or James Bond have dark personality traits (Jonason, Li, & Teicher, 2010). The fascination of the selfish anti-hero can be explained by the fact that they ignore existing laws as if they were above them or larger than life. Despite the strong differences between “good” and “evil,” both may have a common motive: They both pursue the goal of power. Heroes and anti-heroes cross borders. They disregard conventions and are driven by a higher personalized or socialized ideal. Heroes are self-controlled, socially responsible, honest, and advocates for social community. Anti-heroes are more impulsive, less socially acceptable, selfish, and perhaps even dishonest. However, both heroes and anti-heroes have an agentic social style (Jonason et al., 2010). Dark leadership represents a part of leadership reality and describes the dark part of the coin, a selfish and impulsive leader, which may nonetheless be as effective or successful as bright and prosocially oriented leaders. Thus, a counter-trend to the investigation of very positive and idealized constructs can be found since the early 2000s in personality research with the dark triad of personality (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). This chapter deals with the dark side of leaders’ personality. Furthermore, the strengths and weaknesses of the dark triad are discussed for the purpose of leader development. On the one hand, dark leaders have excellent strengths (e.g., self-confidence and dominance) which could be considered in leader development; on the other hand, the knowledge about the weaknesses of dark leader traits could be used to handle or neutralize them effectively.

## 4.1 The Dark Triad of Personality

Paulhus and Williams (2002) coined the term “dark triad of personality” for three similar albeit distinct subclinical dark traits: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. The concepts of narcissism and psychopathy originated in clinical literature. On the other hand, Machiavellianism stems from the philosophy and tactical recommendations of Niccolò Machiavelli, a political advisor to the Medici family

in the 1500s (Christie & Geis, 1970). Despite their different origins, narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy overlap empirically: They all entail a character who exhibits selfishness, emotional coldness, duplicity, and manipulation (Furnham, Richards, & Paulhus, 2013; Paulhus, 2014; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Still, narcissism is considered among these three traits the most adaptive and desirable construct, while psychopathy seems least adaptive and acceptable (Rauthmann, 2012). The strongest mean correlations can be observed between psychopathy and Machiavellianism, and the lowest associations between narcissism and Machiavellianism (Furnham et al., 2013).

Of particular interest may be studies bringing together the dark triad and interpersonal behaviors (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013). For example, Dongwillo and Pincus (2017) showed that the dark triad projected differently onto the interpersonal circumplex (IPC). The IPC postulates that two basic themes underlie social relationships (Bakan, 1966): dominance/agency, related to autonomy and superiority, and affiliation/communion, related to helping and forming nurturing relationships with others. Narcissism is characterized by high dominance, psychopathy by a mixture of high dominance and low affiliation, and Machiavellianism by low affiliation. In accordance with Paulhus (2014), psychopathy has the highest impulsiveness, followed by narcissism and the relatively self-controlled Machiavellianism (Malesza & Ostaszewski, 2016). Psychopathy and Machiavellianism share both a high level in manipulation. Narcissism exhibited the highest level in grandiosity, followed by psychopathy, while Machiavellianism does not tend to be associated with grandiose fantasies. In contrast to Machiavellians and psychopaths, who exhibited a greater tendency to negative humor styles (aggressive, self-defeating), narcissists showed a positive affiliative humor style (Veselka, Schermer, Martin, & Vernon, 2010). Further, narcissism seems to be positively, Machiavellianism negatively, and psychopathy both positively and negatively related to socio-emotional skills (Nagler, Reiter, Furtner, & Rauthmann, 2014). Thus, on average, narcissists still appear as the more social among dark personalities. We should mention here that the terms “narcissist,” “Machiavellian,” and “psychopath” are used as abbreviations for people who score highly on standardized measures of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy as continuous trait dimensions. No psychopathology or diagnostic labeling should be inferred here. Paulhus (2014) gives an overview of the key features of the dark triad relative to the average population-wide level (see Table 4.1).

### 4.1.1 *The Dark Triad*

*Narcissism.* Narcissists are grandiose self-promoters who strive for admiration from others (Paulhus, 2014). Narcissists exhibit an excessive ego and show selfish behavior (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Raskin and Hall (1979) introduced the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), which represents a subclinical version of the DSM-defined personality disorder. On a conceptual level, the main facets of the NPI include grandiosity, entitlement, dominance, and superiority (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). More recent conceptualizations distinguish between narcissistic grandiosity

**Table 4.1** Key features of the dark triad (based on Paulhus, 2014)

Key features	Narcissism	Machiavellianism	Psychopathy
Callousness	++	++	++
Impulsivity	+		++
Manipulation	+	++	++
Criminality		Only white collar	++
Grandiosity	++		+

Note: ++ high levels of a given trait, + slightly elevated levels

and narcissistic vulnerability (e.g., Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008). In a similar vein, Back et al. (2013) described a “bright” and a “dark” side of narcissism, narcissistic admiration and rivalry. Narcissistic admiration involves the pursuit of uniqueness, grandiose fantasies, and charming behavior. Narcissistic rivalry is characterized by the pursuit of superiority, devaluation of others, and aggressive behavior. While narcissistic admiration leads to a self-confident, dominant, and expressive appearance, narcissistic rivalry entails arrogant and contentious behavior. In the mid- to long-term time range, narcissistic rivalry leads to a strong decrease in popularity in social groups (Leckelt, Küfner, Nestler, & Back, 2015).

*Machiavellianism.* According to Paulhus (2014), Machiavellians are master manipulators, pursuing a long-term oriented calculated social manipulation. As Hawley (2003) notes, Machiavellians are “coercive controllers” with an adaptive combination of pro- and antisocial tactics to best achieve their career-success-related goals. Machiavellians are cynical and tactical, and believe in interpersonal manipulation as the key for life success (Furnham et al., 2013). They are cold-hearted and callous, and their primary motivation lies in obtaining money, power, and status (Furtner & Baldegger, 2016). In contrast to narcissists, however, they do not need admiration per se; rather, that would only be good if it were also useful towards some other ultimate goal (e.g., if it resulted in more power or money). Thus, self-promotion and self-aggrandization are not ultimate goals per se for Machiavellians, but rather means to another end.

*Psychopathy.* Psychopathy is characterized by impulsivity, thrill seeking, low empathy, callousness, and interpersonal manipulation (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 2003; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Psychopathy can be divided into two interrelated factors (Hare, 2003): Factor 1 with callous and manipulative traits (primary psychopathy) and Factor 2 with antisocial behavioral tendencies (secondary psychopathy). Factor 2 differs strongly from narcissism and Machiavellianism (Jones & Figueredo, 2013). Jones and Paulhus (2011b) showed that psychopathy is related to dysfunctional impulsivity, whereas narcissism is associated with functional impulsivity. Psychopaths are unable to inhibit antisocial impulses and show high risk-taking behavior (e.g., persisting in gambling which leads to financial misbehavior; see Jones, 2014). In contrast to narcissism, psychopathy and Machiavellianism show stronger positive relations to self-reported violence (Pailing, Boon, & Egan, 2014). Moreover, psychopathy is most strongly associated with bullying behaviors, followed by Machiavellianism, and narcissism (Baughman, Dearing, Giammarco, & Vernon, 2012). Thus, among the dark triad, psychopathy seems to be the socially most aversive, partly dysfunctional, and thus “darkest” trait.

### 4.1.2 *Is There a Common Dark Core?*

Recently, researchers raised the question whether antisocial dark triad personalities exhibit a common dark or “evil” core and what that core would be (Book, Visser, & Volk, 2015; Jonason, Li, Webster, & Schmitt, 2009; Jones & Paulhus, 2011a; Jones & Figueredo, 2013). Although there is an overlap and a potential dark core, the dark triad traits should best be viewed as separate domains. Indeed, recently developed inventories confirm unique contributions of each trait to laboratory behaviors and real-world outcomes (Paulhus, 2014). Within the five-factor model of personality (Big Five: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness; Costa & McCrae, 1992), low agreeableness is the strongest negative correlate of the dark triad (Furnham et al., 2013). Another potential dark core could be honest-humility from Ashton and Lee’s (2001) HEXACO model (basically the Big Five plus a sixth factor). This sixth dimension distinguishes between prosocial and antisocial behavior and therefore may be better qualified to explain the dark triad. Lee and Ashton (2005) showed that all three dark triad traits were strongly negatively correlated with the honest-humility factor (all  $r_s > -0.50$ ).

Besides basic personality traits, a second possible core of the dark triad could be lack of empathy or callousness (Jones & Paulhus, 2011a; Paulhus, 2014). While narcissists, Machiavellians, and psychopaths exhibit a certain degree of callousness (Jonason, Lyons, Bethell, & Ross, 2013), they are nonetheless able to cognitively understand the emotions of others, though without an affective response to this information (Book, Quinsey, & Langford, 2007; Wai & Tiliopoulos, 2012). Thus, they have no impairment in cognitive empathy, but exhibit a specific form of cold empathy. Moreover, Machiavellians have the ability to adapt their empathy to current situations (McIlwain et al., 2012).

A third possible core may be psychopathy itself. Primary psychopathy could potentially represent the core of all three dark personalities. This approach would support empirical findings in which psychopathy is strongly related to narcissism and Machiavellianism, whereas narcissism and Machiavellianism are not as strongly interrelated (Furnham et al., 2013; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). However, psychopathy should still be regarded as an independent construct (Book et al., 2015).

Another explanation for a common dark core may lie in the leadership-relevant trait of social dominance. For example, Jones and Figueredo (2013) could show that social dominance orientation has the same common core as the dark triad. Social dominance and need for power are important targets for leader development (McClelland, 1975). “Friendly” leaders with a high need for affiliation could learn from a leader coach how they can increase their leader effectiveness with a more dominant appearance and a stronger social dominance orientation (controlled conversations). Overall, future research should provide further evidence that, despite differences between the dark triad traits, there may be a common core.

## 4.2 Origins of the Dark Triad

### 4.2.1 *Evolutionary Theory*

At the core of all evolutionary approaches to personality is an important behavioral ecological concept called life history theory (Del Giudice, Gangestad, & Kaplan, 2015; Rushton, 1985; Stearns, 1992). Life history theory proposes that trade-offs considering the investment of energy in somatic growth versus recreational effort and quality versus quantity of offspring underlie individual differences in personality (Ellis, Figueredo, Brumbach, & Schlomer, 2009; Kaplan & Gangestad, 2005). It has been argued that dark personalities have a fast life history strategy in exhibiting short-term mating, selfishness, and other antisocial manifestations (e.g., Brumbach, Figueredo, & Ellis, 2009; Jonason et al., 2009). Life history strategy is shaped by the environment early in life (between birth and the age of 5 years), promoting either a slow strategy associated with long-term investments to the future or a fast strategy characterized by the opposite pattern (Belsky, Schlomer, & Ellis, 2012; Ellis & Del Giudice, 2014). Del Giudice (2014) links fast life strategies with traits such as low empathy, poor executive control, low agreeableness, enhanced impulsivity, risk taking, opportunistic interpersonal intercourses, and volatile mating (Glenn, Kurzban, & Raine, 2011). All these features could be targets for leader development and increase the awareness about the dark side of dark leader traits. They share one commonality, which is constitutional for a fast life strategy: they lead to short-term advantages, but entail social and even formal sanctions and punishments over the long term. McDonald, Donnellan, and Navarrete (2011) showed that antisocial impulsiveness in secondary psychopathy, entitlement in narcissism, and Machiavellianism are associated with a fast life strategy. By contrast, a slow life strategy has been linked to fearless dominance, which is assigned to primary psychopathy.

However, one may ask how evolutionary approaches to dark triad personality traits can be linked to leadership. As noted previously, dark traits can be described as an excessive dominance motivation (see Johnson, Leedom, & Muhtadie, 2012): Narcissistic leaders desire social power and aspire to be in leader positions, psychopathic ones usurp resources in an aggressive manner, and Machiavellian ones exploit others by deception and manipulation (Grijalva & Harms, 2014; Jones & Figueredo, 2013). Thus, dark personalities seem to encompass a variety of behavioral dispositions, which qualify them as leaders (Grijalva & Harms, 2014).

### 4.2.2 *Psychogenic Motives and Values*

Motives represent the basic drive for human action. Three particularly fundamental motives have been repeatedly identified in literature: need for power, need for achievement, and need for affiliation (McClelland, 1985). Need for power corresponds to the desire of a person to take influence and control other people. Need for achievement represents a certain standard of excellence that someone strives

towards. People with a high need for achievement strive to improve constantly their own performance. Need for affiliation aims to build, maintain, or restore positive relationships with others.

Jonason and Ferrell (2016) examined relations between these three central human motives and the dark triad. The dark triad showed particularly positive relations with need for power (being dominant and powerful). Merely narcissism was additionally related to the need for affiliation. Both Machiavellianism and psychopathy showed only low and negative relations to the need for achievement, while narcissism exhibited inconsistent relations to the need for achievement. While Machiavellians and psychopaths had no need for social attachments, narcissists require other people to obtain social appreciation (Jonason & Ferrell, 2016). Another relevant study comes from Kajonius, Persson, and Jonason (2015) who examined relations between the dark triad and 10 universal Schwartz values (e.g., power, security, and benevolence). Machiavellianism and narcissism showed positive relations to the values achievement and power, whereas psychopathy was positively associated with hedonism and power. Overall, all three dark triad traits exhibited strong relations with power motives and values. As need for power, which can be developed in leaders (McClelland, 1975), is a central foundation for leadership, dark triad traits may also play an important role in leadership (Furtner & Baldegger, 2016). Specifically, a strong power motive may be assessed at the beginning of leader development sessions because it could be cultivated and formed to something productive. On the other hand, the more agonistic and combative traits that come with the dark triad could also be harnessed, especially in settings with high and fierce competition. Thus, leader development trainings may benefit from assessing dark traits because these may come with certain strengths (e.g., need for power, social dominance) that confer an adaptive value in certain work environments (e.g., high competition).

### 4.3 The Dark Triad at Work

Dark personalities at work are relatively understudied (Spain, Harms, & Lebreton, 2013), though there is a recent surge in interest for this topic (Cohen, 2016; Harms & Spain, 2015). However, workplace behavior is one of the major outcome domains of the dark triad (for a review, see Furnham et al., 2013). In a meta-analysis (245 independent samples), O'Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, and McDaniel (2012) examined associations between the dark triad, job performance, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). Results showed that Machiavellianism and psychopathy were negatively related to job performance. All three dark triad traits were positively associated with CWB. This means that the assessment of, and also reflection about, dark triad traits in ourselves (and others) may help us learn to shape our behavior as a leader. Such reflection, in turn, may be able to make us more effective. However, no studies have so far (to the best of our knowledge) examined the beneficial effects of self/insight into one's dark traits. Context effects, in the form of level of authority

and organizational culture (in-group collectivism), were also taken into account in the meta-analysis (O'Boyle et al., 2012). While Machiavellianism consistently showed negative effects on workplace behavior across all situations (independent of their level of authority and degrees of in-group collectivism), narcissism showed a more complex picture: Narcissists in positions of higher levels of authority showed stronger negative relations to performance. Narcissists also performed more poorly in organizations with high degrees of collectivism. Authority did not moderate relations between narcissism and CWB. Furthermore, the relation between narcissism and CWB became weaker when collectivism increased. Authority weakened associations between psychopathy and CWB. Psychopaths, who are able to gain higher positions in organizations, may better control their impulsivity and antisocial tendencies. However, there were only small effects between the dark triad and job performance as well as small-to-moderate effects to CWB. Due to predominantly weak effects, Cohen (2016) suggests various mediators (e.g., perception of organizational politics) and moderators (e.g., political skill, organizational culture/climate) which should be considered in future studies.

Jonason et al. (2012) investigated associations between the dark triad and tactics of workplace manipulation. Psychopathy was associated with hard tactics (e.g., threats), narcissism with soft tactics (e.g., offering compliments), and Machiavellianism with both. Compared to women, men showed a more aggressive style of interpersonal influence. Overall, though, dark triad personalities tended more towards hard than soft tactics, such as social influence and manipulation at the workplace. Further, in a recent experimental design, Roeser et al. (2016) examined the effects of the dark triad and unethical behavior (operationalized by cheating and lying). While Machiavellianism positively predicted cheating and psychopathy impulsive cheating and lying, only narcissism did not predict unethical behavior (cheating and lying) in this study. Thus, narcissism can be expected to be the most socially adaptive dimension among the dark triad (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2012, 2013).

Jonason, Wee, Li, and Jackson (2014) dealt with the question of which vocational interests are related to the dark triad. The results of their study suggest that the dark triad may be useful for career inventories and talent management. For example, in terms of person-job fit, dark personalities may be specifically interested in, select themselves into, and excel at specific jobs and vocations. Psychopaths were more interested in realistic (e.g., building kitchen cabinets) and practical jobs (e.g., repairing motor vehicles). Machiavellianism was negatively related to social (e.g., teaching children), caring (e.g., treating people who are sick), and practical jobs. Narcissism correlated positively with cultured (e.g., acting in a film) and caring jobs. Psychopaths preferred jobs where they have little social interaction and were relatively autonomous. Narcissists chose workplaces which have positive effects regarding social admiration. Machiavellians avoided jobs that do not lead to status (Jonason et al., 2014). But how do dark triad personalities perceive their workplaces? Machiavellians and psychopaths perceived their workplaces as more competitive, whereas narcissists experienced them as prestigious and more autonomous. Moreover, perceived prestige was a positive predictor of job satisfaction (Jonason, Wee, & Li, 2015).

Can dark personalities have successful careers? Spurk, Keller, and Hirschi (2016) examined in early-career employees the relations between the dark triad and subjective as well as objective career success. Narcissism was positively associated with



salary, and Machiavellianism with leadership position and career satisfaction. Only psychopathy was negatively associated with all career outcomes. Thus, narcissism and Machiavellianism were positively related to objective career success. Furthermore, the dark triad traits of leaders can have specific effects on followers' career success. For example, Volmer, Koch, and Göritz (2016) showed in a longitudinal study that narcissism had positive effects on followers' subjective (e.g., follower career satisfaction) and objective career success (e.g., follower salary and promotions). The authors suggested that narcissistic leaders try to retain and reward their followers to get consecutive admiration and appreciation. Conversely, psychopathic leaders showed strongly negative effects on followers' well-being and job satisfaction (Mathieu, Neumann, Hare, & Babiak, 2014).

## 4.4 Dark Leadership

All three dark triad traits are related to need for power and have a social dominance orientation (Hodson, Hogg, & MacInnis, 2009; Jones & Figueredo, 2013). A social dominance orientation means that individuals prefer to control conversations and put pressure to others. This fits to Altemeyer's (2004) observation that dominant people are power hungry and manipulative. Thus, social dominance could be a viable construct to distinguish leaders from non-leaders (Mann, 1959). Indeed, dominance was described as one of the first traits related to leadership (Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2009). Dominant people have a higher probability to emerge as leaders and be promoted to positions of authority (Son Hing, Bobocel, Zanna, & McBride, 2007). Dominant leaders appear as competent and emit strong authority. Interestingly, they are perceived as competent, even when they are not (Judge et al., 2009). Although dominant leaders exhibit a politically oppressive style, each of the dark triad traits may have a specific dominance style: Narcissistic leaders have a strong egoistic focus (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001); Machiavellian ones a cold, calculating, long-term oriented and strategic style (Jones & Paulhus, 2009); and psychopathic ones an impulsive and antisocial style (Williams, Paulhus, & Hare, 2007). The particular uniqueness of the dark triad traits has different effects on leadership styles. In their theoretical-conceptual work about the bright and the dark sides of leader traits, Judge et al. (2009) focused on Machiavellianism and narcissism, though they disregarded psychopathy. Although psychopathy is the "darkest" and most malevolent type of the dark triad which could arguably deal out strong damage to an organization, its role in organizational leadership is the least explored (Mathieu et al., 2014). To approach the phenomenon of dark leadership, narcissistic leadership, Machiavellian leadership, and psychopathic leadership are described below in some detail.

### 4.4.1 Narcissistic Leadership

According to Maccoby (2000), many dominating military, religious, political, and economic leaders have a narcissistic personality (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Narcissistic leaders are perceived as arrogant, dominant, and authoritarian. They are

effective leaders and emerge as leaders in group settings (Nevicka, Ten Velden, De Hoogh, & Van Vianen, 2011), probably because of their extraversion (Grijalva, Harms, Newman, Gaddis, & Fraley, 2015). Rosenthal and Pittinsky (2006) emphasize that one should remove the idea whether narcissistic leaders are “good” or “evil.” Rather, the context has to be considered (e.g., accordance between narcissistic leaders’ and organizational goals). Cultural factors (e.g., individualistic culture), environmental factors (e.g., instability, crisis), and structural factors (e.g., absence of strict information control) have an important role in the emergence of narcissistic leadership (Ouimet, 2010). Narcissistic leaders could show a beneficial or a harmful behavior for organizations. It is therefore not surprising that Judge et al. (2009) describe the bright and the dark sides of narcissism, Maccoby (2000) the pros and cons, and Rosenthal and Pittinsky (2006) the upside and the downside of narcissistic leaders (see Table 4.2).

In a military context the best rated leaders represented the bright side of narcissism (e.g., high in egotism and self-esteem), but without the dark side of manipulativeness and impression management (Paunonen, Lönnqvist, Verkasalo, Leikas, & Nissinen, 2006). For practitioners, this knowledge could be used to focus and develop more strongly the strengths of narcissists while trying to work against negative aspects of manipulativeness and impression management. As can be seen in Table 4.2, narcissism shows particularly important associations to charismatic leadership.

Furtner, Rauthmann, and Sachse (2011) examined associations between self-leadership and the dark triad. They could show that self-leadership was positively related to narcissism. In turn, self-leadership is an important basic skill for active and effective leadership behavior, in particular transformational and charismatic leadership (Furtner & Baldegger, 2016; Furtner, Baldegger, & Rauthmann, 2013). Rosenthal and Pittinsky (2006) describe narcissism in a framework of two related leadership models: power motivation and charismatic leadership. The authors state that power is one of the great motivators for narcissistic leaders. Need for power is also one of the most central motivational tendencies of the entire dark triad. Interestingly, the power motive of US presidents has been related to charisma, communication ability, humor, combative skill, aggressiveness, and exploitativeness (Deluga, 1997; Winter, 2005). Narcissistic leadership is related to a specific subtype of power motivation, the personalized power motivation. Leaders with a high personalized power motive have a charismatic, selfish, and aggressive style. Charisma, in turn, is one of the most important positive traits of narcissism (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Not surprisingly, narcissism is also positively related to presidential charismatic leadership and performance (Deluga, 1997). Charismatic leaders are exceptionally gifted (both intellectually and socially), though charisma also has its dark side (see Conger, 1990, for charismatic leadership). Similar to a personalized power motive, the dark side of charismatic leadership is closely related to narcissistic leadership (Furtner & Baldegger, 2016; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

Previous studies on narcissism and leadership showed mixed results. The relationship between narcissism and leader effectiveness could only be observed in self- but not in other-ratings (e.g., supervisor- and subordinate-report). Grijalva et al. (2015)

**Table 4.2** The bright and the dark sides of narcissism

<b>Bright and dark sides of narcissism</b> (Judge et al., 2009)	
<i>Bright</i>	<i>Dark</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charismatic leadership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grandiose self-love (others are inferior)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High leader performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reputation-dependent decisions</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consensus oriented in political and influence processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrogance</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High organizational performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insensitive and hostile</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of empathy</li> </ul>
<b>Pros and cons of narcissistic leaders</b> (Maccoby, 2000)	
<i>Pros</i>	<i>Cons</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great vision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensitive to criticism</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charismatic and gifted in attracting followers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor listeners</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of empathy</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of mentoring others</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire to compete</li> </ul>
<b>Upside and downside of narcissistic leaders</b> (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006)	
<i>Upside</i>	<i>Downside</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supreme confidence and dominance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrogance</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspiring followers with great visions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feelings of inferiority and emptiness about themselves</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context-dependent necessity (e.g., social crisis)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for recognition and superiority</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shape the future</li> <li>• Great charisma</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hypersensitivity and anger</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of empathy</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amorality</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irrationality and inflexibility</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paranoia (e.g., creating enemies where there had been none)</li> </ul>

demonstrated that an optimal, mid-range level of leaders’ narcissism is positively related to leader effectiveness. Thus, very high and very low levels of narcissism are hindering, whereby moderate narcissism is positively related to leadership effectiveness. Among the dark triad traits narcissism is very agentic in nature and shows the strongest associations with extraversion and openness (e.g., Paulhus & Williams, 2002). To foster leader emergence and effectivity, narcissists should focus more on the “bright” side of narcissism and show a moderate form of narcissistic characteristic (see Table 4.2). Ong, Roberts, Arthur, Woodman, and Akehurst (2016) observed positive and negative effects of narcissistic leadership on leader emergence and leader effectivity. While narcissists can be perceived at the beginning as transformational and charismatic (i.e., leader emergence), the attractiveness of narcissists in peer ratings, after a brief “honeymoon” period of leadership, declined rapidly (i.e., leader effectivity). This is also in line with other researches demonstrating that narcissists’ initial positive appearance and effects diminish after prolonged interactions (Küfner, Nestler, & Back, 2013; Leckelt et al., 2015; Paulhus, 1998).

#### 4.4.2 *Machiavellian Leadership*

Judge et al. (2009) emphasize the important role of Machiavellianism in leadership, and similar to narcissism, they describe a bright and dark side of Machiavellianism. Machiavellians strive to leadership positions in which they can plan, coordinate, organize, and control. They are very effective in organizational administration (Calhoun, 1969) and exhibit a high calculative motivation to lead. Using an experimental design Drory and Gluskinos (1980) compared high versus low Machiavellian leaders in task group settings. High Machiavellian leaders gave more orders, showed a greater responsiveness to situational demands, exhibited a more participative style under unfavorable conditions, and were consistently less concerned with their group members' feelings. They had a wider range of appropriate behaviors than low Machiavellian leaders. These findings fit to the conceptualization of Machiavellian leaders as very strategic in their thinking and able to navigate power dynamics in their business and organizations. Such leaders exhibit a wide range of different influencing tactics to build political relations (Judge et al., 2009). According to Simonton (1986), Machiavellian presidents had more legislative victories. Additionally, Machiavellian presidents were highly effective by demonstrating intellectual brilliance.

Although narcissists are usually perceived as more charismatic, Machiavellian leaders may be experienced as charismatic under specific circumstances (e.g., occupation of very powerful positions). For example, Deluga (2001) analyzed 39 American presidents and showed that presidential Machiavellianism was positively associated with charismatic leadership and rated performance. In a historiometric examination, Bedell, Hunter, Angie, and Vert (2006) showed that charismatic (e.g., John F. Kennedy, Benito Mussolini), ideological (e.g., Mohandas Gandhi, Fidel Castro), and pragmatic (e.g., Warren Buffet, Al Capone) leaders differentially exhibited Machiavellian characteristics. Charismatic leaders showed moderate and pragmatic leaders the highest levels of Machiavellianism. Pragmatic leaders used a more functional, problem-based approach that deals with present situations and demands. Personalized leaders with a strong ego focus exhibited more extreme Machiavellian characteristics, while surprisingly also socialized "altruistic" leaders used Machiavellian strategies. They manipulated given situations to obtain efficient and practical solutions. The dark side of Machiavellianism can be attributed directly to the observations of Niccolò Machiavelli. To reach their long-term goals, Machiavellian leaders abuse their leadership position for personal purposes and reduce the work-related intrinsic motivation of their subordinates (Judge et al., 2009).

Based on the results of three studies, Kessler et al. (2010) proposed a three-dimensional model of Machiavellianism: maintaining power (e.g., "An effective individual builds a powerbase of strong people"), management practices (e.g., "It is important for an individual to learn about the mistakes of unsuccessful people"), and manipulative behaviors (e.g., "Since most people are weak, a rational individual should take advantage of the situation to maximize his/her own gains"). The first two dimensions are more positive in nature: maintaining power and management practices

were positively associated with conscientious and negatively to CWB, while manipulative behaviors were positively related to CWB. Machiavellian leaders showed positive associations to subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervision. These relations were fully mediated by subordinates' perceptions of authoritarian leadership. Therefore, Machiavellian leader tendencies will strongly express authoritarian leadership behaviors (Kiazad, Restubog, Zagenczyk, Kiewitz, & Tang, 2010).

Not only leaders, but also followers, could have high Machiavellian tendencies. In a recent study Belschak, Den Hartog, and Kalshoven (2015) demonstrated that transformational leadership has a positive influence on Machiavellian followers. Transformational leadership moderated relations between Machiavellian followers and organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is also known as the good soldier syndrome (Organ, 1988). Citizenship behavior often goes beyond an employee's job description, for example helping others or putting in extra hours (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, & Harvey, 2013). With leaders' transformational leadership the selfish Machiavellian follower could be transformed in pro-organizational behavior. Nevertheless, it has to be considered that Machiavellians may use OCB and prosocial behavior for selfish purposes. Thus, a dark side of organizational citizenship behavior may also exist (Bolino et al., 2013). There are positive as well as negative Machiavellian tendencies which could be considered in leader development. Machiavellian leaders are relatively self-controlled, acute, and pragmatic. They exhibit high flexibility and are excellent business administrators. Additionally, Machiavellian leaders have excellent negotiation skills (Judge et al., 2009). The more negative aspects of Machiavellian tendencies would need to be recognized, reflected upon, and eventually neutralized (or at least somehow channeled into more constructive ways). For example, Machiavellian leaders are strongly manipulative and dishonest. They exhibit an extrinsic (calculative) form of motivation to lead which reduce intrinsic work motivation of followers. These tendencies will have to be kept at bay.

### ***4.4.3 Psychopathic Leadership***

Psychopathy is the "darkest" dark triad trait in organizational leadership and also the least explored (Mathieu et al., 2014). There is little evidence in terms of psychopathy and leadership (Boddy, 2015a). To describe psychopathic leadership, the more general term of a "corporate psychopath" is broadly used. Approximately 1% of the population who work for organizations are estimated to be psychopaths (Coid, Yang, Ullrich, Roberts, & Hare, 2009). How do psychopaths obtain organizational leadership positions? As soon as psychopaths are in organizations, they use diverse strategies of impression management to reach their goal of rising to the top of the organization. Psychopathic leaders ally themselves with their promotors and at the same time they oppose their enemies which in their view constitute an obstacle to a successful organizational career. Chiaburu, Munoz, and Gardner (2013)

showed that primary psychopathy is an important predictor of careerism. According to Babiak and Hare (2006), psychopaths divide organizational members into two fractions: One fraction is composed of their supporters, and the other fraction of their detractors who recognize that the organization is in danger. Psychopaths try to outmaneuver and remove their detractors to better ascend to power. According to Babiak, Neumann, and Hare (2010), about 4% of leaders at the senior management level of organizations are psychopaths. Psychopathic leaders were associated positively with perceived charisma and presentation style, including excellent communication styles (Babiak et al., 2010). Psychopathic leaders can be predominantly found in senior management levels (Spencer & Byrne, 2016). Thus, good presentation skills and excellent communication styles could be considered as strengths to build upon in leader development, especially as they seem to promote organizational career.

Psychopathic leaders are very sensitive in the selection of their followers, who must pay them absolute loyalty. Conformity and dependability of subordinates may play an important role for the success of psychopathic leaders. Regarding the relationship between psychopathy and the full-range leadership model (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership) two studies with relatively similar results revealed no associations between psychopathy and charisma (Mathieu, Neumann, Babiak, & Hare, 2015; Westerlaken & Woods, 2013): Psychopathy was positively correlated with passive leadership (management by exception and laissez-faire leadership) and negatively with active and effective leadership (transformational and transactional leadership). Thus, psychopathic leaders avoid decision making and do not care about their followers. Mathieu et al. (2015) concluded that, like narcissism, psychopathy may be associated with leader emergence or a surface identification with leadership, but not with leader effectiveness. Mathieu and Babiak (2015) also demonstrated that leaders' psychopathy was a stronger predictor for employee attitudes (job satisfaction, turnover intentions, work motivation, job neglect) than the three dimensions of the full-range leadership model. Mathieu and Babiak (2016) also found that psychopathic leaders were positively associated with abusive supervision and employees' turnover intentions, and negatively to followers' job satisfaction.

In summary, Boddy (2015a) expects a variety of negative consequences of psychopathy for organizations (e.g., corporate failure, fraudulent activities, exploited followers, workplace bullying, and short-term decision making). In a longitudinal case study of a corporate psychopath as CEO, Boddy (2015b) describes the negative long-term effects of psychopathic leadership. The delineated leadership style showed strong similarities to laissez-faire leadership with negative outcomes related to bullying, staff withdrawal, and high turnover rates. A high corporate psychopathy score of the CEO also reduced employees' organizational commitment, creativity, and innovation. Furthermore, the psychopathic CEO focused on the strength of his own position and external reputation while implementing a climate of organizational fear. The dark aspects of psychopathic leadership should be counteracted in leader development as they show a broad variety of negative outcomes for individuals, teams, and organizations.

## 4.5 Dark Leader Traits and Leader Development

Leader development focuses on the intrapersonal development of skills (e.g., self-awareness, self-regulation, and self-motivation) which are required for their formal leadership roles (Day, 2000). These skills lead to increased individual knowledge, trust, and personal power (Zand, 1997). The dark triad traits, rather than being purely maladaptive, can be seen as adaptations promoting benefits for an individual primarily over the short term in an unpredictable environment, along with some facets promoting also long-term success (McDonald et al., 2011). This aspect can be employed for developing leaders.

How can the knowledge about dark traits be used for leader development? Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy are relatively stable personality traits, which should be targeted through the selection process of leaders (Reichard & Johnson, 2011). The knowledge about the dark personality traits of leaders could be used to determine the extent to which a development readiness already exists in leaders (Avolio, 2004). Narcissists could show the strongest development readiness, followed by Machiavellians and psychopaths (Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011).

Among the dark triad, narcissism is the trait that is most strongly associated with agentic traits (openness, extraversion) and self-leadership (Furtner et al., 2011; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Self-leadership, in turn, is an important prerequisite for charismatic and transformational leadership (Furtner et al., 2013). Thus, narcissistic leaders may be perceived as charismatic. Narcissists strive for social recognition and admiration. Both the leadership position and the leadership process can fulfill their basic motive for social recognition and admiration. Narcissists enjoy the leadership process per se and show a high intrinsic (affective) motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). The intrinsic motivation of narcissistic leaders, in turn, increases their charisma (Barbuto, 2005; Furtner et al., 2013; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Charisma is a key tool for narcissistic leaders to receive social recognition and admiration. Not only the intrinsic motivation to lead increases the charismatic perceptions of narcissists, but also their dominant, self-confident, and at the same time charming appearance. On the basis of their central need for power, recognition, and admiration, the development of charisma is a socially adaptive strategy of narcissists. In summary, narcissists have good requirements to benefit from leader development as they are open to new experiences and insatiable learners. They incorporate new knowledge (e.g., about self-motivation) quickly to continually improve their personal effectivity and ultimately reach their central goal.

On the basis of their relative good self-control, high adaptability, and flexibility for situational demands, Machiavellians may also benefit from leader development. Machiavellians could show a high learning ability in the framework of leader development, if the mediated knowledge (e.g., increasing one's self-regulation) serves for their personal long-term goal (attaining power and status). Machiavellians are masters of manipulation and tactical deception. They have the highest self-control among the dark triad traits (Paulhus, 2014), show a high adaptability, and must exert a certain degree of awareness to flexibly adapt to specific situations. On the basis of increased awareness (of internal and external processes) and the acquisition

of new and personally relevant knowledge, Machiavellians could also benefit from leader development.

Psychopaths have a great interest in experiencing new things and are very adventurous. Despite their high impulsivity and their relatively short-term focus, psychopaths who strive for high leadership positions in organizations could also obtain advantages from leader development. To reduce their central weakness of low self-control, an emphasis should be put on the training of specific self-regulatory techniques (e.g., cultivation of mindfulness skills).

How can the strengths and weaknesses of dark leaders be utilized in leader development? The knowledge about the pros (adaptive advantages) and cons (maladaptive disadvantages) of the dark triad traits can be very useful for leader development programs and leader coaches. Dark leaders can reflect on their strengths and weaknesses and develop a plan to use their strengths and neutralize or eliminate their weaknesses. Young executives, “bright” leaders (e.g., empowering leaders), and leaders with a high need for affiliation as well as a low social dominance orientation could learn from the strengths of dark leaders. For example, affiliative leaders may become aware that they may not be sufficiently dominant and effective in their leadership role.

With the central aim of leader development in improving leaders’ individual knowledge, trust, and personal power as well as to promote the human capital of individual leaders, Table 4.3 summarizes the key strengths and weaknesses of leaders’ dark triad traits. This knowledge can be utilized directly in leader development.

## 4.6 Conclusions and Future Research

The dark side of leadership has long been ignored in leadership research and is still under-researched. Currently, many different terms are used for the dark side of leadership (e.g., destructive leadership: Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013; toxic leadership: Pelletier, 2010; abusive leadership: Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, & Chang, 2012; unethical leadership: Brown & Mitchell, 2010). Yet, a uniform concept of dark leadership does not exist, but would be highly conducive for the exploration of the dark side of leadership. Focusing on dark triad traits of leaders may be a fruitful foundation for dark leadership research. Krasikova et al. (2013) describe the dark triad leader characteristics as predictors of engaging in destructive leadership. While personality research has investigated the dark triad of personality for over 15 years, leadership research focused more recently and independently of personality psychology on narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. Following the issue whether there is a dark common core of the dark triad of personality, the question arises if there is also a common dark core in leadership. Different potential cores of the dark triad have been proposed, such as disagreeableness (Furnham et al., 2013), low honesty/humility (Lee & Ashton, 2005), callousness (Jones & Figueredo, 2013), need for power (Jonason & Ferrell, 2016), and social dominance orientation (Jones & Figueredo, 2013). In leadership context need for power (McClelland, 1975) and social dominance orientation (Judge et al., 2009) may play the most important role for dark leadership.



**Table 4.3** Strengths (to be developed) and weaknesses (to be worked on) of the dark triad in leader development

Dark trait	Strengths (to be developed)	Weaknesses (to be worked on)
Narcissism	• Self-confident	• Arrogant
	• Dominant	• Selfish
	• Intrinsic (affective) motivation to lead	• Oversensitive to criticism
	• Self-leading	• Exaggerated self-love
	• Charismatic	• Competing
	• Visionary	• Lack of empathy
	• Innovative	
	• Charming	
Machiavellianism	• Sensitive to social cues	
	• Dominant	• Manipulative
	• Self-controlled	• Selfish
	• Highly flexible in social situations	• Cheating
	• Astute and strategic thinking	• Inconsiderate
	• Pragmatic	• Extrinsic (calculating) motivation to lead
	• Effective in business administration	
Psychopaths	• Tactical negotiating skills	
	• Broad variety of influencing tactics	
	• Dominant	• Impulsive
	• Communicative	• Selfish
	• Thrill seeking	• Callous
		• Lack of empathy
		• Unpredictable and irrational behavior
• Paranoid		
	• Terrifying	

Narcissistic leadership, as the most adaptive and brightest side of leaders’ dark tendencies, has received the most attention so far. The darker the personality trait, the less it has been researched. As such, psychopathy, being the most malicious dark triad trait concept (Krasikova et al., 2013), has hardly been investigated. Generally, narcissists are deemed most qualified as leaders and may indeed also be effective in leader roles. Besides narcissists also Machiavellians and psychopaths strive to power and leadership positions. Nevertheless, among the dark triad, narcissism could have the most important role in leadership research. It is likely that a lot of leadership positions are occupied by narcissists (Maccoby, 2000). Positive relations between narcissism and leader emergence confirm this (Mathieu et al., 2015; Ong et al., 2016). As narcissists always want to approve their own grandiosity and dominance, they strive for unrestricted social appreciation and acceptance. They have an inherent interest in leadership and exhibit a high affective (intrinsic) motivation to lead.

An additional strength of narcissistic leaders is demonstrated by the fact that, based on their visions, dominance, and strong social influence, they exhibit the most powerful forms of leadership behavior, transformational and charismatic leadership. The key force of narcissistic leaders is that they are perceived as charismatic. Nevertheless, it must be considered that selfish narcissists are driven by a personalized power motive and therefore exhibit a dark and personalized form of transformational and charismatic leadership.

In contrast, Machiavellian leaders are typical managers and administrators. They have a special talent for planning, organizing, and controlling. Machiavellian leaders feature a high personalized power motive and a calculative motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). On higher leadership levels Machiavellians could even be perceived as charismatic, although commonly charisma may be stronger attributed to narcissistic leaders. With their charismatic qualities narcissistic leaders can stimulate the intrinsic motivation and performance of their followers (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006), while due to their pragmatic perspective Machiavellians reduce followers' work-related intrinsic motivation (Judge et al., 2009). Just as narcissistic leaders, Machiavellian leaders show a strong authoritarian leadership behavior. The powerful leadership approach of transformational leadership, which is more demonstrated by narcissists, can be a means to motivate Machiavellian followers to a pro-organizational behavior.

Based on their personalized power motive and social dominance orientation, psychopathic leaders show the strong desire to get to the top of an organization. They exhibit a non-altruistic/antisocial motivation to lead. Psychopaths polarize and hence know only friends or enemies. In organizational context psychopathic leaders exhibit an unpredictable and impulsive leadership behavior. Psychopathic destructive leadership behavior could have strong negative effects on organizational members and effectivity (Boddy, 2015b). Despite their high impulsivity, psychopathic leaders use a wide range of strategies and tactical arrangements, though these are usually geared more towards short-term benefits and hence not calibrated to long-term consequences. Although psychopathy is positively associated with leader emergence it is negatively associated with leader effectivity (Mathieu et al., 2015), and often, psychopathic leaders show a very passive and ineffective leadership behavior (e.g., management-by-exception, laissez-faire) and similar to Machiavellian leaders are not interested in leadership per se. As a consequence, they entail a variety of negative effects for their followers (e.g., low job satisfaction, work motivation, high turnover intentions, and job neglect) and their organizations (e.g., corporate failure, workplace bullying), making them truly toxic and destructive in leadership contexts.

Investigating the dark triad in the context of leadership is a nascent field. There are several avenues for future research. First, there is currently no clear picture of psychopathy's role in leadership. Results are inconsistent and sometimes contradictory (e.g., successful vs. unsuccessful careers). Second, more studies are needed which examine the dark triad directly with different types of leadership behavior and relevant outcome variables (e.g., leader effectiveness, followers' job performance). Third, in the framework of the dark tetrad, subclinical sadism is discussed as a fourth important malevolent dimension, which also has high callousness (Paulhus, 2014).

Yet the role of sadism in leadership is completely unknown. Fourth, not only dark leaders, but also dark followers and the situational context (e.g., organizational individualism vs. collectivism), should be considered more. Fifth, two-way interaction effects of pairs of dark triad traits (e.g., a leader could exhibit high narcissistic and Machiavellian characteristics or Machiavellian long-term strategies could buffer psychopathic impulsivity) should be examined in the leadership context.

Finally, the effects of the dark triad on leader development, leader emergence, and leader effectivity should be investigated in detail. For example, there exists only one study examining the influence of dark personality traits on leader development (Harms et al., 2011). The authors demonstrated that although several dark personality dimensions were negatively associated with change in leadership, other dimensions of the Hogan Development Survey (HDS) (cautious, bold, colorful, and dutiful) showed positive relations to leader development over time. Bold (overly self-confident, arrogant, and entitled) was positively associated with narcissism, primary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism. Colorful (dramatic, attention seeking, and interruptive) was positively related to narcissism and primary psychopathy (Douglas, Bore, & Munro, 2012). Bold and colorful are particularly interconnected with narcissism and development (Harms et al., 2011). Narcissists are insatiable learners (Maccoby, 2003); for example, Napoleon had an enthusiastic interest for works of military history and philosophy. The connections between psychopathy and leader development remained unclear, although bold and colorful were also related to psychopathy. Furthermore, bold was also associated with Machiavellianism. Machiavellians are highly adaptable and flexible. Besides narcissism Machiavellians and psychopaths may also benefit from a leader development program. First, this program could contain the strengths and weaknesses of leaders' dark triad traits. Second, it could also initiate specific behavioral changes. As self-influencing processes towards behavioral change, self-leadership facets (e.g., self-goal setting, self-observation, self-reward, and self-cueing) could be used (Lucke & Furtner, 2015). Young or ineffective leaders could also benefit from a specific focus on leaders' dark triad traits. Passive leaders or leaders with a high need for affiliation could reflect about their (in certain environments) inappropriate leadership behavior and learn from the strengths of dark leaders (e.g., need for power, social dominance orientation). In the context of leader development, leader coaches can especially use the knowledge and strengths of the dark triad to increase individual knowledge, trust, personal power, and leader effectiveness.

But one must never forget that what narcissists, Machiavellians, and psychopaths have learned will be used exceptionally for selfish purposes and goals. Thus, despite their poor self-control and on the base of personal goals, it's possible that narcissists, Machiavellians, as well as psychopaths could increase their personal effectivity with a leader development program, while narcissism as the most adaptive trait of the dark triad promises best learning outcomes (Spain et al., 2013).

Due to their high personalized power motive, strong social dominance orientation, charisma, and impression management narcissists, Machiavellians, and psychopaths have in common that they strongly and inexorably strive for leadership positions, which are directly related to power and success. Therefore, it can be assumed that a variety and possibly the majority of leadership positions are occupied

with dark triad personalities. As Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009) noted, “the period that leadership theory and research will enter for the next decade is indeed one of the most exciting in the history of this planet” (p. 442). Concerning this, the focus on the role of leaders’ dark triad personality traits and dark leadership could improve our understanding of the complex field of leadership research, which for long time has only been fascinated of “good” and “idealized” leadership behaviors.

## References

- Altemeyer, B. (2004). Highly dominating, highly authoritarian personalities. *Journal of Social Psychology, 144*, 421–447.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2001). A theoretical basis for the major dimensions of personality. *European Journal of Personality, 15*, 327–353.
- Avolio, B. J. (2004). Examining the full range model of leadership: Looking back to transform forward. In D. V. Day, S. J. Zaccaro, & S. M. Halpin (Eds.), *Leader development for transforming organizations: Grow leaders for tomorrow* (pp. 71–98). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421–449.
- Babiak, P., & Hare, R. D. (2006). *Snakes in suits when psychopaths go to work*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Babiak, P., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2010). Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 28*, 174–193.
- Back, M. D., Küfner, A. C. P., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*, 1013–1037.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Barbuto, J. E. (2005). Motivation and transactional, charismatic, and transformational leadership: A test of antecedents. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 11*, 26–40.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*, 19–36.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 181–217.
- Baughman, H. M., Dearing, S., Giammarco, E., & Vernon, P. A. (2012). Relationships between bullying behaviours and the Dark Triad: A study with adults. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 571–575.
- Bedell, K., Hunter, S., Angie, A., & Vert, A. (2006). A historiometric examination of Machiavellianism and a new taxonomy of leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 12*, 50–72.
- Belschak, F. D., Den Hartog, D. N., & Kalshoven, K. (2015). Leading Machiavellians: How to translate Machiavellians’ selfishness into pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Management, 41*, 1934–1956.
- Belsky, J., Schlomer, G. L., & Ellis, B. J. (2012). Beyond cumulative risk: Distinguishing harshness and unpredictability as determinants of parenting and early life history strategy. *Developmental Psychology, 48*, 662–673.
- Boddy, C. R. (2015a). Organisational psychopaths: A ten year update. *Management Decision, 53*, 2407–2432.
- Boddy, C. R. (2015b). Psychopathic leadership: A case study of a corporate psychopath CEO. *Journal of Business Ethics*. doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2908-6
- Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 542–559.

- Book, A. S., Quinsey, V. L., & Langford, D. (2007). Psychopathy and the perception of affect and vulnerability. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*, 531–544.
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., & Volk, A. A. (2015). Unpacking “evil”: Claiming the core of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 73*, 29–38.
- Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: Exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 20*, 583–616.
- Brumbach, B. H., Figueredo, A. J., & Ellis, B. J. (2009). Effects of harsh and unpredictable environments in adolescence on development of life history strategies: A longitudinal test of an evolutionary model. *Human Nature, 20*, 25–81.
- Cain, N. M., Pincus, A. L., & Ansell, E. B. (2008). Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*, 638–656.
- Calhoun, R. P. (1969). Niccolo Machiavelli and the twentieth century administrator. *The Academy of Management Journal, 12*, 205–212.
- Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 481–498.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Munoz, G. J., & Gardner, R. G. (2013). How to spot a careerist early on: Psychopathy and exchange ideology as predictors of careerism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 118*, 473–486.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cleckley, H. (1976). *The mask of sanity* (5th ed.). St. Louis, MO: CV Mosby.
- Cohen, A. (2016). Are they among us? A conceptual framework of the relationship between the Dark Triad personality and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). *Human Resource Management Review, 26*, 69–85.
- Coid, J., Yang, M., Ullrich, S., Roberts, A., & Hare, R. D. (2009). Prevalence and correlates of psychopathic traits in the household population of Great Britain. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 32*, 65–73.
- Conger, J. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*, 44–55.
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO Personality Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 4*, 5–13.
- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 857–880.
- Del Giudice, M. (2014). An evolutionary life history framework for psychopathology. *Psychological Inquiry, 25*, 261–300.
- Del Giudice, M., Gangestad, S. W., & Kaplan, H. S. (2015). Life history theory and evolutionary psychology. In D. M. Buss (Ed.), *The handbook of evolutionary psychology—Vol 1: Foundations* (2nd ed., pp. 88–114). New York: Wiley.
- Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*, 49–65.
- Deluga, R. J. (2001). American presidential Machiavellianism: Implications for charismatic leadership and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 339–363.
- Dongwillo, E. A., & Pincus, A. L. (2017). Differentiating Dark Triad traits within and across interpersonal circumplex surfaces. *Assessment, 24*, 24–44.
- Douglas, H., Bore, M., & Munro, D. (2012). Distinguishing the Dark Triad: Evidence from the five-factor model and the Hogan development survey. *Psychology, 3*, 237–242.
- Drory, A., & Gluskinos, U. M. (1980). Machiavellianism and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*, 81–86.
- Ellis, B. J., & Del Giudice, M. (2014). Beyond allostatic load: Rethinking the role of stress in regulating human development. *Development and Psychopathology, 26*, 1–20.
- Ellis, B. J., Figueredo, A. J., Brumbach, B. H., & Schlomer, G. L. (2009). The impact of harsh versus unpredictable environments on the evolution and development of life history strategies. *Human Nature, 20*, 204–268.

- Furnham, A., Richards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). The Dark Triad of personality: A 10 year review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7, 199–216.
- Furtner, M. R., & Baldegger, U. (2016). *Self-Leadership und Führung: Theorien, Modelle und praktische Umsetzung (2. Auflage) [Self-leadership and leadership: Theories, models, and practical application (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)]*. Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler.
- Furtner, M. R., Baldegger, U., & Rauthmann, J. F. (2013). Leading yourself and leading others: Linking self-leadership to transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22, 436–449.
- Furtner, M. R., Rauthmann, J. F., & Sachse, P. (2011). The self-loving self-leader: An examination of the relationship between self-leadership and the Dark Triad. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 39, 369–380.
- Glenn, A. L., Kurzban, R., & Raine, A. (2011). Evolutionary theory and psychopathy. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16, 371–380.
- Grijalva, E., & Harms, P. D. (2014). Narcissism: An integrative synthesis and dominance complementarity model. *Academy of Management: Perspectives*, 28, 108–127.
- Grijalva, E., Harms, P. D., Newman, D. A., Gaddis, B. H., & Fraley, C. (2015). Narcissism and leadership: A meta-analytic review of linear and nonlinear relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 68, 1–47.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare psychopathy checklist—Revised*. Toronto, Canada: MHS.
- Harms, P. D., & Spain, S. M. (2015). Beyond the bright side: Dark personalities at work. *Applied Psychology*, 64, 15–24.
- Harms, P. D., Spain, S. M., & Hannah, S. T. (2011). Leader development and the dark side of personality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 495–509.
- Hawley, P. (2003). Prosocial and coercive configurations of resource control in early adolescent: A case for the well-adapted Machiavellian. *Journal of Development Psychology*, 49, 279–309.
- Higgs, M. (2009). The good, the bad and the ugly: Leadership and narcissism. *Journal of Change Management*, 9, 165–178.
- Hodson, G., Hogg, S. M., & MacInnis, C. C. (2009). The role of “dark personalities” (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy), Big Five personality factors, and ideology in explaining prejudice. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 686–690.
- Johnson, S. L., Leedom, L. J., & Muhtadie, L. (2012). The dominance behavioral system and psychopathology: Evidence from self-report, observational, and biological studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138, 692–743.
- Johnson, R. E., Venus, M., Lanaj, K., Mao, C., & Chang, C.-H. (2012). Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 1262–1272.
- Jonason, P. K., & Ferrell, J. D. (2016). Looking under the hood: The psychogenic motivational foundations of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 94, 324–331.
- Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., & Teicher, E. A. (2010). Who is James Bond? The Dark Triad as an agentic social style. *Individual Differences Research*, 8, 111–120.
- Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., Webster, G. D., & Schmitt, D. P. (2009). The Dark Triad: Facilitating a short-term mating strategy in men. *European Journal of Personality*, 23, 5–18.
- Jonason, P. K., Lyons, M., Bethell, E. J., & Ross, R. (2013). Different routes to limited empathy in the sexes: Examining the links between the Dark Triad and empathy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 572–576.
- Jonason, P. K., Slomski, S., & Partyka, J. (2012). The Dark Triad at work: How toxic employees get their way. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 449–453.
- Jonason, P. K., Wee, S., & Li, N. P. (2015). Competition, autonomy, and prestige: Mechanisms through which the Dark Triad predict job satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 72, 112–116.
- Jonason, P. K., Wee, S., Li, N. P., & Jackson, C. (2014). Occupational niches and the Dark Triad traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 69, 119–123.
- Jones, D. N. (2014). Risk in the face of retribution: Psychopathic individuals persist in financial misbehavior among the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 109–113.

- Jones, D. N., & Figueredo, A. J. (2013). The core of darkness: Uncovering the heart of the Dark Triad. *European Journal of Personality, 27*, 521–531.
- Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2009). Machiavellianism. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 102–120). New York: Guilford.
- Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2011a). Differentiating the Dark Triad within the interpersonal circumplex. In L. M. Horowitz & S. Strack (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal psychology: Theory, research, assessment, and therapeutic interventions* (pp. 249–269). New York: Wiley.
- Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2011b). The role of impulsivity in the Dark Triad of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*, 679–682.
- 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. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 855–875.
- Kajonius, P. J., Persson, B. N., & Jonason, P. K. (2015). Hedonism, achievement, and power: Universal values that characterize the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 77*, 173–178.
- Kaplan, H. S., & Gangestad, S. W. (2005). Life history theory and evolutionary psychology. In D. M. Buss (Ed.), *The handbook of evolutionary psychology* (pp. 68–95). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Kessler, S. R., Bandelli, A. C., Spector, P. E., Borman, W. C., Nelson, C. E., & Penney, L. M. (2010). Re-examining Machiavelli: A three-dimensional model of Machiavellianism in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*, 1868–1896.
- Kiazad, K., Restubog, S. L. D., Zagenczyk, T. J., Kiewitz, C., & Tang, R. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*, 512–519.
- Krasikova, D. V., Green, S. G., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda. *Journal of Management, 39*, 1308–1338.
- Küfner, A. C. P., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2013). The two pathways to being an (un-)popular narcissist. *Journal of Personality, 81*, 184–195.
- Leckelt, M., Küfner, A. C. P., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2015). Behavioral processes underling the decline of narcissists' popularity over time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*, 856–871.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism in the five factor model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 1571–1582.
- Lucke, G. A., & Furtner, M. R. (2015). Soldiers lead themselves to more success: a self-leadership intervention study. *Military Psychology, 27*, 311–324.
- Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review, 78*, 68–77.
- Maccoby, M. (2003). *The productive narcissist: The promise and peril of visionary leadership*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Malesza, M., & Ostaszewski, P. (2016). Dark side of impulsivity—Associations between the Dark Triad, self-report and behavioral measures of impulsivity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 88*, 197–201.
- Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small group. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*, 241–270.
- Mathieu, C., & Babiak, P. (2015). Tell me who you are, I'll tell you how you lead: Beyond the full-range leadership model, the role of corporate psychopathy on employee attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences, 87*, 8–12.
- Mathieu, C., & Babiak, P. (2016). Corporate psychopathy and abusive subversion: Their influence on employees' job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 91*, 102–106.
- Mathieu, C., Neumann, C., Babiak, P., & Hare, R. D. (2015). Corporate psychopathy and the full-range leadership model. *Assessment, 22*, 267–278.

- Mathieu, C., Neumann, C. S., Hare, R. D., & Babiak, P. (2014). A dark side of leadership: Corporate psychopathy and its influence on employee well-being and job satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 59*, 83–88.
- McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington.
- McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- McDonald, M. M., Donnellan, M. B., & Navarrete, C. D. (2011). A life history approach to understanding the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 601–605.
- McIlwain, D., Evans, J., Caldis, E., Cicchini, F., Aronstan, A., Wright, A., & Taylor, A. (2012). Strange moralities: Vicarious emotion and moral emotions in Machiavellian and Psychopathic personality styles. In R. Langdon & C. Mackenzie (Eds.), *Emotions, imagination, and moral reasoning* (pp. 119–148). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 177–196.
- Nagler, U. K. J., Reiter, K. J., Furtner, M. R., & Rauthmann, J. F. (2014). Is there a “dark intelligence”? Emotional intelligence is used by dark personalities to emotionally manipulate others. *Personality and Individual Differences, 65*, 47–52.
- Nevicka, B., Ten Velden, F. S., De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2011). Reality at odds with perceptions: Narcissistic leaders and group performance. *Psychological Science, 22*, 1259–1264.
- O’Boyle, E. H., Jr., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 557–579.
- Ong, C. W., Roberts, R., Arthur, C. A., Woodman, T., & Akehurst, S. (2016). The leader ship is sinking: A temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership. *Journal of Personality, 84*, 237–247.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Ouimet, G. (2010). Dynamics of narcissistic leadership in organizations: Towards an integrated research model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*, 713–726.
- Pailing, A., Boon, J., & Egan, V. (2014). Personality, the Dark Triad and violence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 67*, 81–86.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1197–1208.
- Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Toward a taxonomy of dark personalities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23*, 421–426.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556–563.
- Paunonen, S. V., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Verkasalo, M., Leikas, S., & Nissinen, V. (2006). Narcissism and emergent leadership in military cadets. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 475–486.
- Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership, 6*, 373–389.
- Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590.
- Rauthmann, J. F. (2012). The Dark Triad and interpersonal perception: Similarities and differences in the social consequences of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*, 487–496.
- Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2012). How “dark” are the Dark Triad traits? Examining the perceived darkness of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*, 884–889.
- Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2013). Positioning the Dark Triad in the interpersonal circumplex: The friendly-dominant narcissism, hostile-submissive Machiavellian, and hostile-dominant psychopath? *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*, 622–627.
- Reichard, R. J., & Johnson, S. K. (2011). Leader self-development as organizational strategy. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 33–42.



- Roeser, K., McGregor, V. E., Stegmaier, S., Mathew, J., Kübler, A., & Meule, A. (2016). The Dark Triad of personality and unethical behavior at different times of day. *Personality and Individual Differences, 88*, 73–77.
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 617–633.
- Rushton, J. P. (1985). Differential K theory: The sociobiology of individual and group differences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 6*, 441–452.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*, 577–594.
- Simonton, D. K. (1986). Presidential personality: Biographical use of the Gough Adjective Check List. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 149–160.
- Son Hing, L. S., Bobocel, D. R., Zanna, M. P., & McBride, M. V. (2007). Authoritarian dynamics and unethical decision making: High social dominance orientation leaders and high right-wing authoritarianism followers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 67–81.
- Spain, S. M., Harms, P., & Lebreton, J. M. (2013). The dark side of personality at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*, 41–60.
- Spencer, R. J., & Byrne, M. K. (2016). Relationship between the extent of psychopathic features among corporate managers and subsequent employee job satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 101*, 440–445.
- Spurk, D., Keller, A. C., & Hirschi, A. (2016). Do bad guys get ahead or fall behind? Relationships of the Dark Triad of personality with objective and subjective career success. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 7*, 113–121.
- Stearns, S. C. (1992). *The evolution of life histories*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Veselka, L., Schermer, J. A., Martin, R. A., & Vernon, P. A. (2010). Relations between humor styles and the Dark Triad traits of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 772–774.
- Volmer, J., Koch, I. K., & Göritz, A. S. (2016). The bright and the dark side of leaders' Dark Triad traits: Effects on subordinates' career success and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 101*, 413–418.
- Wai, M., & Tiliopoulos, N. (2012). The affective and cognitive empathic nature of the Dark Triad personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 794–799.
- Westerlaken, K. M., & Woods, P. R. (2013). The relationship between psychopathy and the full range leadership model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*, 41–46.
- Williams, K. M., Paulhus, D. L., & Hare, R. D. (2007). Capturing the four-factor structure of psychopathy in college students via self-report. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 88*, 205–219.
- Winter, D. G. (2005). Things I've learned about personality from studying political leaders at a distance. *Journal of Personality, 73*, 557–584.
- Zand, D. E. (1997). *The leadership triad: Knowledge, trust, and power*. New York: Oxford University.