Copyright American Psychological Association

INTRODUCTION: A BRIGHT FUTURE FOR DARK PERSONALITY FEATURES?

VIRGIL ZEIGLER-HILL AND DAVID K. MARCUS

The past decade has witnessed a dramatic surge in empirical research dedicated to understanding the dark side of personality. This research has flourished despite the fact that there has not been a clear consensus regarding what is necessary or sufficient for a personality feature to be considered "dark." Consistent with previous scholars (e.g., Paulhus & Williams, 2002), we contend that dark personality features are socially aversive and linked with various sorts of interpersonal difficulties and potentially destructive behaviors (e.g., aggression, manipulation, exploitation). For example, certain dark personality features have been linked with the perpetration of sexual violence (e.g., Mouilso & Calhoun, 2012; Zeigler-Hill, Enjaian, & Essa, 2013). Of course, it is important to acknowledge that many personality features, if not all of them, have the potential to be problematic when taken to their most extreme levels (e.g., Grant & Schwartz, 2011). For example,

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14854-001
The Dark Side of Personality: Science and Practice in Social, Personality, and Clinical Psychology, V. Zeigler-Hill and D. K. Marcus (Editors)
Copyright © 2016 by the American Psychological Association. All rights reserved.

Copyright American Psychological Association

conscientiousness is generally considered to be a relatively positive personality feature (e.g., O'Connor, Conner, Jones, McMillan, & Ferguson, 2009), but individuals who are "overly conscientious" may be rigid and inflexible, whereas those who are "not conscientious enough" may be impulsive and undependable. It is relatively easy to imagine scenarios in which nearly any personality feature may be socially aversive. Consequently, we propose that traits be considered "dark" when they are linked with interpersonal difficulties across a variety of contexts even when only modest levels of these features are present.

The purpose of this volume is to provide an overview of the current conceptualizations of a diverse array of personality traits that may have socially aversive, destructive, or dark features. It presents an interdisciplinary approach that extends social and personality psychology to overlap with clinical psychology. In doing so, each chapter in this book discusses implications for assessment and intervention, as well as future directions for research.

In addition to prototypically dark personality traits, this book covers some traits (e.g., spitefulness) that have been largely overlooked by psychologists, despite being topics of interest in associated disciplines (e.g., economics, evolutionary biology), and other traits (e.g., perfectionism) that have been presumed to be largely beneficial even though they may often be associated with negative outcomes. We review not only the maladaptive features of these dark traits but also the adaptive and beneficial features—such as the potential for altruistic outcomes from spitefulness—to provide a more expansive and nuanced analysis.[1] As a consequence, this volume includes a relatively broad range of dark personality traits that have rarely, if ever, been brought together in the same work (e.g., sadism and distractibility; interpersonal dependency and overconfidence). We do not believe that the dark personality traits reviewed in this volume constitute an exhaustive list of dark personality traits or even that these are the most important. Rather, our goal for the volume was to cover a wide array of personality traits that would have the potential to expand the common understanding of the dark side of personality. We hope this volume will draw attention to a range of personality traits that have dark aspects.

The dark personality features that have received the most empirical attention during the past decade are the *Dark Triad*, which is a constellation of personality traits that includes narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism

[1]Throughout the book, the terms *adaptive* and *maladaptive* are used in their broadest sense as synonyms for functional or dysfunctional or as being associated with positive or negative outcomes. Unless the authors specify otherwise, these terms are not intended to imply biological adaptation.

Copyright American Psychological Association

(for a review, see Furnham, Richards, & Paulhus, 2013). The first component of the Dark Triad is narcissism, which refers to exaggerated feelings of grandiosity, vanity, self-absorption, and entitlement (e.g., Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). The construct of narcissism takes its name from the character of Narcissus from Greek mythology, who drowned after falling in love with his own reflection in a pool of water. Narcissism tends to interfere with various aspects of interpersonal functioning because others generally become tired of the exploitative, self-centered, and grandiose tendencies of narcissists (for a review, see Dowgwillo, Dawood, & Pincus, Chapter 1, this volume). Psychopathy is often considered to be the most malevolent of the Dark Triad traits (e.g., Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Rauthmann, 2012), and it is characterized by features that include impulsivity, thrill seeking, callousness, fearlessness, and interpersonal aggression (Hare, 1985; Harpur, Hare, & Hakstian, 1989; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996; Patrick, Fowles, & Krueger, 2009; see also Chapter 3, this volume, for a review of the fearless dominance component of psychopathy, and Chapter 2, this volume, for a review of the callous component). Not only are these features of psychopathy only loosely associated with one another (Marcus, Fulton, & Edens, 2013; Miller & Lynam, 2012), but impulsivity—one of its core features—is itself multifaceted (Whiteside & Lynam, 2001; see Part II of this volume). The third component of the Dark Triad is Machiavellianism. The term *Machiavellianism* is a homage to Niccolò Machiavelli, who was a political advisor to the Medici family in the 16th century. His most famous work (*The Prince*) described the sort of manipulative and calculating interpersonal strategies that would become his namesake. Machiavellianism reflects an extremely selfish orientation in which an individual is willing to use whatever means are necessary to attain his or her goals (e.g., deception, manipulation, exploitation; see Chapter 4, this volume, for a review).

Interest in the Dark Triad originated with McHoskey, Worzel, and Szyarto (1998), who examined these personality features with special attention given to the similarities between psychopathy and Machiavellianism. The similarities and differences among the Dark Triad personality traits were further expanded and clarified by Paulhus and Williams (2002), who coined the term *Dark Triad*. These authors noted that the Dark Triad traits shared characteristics such as disagreeableness, callousness, deceitfulness, egocentrism, lack of honesty-humility, and tendencies toward interpersonal manipulation and exploitation. It has been argued that one or more of these shared features may capture the true core of the Dark Triad, but the search for this elusive core has led to considerable debate (see Book, Visser, & Volk, 2015, for an extended discussion). The disagreement over the core of the Dark Triad may be due, at least in part, to the fact that these personality traits are "overlapping but distinct constructs" (Paulhus & Williams, 2002, p. 556).

Copyright American Psychological Association

RESEARCH CONCERNING THE DARK TRIAD

Narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism have each received considerable empirical attention outside their inclusion in the Dark Triad, but it is impressive that nearly 150 articles have explicitly focused on this particular constellation of dark personality features during the past decade (for a review, see, Furnham et al., 2013). Paulhus and Williams (2002) suggested that researchers interested in any one of these traits should assess all three to gain a clearer understanding of the extent to which each trait uniquely predicts particular outcomes (for an extended discussion, see Furnham, Richards, Rangel, & Jones, 2014). To distinguish between the unique contributions of the Dark Triad traits, researchers often use statistical approaches that account for their shared variance (e.g., entering all three Dark Triad traits into a simultaneous regression; e.g., Furnham et al., 2014).

The Dark Triad traits have been found to predict a wide array of behaviors and interpersonal tendencies. We cannot address the breadth of research concerning the Dark Triad in this brief introduction, so we limit our review to some aspects of interpersonal behavior (see Furnham et al., 2013, for a discussion of the connections that the Dark Triad traits have with a much broader range of outcomes). The Dark Triad traits have often been found to be associated with behaviors and qualities that may contribute to impaired social relationship functioning including aggressive tendencies (Jones & Paulhus, 2010), limited empathic abilities (Jonason & Krause, 2013; Jonason, Lyons, Bethell, & Ross, 2013), interpersonal styles reflecting a blend of dominance and hostility (Jonason & Webster, 2012; Jones & Paulhus, 2011; Southard, Noser, Pollock, Mercer, & Zeigler-Hill, in press), a willingness to use coercive strategies to obtain desired resources (Zeigler-Hill, Southard, & Besser, 2014), a focus on self-advancement with relatively little concern for others (Zuroff, Fournier, Patall, & Leybman, 2010), and a tendency to use deception (Baughman, Jonason, Lyons, & Vernon, 2014; Book et al., 2015).

There are clearly important similarities between the Dark Triad traits, but it is also important to acknowledge some of their differences as well. One area of divergence concerns the fact that psychopathy and Machiavellianism are often viewed as "darker" or more "toxic" personality features than narcissism (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2012). This view is supported by the results of studies showing that psychopathy and Machiavellianism have stronger associations with outcomes such as a relative lack of moral concerns (Arvan, 2013; Glenn, Iyer, Graham, Koleva, & Haidt, 2009). Another key difference among the Dark Triad traits concerns their connections with aggressive behavior following provocation. Psychopathy is associated with the use of aggression in response to physical threats (Jones & Paulhus, 2011), whereas narcissism is most strongly linked with aggressive behavior

Copyright American Psychological Association

following self-esteem threats (e.g., Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Jones & Paulhus, 2010; Twenge & Campbell, 2003). In contrast to psychopathy and narcissism, Machiavellianism does not have particularly strong connections with aggressive behavior following any sort of provocation (Chapter 4, this volume). The lack of aggression displayed by individuals with high levels of Machiavellianism may be explained, to at least some extent, by their caution. In contrast to the cautious and deliberate approach that characterizes those with Machiavellian tendencies, both psychopathy (Hart & Dempster, 1997) and narcissism (Vazire & Funder, 2006) are closely linked with impulsivity.

The Dark Triad has provided a valuable framework for considering socially aversive personality traits, and it has clearly generated a great deal of interest and research. However, it is unlikely that only three dark personality features exist. For example, there have been recent suggestions to expand the Dark Triad into the newly christened *Dark Tetrad* with the inclusion of sadism (e.g., Buckels, Jones, & Paulhus, 2013; Chabrol, Van Leeuwen, Rodgers, & Séjourné, 2009). In addition, Miller et al. (2010) suggested that researchers consider a second constellation of personality features that were both dark and emotionally vulnerable, which they referred to as the *Vulnerable Dark Triad* (i.e., borderline personality features, vulnerable narcissism, and secondary psychopathy). We are supportive of attempts to broaden the examination of dark personality features beyond those included in the Dark Triad (or recent expansions such as the Dark Tetrad or Vulnerable Dark Triad), including characteristics that have received relatively little previous attention, such as spitefulness (Marcus, Zeigler-Hill, Mercer, & Norris, 2014) and status-driven risk taking (Visser, Pozzebon, & Reina-Tamayo, 2014). However, we believe that it is simply too early in the process of understanding these dark personality features to attempt to identify the precise number of dark personality features that exist. Will the Dark Tetrad expand at some point to be the Dark Pentad? Would the Dark Hexad be far behind? We contend that this sort of enumeration approach may be overly constricting and may actually lead researchers to ignore other personality features that may be socially aversive or problematic in other ways. It is important to cast a somewhat wider net because the Dark Triad—or the Dark Tetrad—consists of personality traits that are relatively antagonistic, dishonest, and egocentric. We agree that antagonism is a vitally important aspect of dark personality features, but we would like scholars to consider adopting a somewhat broader view of dark personality features that extends beyond those features that are overtly antagonistic. In essence, we contend that there may actually be various types of dark personality features that deserve close consideration even if they are not overtly antagonistic in nature. This broader view of dark personality serves as the impetus for this volume.

Copyright American Psychological Association

A BROADER VIEW OF DARK PERSONALITY FEATURES

A considerable body of previous research has examined the links that certain dark personality features have with basic models of personality such as the Big Five personality dimensions (e.g., Lee & Ashton, 2014), the HEXACO model (e.g., Jonason & McCain, 2012; Lee & Ashton, 2014), and the interpersonal circumplex (e.g., Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013b; Southard et al., in press). These studies have offered insights into these dark personality features. For example, individuals with high levels of narcissism have been shown to possess low levels of agreeableness and high levels of extraversion, which has led to them being described as "disagreeable extraverts" (Paulhus, 2001). This work has also led to the development of assessment instruments for some dark personality features that are derived from basic personality models including the Five-Factor Narcissism Inventory (Glover, Miller, Lynam, Crego, & Widiger, 2012). The most ambitious attempt to integrate basic personality dimensions with the darker side of personality may be the model of pathological personality features that was described in Section III ("Emerging Measures and Models" in need of further study) of the fifth edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (*DSM–5*; American Psychiatric Association, 2013; see Krueger et al., 2011, for a review).[2] This model of pathological personality is concerned with maladaptive variants of the Big Five personality dimensions of extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness (Thomas et al., 2013) and has led to the development of the Personality Inventory for the *DSM–5* (PID–5; Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson, & Skodol, 2012). The PID–5 is used to capture the following personality dimensions: detachment (which is characterized by introversion, social isolation, and anhedonia), negative affect (which concerns the tendency to experience an array of negative emotions), antagonism (which refers to aggressive tendencies accompanied by assertions of dominance and grandiosity), disinhibition (which includes impulsivity and sensation seeking), and psychoticism (which involves a disconnection from reality and a tendency for illogical thought patterns). In addition to these higher order dimensions, the PID–5 consists of 25 lower order facets including callousness, deceitfulness, depressivity, hostility, submissiveness, and withdrawal. Research concerning the PID–5 is clearly still in its earliest stages but it has already demonstrated considerable potential (e.g., Hopwood, Schade, Krueger, Wright, & Markon, 2013; Noser et al., 2015; Strickland, Drislane, Lucy, Krueger, & Patrick, 2013).

[2]The dimensional model of personality pathology is *DSM*-specific and therefore does not have a counterpart in the *International Classification of Diseases*.

Copyright American Psychological Association

The PID–5 has the potential to expand our view of dark personality features, but it is not without its possible flaws. Although the PID–5 is an important extension of traditional measures of the Big Five personality dimensions, which often assess relatively moderate levels of these personality dimensions without capturing extreme or atypical levels (e.g., Samuel, Simms, Clark, Livesley, & Widiger, 2010), it is still somewhat limited because it focuses only on potentially maladaptive aspects of the Big Five dimensions in a single direction. As we noted earlier, personality traits may be problematic when individuals possess either extremely low levels or extremely high levels of these traits. For example, individuals who possess levels of conscientiousness that are extremely low may be impulsive and undependable, whereas those with levels of conscientiousness that are extremely high may be somewhat rigid and inflexible. The PID–5 model was intended to account for extremely low levels of conscientiousness, but it is limited in its ability to detect extremely high levels of conscientiousness, which may also have dark elements (e.g., authoritarian or obsessive personality features). Similar limitations exist for the other dimensions (e.g., antagonism captures extremely low levels of agreeableness, but there is little attention given to personality features reflecting extremely high levels of agreeableness such as gullibility).

Dark personality features are socially aversive and associated with a range of negative outcomes, but it is important to note that these personality features may be at least somewhat beneficial in some areas of life. One example of the potential benefits that stem from dark personality features is success in short-term mating contexts (Holtzman & Strube, 2011, 2013; Jonason, Li, Webster, & Schmitt, 2009). For example, individuals with higher levels of narcissism and psychopathy report larger numbers of previous sexual partners and preferences for relationships that require little commitment (e.g., Jonason, Luevano, & Adams, 2012; Jonason et al., 2009) and greater willingness to use deceptive and manipulative mating behaviors, such as mate poaching and infidelity (e.g., Jonason & Buss, 2012; Jonason, Li, & Buss, 2010). Interestingly, women consistently evaluate men with narcissistic and psychopathic personality features as being more attractive than other men (Carter, Campbell, & Muncer, 2014b; cf. Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013a). The link between dark personality features and success in short-term mating contexts has been considered from the perspective of life history theory (i.e., a midlevel model from evolutionary biology that provides an explanation for energy and resource allocation across the life span), and it has been argued that some dark personality features—such as the Dark Triad—may represent alternative life-history strategies that are focused on short-term mating (Book et al., 2015; Carter, Campbell, & Muncer, 2014a; Figueredo et al., 2009; Jonason et al., 2012).

Copyright American Psychological Association

The results concerning the short-term mating success of those with some dark personality features suggest the intriguing possibility that certain dark personality features may represent specialized adaptations that allow individuals to exploit particular niches within society (e.g., Furnham et al., 2013; Jonason, Jones, & Lyons, 2013). In addition to life-history theory, several other promising evolutionary approaches have been applied to understanding dark personality features, including costly signaling theory, mutation load, flexibly contingent shifts in strategy according to environmental conditions, environmental variability in fitness optima, and frequency-dependent selection (for a review, see Buss, 2009). A prominent example of these evolutionary explanations is the argument that psychopathy is the expression of a frequency-dependent life strategy that is selected in response to varying environmental circumstances (Mealey, 1995). Frequency-dependent selection involves a dynamic equilibrium in which certain characteristics (e.g., psychopathic personality features) will be advantageous to the individuals who possess them as long as the frequency of those characteristics remains relatively low in the general population. This frequency-dependent model could easily be applied to other dark personality features (e.g., spitefulness, impulsivity), but it is important to note that the original model concerning psychopathy has been criticized on multiple fronts, including the heritability estimates of psychopathy (e.g., Crusio, 1995; Stoltenberg, 1997) and the failure to consider more parsimonious explanations (Crusio, 2004).

OVERVIEW OF THE VOLUME

Our goal for this volume was to expand the appreciation that researchers and clinicians have for what constitutes dark personality traits beyond the ubiquitous Dark Triad (i.e., narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism; see Furnham et al., 2013, for a review). Consequently, we cast a wide net when identifying potentially dark personality traits that were worthy of review. First, the broad constellations of dark personality features that we included in this volume were informed by the recent work that has been done to develop a stronger connection between pathological personality features and the Big Five personality dimensions (e.g., Thomas et al., 2013). This can be readily seen by our decision to include sections concerning negative affectivity, antagonism, and disinhibition which are all considered to be pathological personality trait domains in the model that is included in *DSM–5* (Krueger et al., 2012). We also included a section on rigidity because we believe this is an important domain that has often been ignored by those researchers who are interested in dark personality features.

Copyright American Psychological Association

A second strategy was to include the Dark Triad traits such that we dedicated individual chapters to narcissism and Machiavellianism (as well as sadism, which has recently been included as part of the newly christened Dark Tetrad). In the case of psychopathy, however, there is compelling evidence that it is best understood as a multidimensional construct and that these various dimensions are only loosely associated with one another and often have distinct (and even opposite) associations with various external correlates (e.g., Benning, Patrick, Hicks, Blonigen, & Krueger, 2003; for a meta-analytic review, see Marcus et al., 2013). In other words, psychopathy may be a compound variable (Lilienfeld, 2013) that emerges when its independent components happen to co-occur. Therefore, rather than devote a single chapter to psychopathy, we followed the outline of the triarchic model of psychopathy (Patrick et al., 2009), which conceptualizes psychopathy as the confluence of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition. In the current volume, the chapter on fearless dominance corresponds to boldness, and the chapter on callousness corresponds to meanness. Disinhibition was represented by the traits of sensation seeking, urgency, and distractibility with urgency being the trait that is most closely related to the disinhibition component of psychopathy (Ray, Poythress, Weir, & Rickelm, 2009). Thus, by deconstructing the compound trait of psychopathy into its constituent parts, we expanded the range of dark personality traits. Furthermore, because psychopathy is not a unitary construct, researchers working within the Dark Triad framework should consider assessing and analyzing the components of psychopathy instead of relying on a composite psychopathy score, which may either amalgamate a set of disparate traits or fail to assess the full range of traits encompassed by the psychopathy construct depending on the particular instrument that is used.

A third strategy we used for expanding the realm of dark personality traits was to consider traits that are decidedly dark but that have not been included in the traditional dark personality literature. Given its associations with fascism, prejudice, and scapegoating, authoritarianism (Ludeke, Chapter 11, this volume) may be as interpersonally destructive and potentially dangerous as any of the Dark Triad traits. Furthermore, authoritarianism is only weakly correlated with the Dark Triad traits (Hodson, Hogg, & MacInnis, 2009; Jonason, 2015), so it may independently contribute to the prediction of various negative outcomes. Spite is another unambiguously dark personality trait. Unlike authoritarianism, which has generated thousands of psychological studies (Ludeke, Chapter 11, this volume) even if it has not been included in the Dark Triad, spite has received surprisingly little attention from personality and clinical psychologists (Marcus & Norris, Chapter 6, this volume). There are a variety of other understudied personality traits—such as greed (Marcus & Zeigler-Hill, 2015) and self-righteousness—that might also have been included in this volume,

Copyright American Psychological Association

but the research base for these traits is so limited that it would have been premature to review them.

A fourth strategy to expand the range of dark personality traits was to include internalizing traits. Whereas the traditional Dark Triad traits are associated with inflicting harm and misery on others, the traits reflecting negative affectivity are prototypically associated with the misery they bring to their possessors. We believe that there is a benefit to expanding the notion of dark traits beyond antagonistic or externalizing traits, and a trait may also be considered dark if it is associated with self-harm (e.g., suicide, social impairment). Yet it is noteworthy that many of these "internalizing" traits are also associated with aggressive behaviors and harm to others.

Finally, we also included some traits that might superficially be considered neutral or even positive but that also have darker aspects. For example, fearless dominance is considered to be the "right stuff" for bravery and heroism, but it is also a component of psychopathy (Lilienfeld, Smith, & Watts, Chapter 3, this volume). Similarly, perfectionism is a trait that is often assumed to be adaptive and desirable because it inspires people to produce their best work. Yet, as discussed by Flett, Hewitt, and Sherry (Chapter 10, this volume), high levels of perfectionism are associated not only with personal misery, including suicidality, but, in extreme cases, perfectionism can lead to interpersonal violence and even murder. Even overconfidence, a trait that may be considered more annoying than dark, can have harmful interpersonal consequences. As detailed by Ehrlinger and Eichenbaum (Chapter 12, this volume), in some circumstances, overconfidence can result in disastrous and deadly outcomes (e.g., the deaths of more than 800 overconfident but ill-prepared people who have tried to climb Nepali mountains; the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba). Similarly, distractibility might also be considered more irritating than dark until one considers, for example, all of the injuries and deaths caused by distracted drivers (Barry, Fisher, DiSabatino, & Tomeny, Chapter 9, this volume).

Part I: Antagonism

Part I (Chapters 1–6) examines a range of personality features that share a common core of antagonism and includes elements of the Dark Tetrad. Chapter 1 (Dowgwillo, Dawood, & Pincus) is concerned with *narcissism*, which reflects feelings of grandiosity, vanity, self-absorption, and entitlement. The authors consider recent developments in our understanding of narcissism including contemporary models of pathological narcissism that incorporate both grandiose and vulnerable aspects of narcissism.

Chapter 2 (Pardini & Ray) focuses on *callousness*, which is a facet of psychopathy that is characterized by an indifference to the pain and suffering of others, a lack of remorse and guilt for wrongdoing, blunted emotional

Copyright American Psychological Association

responses, and a failure to develop close emotional bonds with others. The authors review a body of work that has clearly identified callousness as a core feature of psychopathy.

Chapter 3 (Lilienfeld et al.) deals with *fearless dominance*, which is another facet of psychopathy. Fearless dominance includes characteristics such as interpersonal potency, physical fearlessness, risk taking, and calmness in the face of danger. The authors review evidence suggesting the intriguing possibility that fearless dominance, which seems like a positive quality on the surface, may be detrimental in daily life when it is paired with qualities such as poor impulse control.

Chapter 4 (Jones) is concerned with *Machiavellianism*, which reflects a tendency to use strategic behaviors for selfish gains (e.g., deceitfulness, manipulation). The author reviews research that suggests Machiavellianism is linked with characteristics and behaviors such as being calculating and strategic, cautious, and highly sensitive to rewards and punishments.

Chapter 5 (Paulhus & Dutton) reviews *sadism* (i.e., the enjoyment of other people's suffering) which may explain common behaviors such as humiliating others, bullying others, or enjoying depictions of violence in sports, films, or video games.

Chapter 6 (Marcus & Norris) concerns *spitefulness* which is the tendency for individuals to be willing to incur costs to themselves in order to inflict costs on others. The authors consider recent advancements in the study of spitefulness in psychology as well as the way that fields such as economics and evolutionary biology have included this intriguing construct.

Part II: Disinhibition

Part II (Chapters 7–9) examines specific aspects of disinhibition. Chapter 7 (Maples-Keller, Berke, Few, & Miller) concerns *sensation seeking*, which reflects the desire for varied, novel, and complex experiences as well as the willingness to take various risks (i.e., physical and social) to have these experiences. The authors explore the complex nomological network surrounding sensation seeking, which includes behaviors that are largely beneficial or neutral as well as those that are detrimental or antisocial.

Chapter 8 (Cyders, Coskunpinar, & VanderVeen) focuses on *urgency*, which reflects the tendency to engage in behaviors that may be detrimental to the self or others in response to extreme levels of affect. The authors suggest that urgency may be the most clinically relevant of the traits connected to impulsivity and that it serves as a common, transdiagnostic endophenotype for a wide array of negative outcomes and clinical disorders.

Chapter 9 (Barry et al.) reviews *distractibility*, which is an interruption in selective attention that is caused by an inability to ignore extraneous stimuli

Copyright American Psychological Association

from both external and internal sources. Although it appears that there are some positive outcomes linked with distractibility (e.g., creativity), the existing evidence clearly indicates that distractibility is associated with a wide array of maladaptive outcomes.

Part III: Rigidity

Part III (Chapters 10–12) examines the broad domain of rigidity. Chapter 10 (Flett et al.) concerns a multidimensional view of *perfectionism* that includes self-oriented perfectionism (i.e., setting unrealistic self-standards), other-oriented perfectionism (i.e., setting exacting standards for other people), and socially prescribed perfectionism (i.e., the perception that others demand perfection from the self). Although the term *perfectionist* often has positive connotations linked to it, the authors provide compelling evidence that there is an important dark side to perfectionism.

Chapter 11 (Ludeke) reviews *authoritarianism*, which includes the tendency to submit to established authorities, a willingness to aggress against those condemned by those authorities, and a preference for traditional values. The author reviews evidence that the detrimental consequences of authoritarianism—especially for the lives of others—clearly outweighs its benefits as well as research concerning how to reduce authoritarianism or mitigate against its negative impact on others.

Chapter 12 (Ehrlinger & Eichenbaum) concerns *overconfidence*, which is defined as an overly positive perception of oneself relative to some comparison standard. The authors review research findings that suggest overconfidence is a ubiquitous feature of human judgment and decision making that stems from the desire to think well of oneself as well as how individuals organize information.

Part IV: Negative Affectivity

Part IV (Chapters 13–17) examines the broad domain of negative affectivity. Chapter 13 (Gratz, Dixon-Gordon, & Whalen) concerns *emotional lability*, which is concerned with intense, frequent, and reactive shifts in emotional states. The authors argue that a more complex model of emotional lability is needed because extreme levels of emotional lability—both high and low—are risk factors for some forms of psychopathology or other negative outcomes (e.g., an inability to respond appropriately to emotionally salient environmental cues).

Chapter 14 (Rosellini & Brown) focuses on *anxiousness*, which refers to a dispositional tendency to experience anxiety-related physiological reactions (e.g., increased heart rate), cognitions (e.g., worries), and behaviors

Copyright American Psychological Association

(e.g., avoidance) when confronted with stressful events. The authors suggest that future research focusing on anxiousness, rather than higher order constructs such as negative affectivity, may shed additional light on the connections between personality and psychopathology.

Chapter 15 (Kessel & Klein) considers *depressive* personality features (i.e., a dispositional tendency to experience depression-related affect, cognitions, and behaviors) and *anhedonic* personality features (i.e., a dispositional inability to experience pleasure from activities that are usually found to be pleasurable). They argue that depressive and anhedonic personality features may have more in common than is generally recognized (e.g., both may stem from the same temperamental vulnerability) and that understanding the similarities and differences between these constructs will have broader benefits for our understanding of dark personality features.

Chapter 16 (Zeigler-Hill et al.) focuses on *self-esteem*, which is defined as the evaluative aspect of self-knowledge that reflects the extent that individuals like themselves and believe they are competent. The authors review the links that low self-esteem has with a range of outcomes as well as considering the role that fragile self-esteem plays in moderating the associations that self-esteem level has with important life outcomes.

Chapter 17 (Bornstein) concerns *interpersonal dependency*, which is often defined as the tendency to rely on others for help, nurturance, guidance, and protection even in those situations when autonomous functioning is possible. The author contends that the core of interpersonal dependency is a helpless self-schema in which individuals perceive themselves as weak and unable to survive without the guidance and support of others.

Part V: Current and Future Issues

Chapter 18 (Marcus & Zeigler-Hill) offers an integration of the chapters included in this volume as well as possible future directions for research concerning dark personality features.

CONCLUSION

We believe that the consideration of dark personality features has a great deal to offer to our understanding of human behavior. The Dark Triad traits of narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism have provided an excellent foundation for work in this area, but we believe that it is important for researchers to move beyond these traits and consider investigating other dark personality features. We contend that it is reasonable to use the term

Copyright American Psychological Association

dark for socially aversive personality features that extend beyond those that are antagonistic or externalizing in nature. As a result, we believe that many of the personality features described in this volume (e.g., spitefulness, perfectionism) have the potential to be aversive or harmful to others—even when they are only present in modest levels—and so warrant consideration as part of an extended constellation of dark personality features. To be clear, we are not claiming that the personality features discussed in this volume represent a comprehensive list of dark personality features. Rather, we believe that our current efforts are merely an intermediate step in the process of developing a deeper and more complete understanding of dark personality features. The contributions of the authors included in this volume, as well as the many other researchers who are doing exciting work in this area of the literature, provide us with hope that there will be a bright future for research concerning dark personality features.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.

Arvan, M. (2013). Bad news for conservatives? Moral judgments and the Dark Triad personality traits: A correlational study. *Neuroethics*, 6, 307–318. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12152-011-9140-6

Baughman, H. M., Jonason, P. K., Lyons, M., & Vernon, P. A. (2014). Liar liar pants on fire: Cheater strategies linked to the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *71*, 35–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.07.019

Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Hicks, B. M., Blonigen, D. M., & Krueger, R. F. (2003). Factor structure of the psychopathic personality inventory: Validity and implications for clinical assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, *15*, 340–350.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.016

Buckels, E. E., Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). Behavioral confirmation of everyday sadism. *Psychological Science*, *24*, 2201–2209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797613490749

Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 219–229. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.219

Buss, D. M. (2009). How can evolutionary psychology successfully explain personality and individual differences? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*, 359–366. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01138.x

Copyright American Psychological Association

Carter, G. L., Campbell, A. C., & Muncer, S. (2014a). The dark triad: Beyond a "male" mating strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *56*, 159–164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.09.001

Carter, G. L., Campbell, A. C., & Muncer, S. (2014b). The Dark Triad personality: Attractiveness to women. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *56*, 57–61. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.021

Chabrol, H., Van Leeuwen, N., Rodgers, R., & Séjourné, N. (2009). Contributions of psychopathic, narcissistic, Machiavellian, and sadistic personality traits to juvenile delinquency. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*, 734–739. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.020

Crusio, W. E. (1995). The sociopathy of sociobiology. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *18*, 552. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00039716

Crusio, W. E. (2004). The sociobiology of sociopathy: An alternative hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *27*, 154–155. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X04220040

Figueredo, A. J., Wolf, P. S. A., Gladden, P. R., Olderbak, S. G., Andrzejczak, D. J., & Jacobs, W. J. (2009). Ecological approaches to personality. In D. M. Buss & P. H. Hawley (Eds.), *The evolution of personality and individual differences* (pp. 210–241). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12018

Furnham, A., Richards, S., Rangel, L., & Jones, D. N. (2014). Measuring malevolence: Quantitative issues surrounding the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *67*, 114–121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.001

Glenn, A. L., Iyer, R., Graham, J., Koleva, S., & Haidt, J. (2009). Are all types of morality compromised in psychopathy? *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *23*, 384–398. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2009.23.4.384

Glover, N., Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., Crego, C., & Widiger, T. A. (2012). The five-factor narcissism inventory: A five-factor measure of narcissistic personality traits. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *94*, 500–512. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.670680

Grant, A. M., & Schwartz, B. (2011). Too much of a good thing: The challenge and opportunity of the inverted U. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*, 61–76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393523

Hare, R. D. (1985). Comparison of procedures for the assessment of psychopathy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *53*, 7–16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.53.1.7

Harpur, T. J., Hare, R. D., & Hakstian, R. A. (1989). Two-factor conceptualization of psychopathy: Construct validity and assessment implications. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *1*, 6–17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.1.1.6

Copyright American Psychological Association

Hart, S. D., & Dempster, R. J. (1997). Impulsivity and psychopathy. In C. D. Webster & M. A. Jackson (Eds.), *Impulsivity: Theory, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 212–232). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.02.005

Holtzman, N. S., & Strube, M. J. (2011). The intertwined evolution of narcissism and short-term mating: An emerging hypothesis. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 210–220). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118093108.ch19

Holtzman, N. S., & Strube, M. J. (2013). Above and beyond short-term mating, long-term mating is uniquely tied to human personality. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *11*, 1101–1129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/147470491301100514

Hopwood, C. J., Schade, N., Krueger, R. F., Wright, A. G. C., & Markon, K. E. (2013). Connecting *DSM–5* personality traits and pathological beliefs: Toward a unifying model. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *35*, 162–172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10862-012-9332-3

Jonason, P. K. (2015). How "dark" personality traits and perceptions come together to predict racism in Australia. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *72*, 47–51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.08.030

Jonason, P. K., & Buss, D. M. (2012). Avoiding entangling commitments: Tactics for implementing a short-term mating strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *52*, 606–610. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.12.015

Jonason, P. K., Jones, A., & Lyons, M. (2013). Creatures of the night: Chronotypes and the Dark Triad traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55*, 538–541. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.05.001

Jonason, P. K., & Krause, L. (2013). The emotional deficits associated with the Dark Triad traits: Cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and alexithymia. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55*, 532–537. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.04.027

Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., & Buss, D. M. (2010). The costs and benefits of the Dark Triad: Implications for mate poaching and mate retention tactics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*, 373–378. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.11.003

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/per.698

Jonason, P. K., Luevano, V. X., & Adams, H. M. (2012). How the Dark Triad traits predict relationship choices. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*, 180–184. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.03.007

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.

Copyright American Psychological Association

Personality and Individual Differences, *54*, 572–576. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.009

Jonason, P. K., & McCain, J. (2012). Using the HEXACO model to test the validity of the Dirty Dozen measure of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*, 935–938. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.07.010

Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2012). A protean approach to social influence: Dark Triad personalities and social influence tactics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *52*, 521–526. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.023

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2010). Different provocations trigger aggression in narcissists and psychopaths. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *1*, 12–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1948550609347591

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2011). 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, NY: Wiley.

Krueger, R. F., Derringer, J., Markon, K. E., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. E. (2012). Initial construction of a maladaptive personality trait model and inventory for *DSM–5*. *Psychological Medicine*, *42*, 1879–1890. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002674

Krueger, R. F., Eaton, N. R., Clark, L. A., Watson, D., Markon, K. E., Derringer, J., . . . Livesley, W. J. (2011). Deriving an empirical structure of personality pathology for *DSM–5*. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *25*, 170–191. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2011.25.2.170

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *67*, 2–5. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.048

Lilienfeld, S. O. (2013). Is psychopathy a syndrome? Commentary on Marcus, Fulton, and Edens. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *4*, 85–86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027544

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *66*, 488–524. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6603_3

Marcus, D. K., Fulton, J. J., & Edens, J. F. (2013). The two-factor model of psychopathic personality: Evidence from the Psychopathic Personality Inventory. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *4*, 67–76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025282

Marcus, D. K., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). A big tent of dark personality traits. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *9*, 434–446.

Marcus, D. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Mercer, S. H., & Norris, A. L. (2014). The psychology of spite and the measurement of spitefulness. *Psychological Assessment*, *26*, 563–574. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036039

Copyright American Psychological Association

McHoskey, J. W., Worzel, W., & Szyarto, C. (1998). Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 192–210. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.192

Mealey, L. (1995). The sociobiology of sociopathy: An integrated evolutionary model. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *18*, 523–599. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00039595

Miller, J. D., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Searching for a vulnerable dark triad: Comparing Factor 2 psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality*, *78*, 1529–1564. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00660.x

Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2012). An examination of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory's nomological network: A meta-analytic review. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *3*, 305–326. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024567

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Expanding the dynamic self-regulatory processing model of narcissism: Research directions for the future. *Psychological Inquiry*, *12*, 243–251. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1204_3

Mouilso, E. R., & Calhoun, K. S. (2012). A mediation model of the role of sociosexuality in the associations between narcissism, psychopathy, and sexual aggression. *Psychology of Violence*, *2*, 16–27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026217

Noser, A. E., Zeigler-Hill, V., Vrabel, J. K., Besser, A., Ewing, T. D., & Southard, A. C. (2015). Dark and immoral: The links between pathological personality features and moral values. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *75*, 30–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.11.010

O'Connor, D. B., Conner, M., Jones, F., McMillan, B., & Ferguson, E. (2009). Exploring the benefits of conscientiousness: An investigation of the role of daily stressors and health behaviors. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, *37*, 184–196. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12160-009-9087-6

Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Development and Psychopathology*, *21*, 913–938. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579409000492

Paulhus, D. L. (2001). Normal narcissism: Two minimalist accounts. *Psychological Inquiry*, *12*, 228–230.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *36*, 556–563. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1948550611427608

Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2012). How "dark" are the Dark Triad traits? Examining the perceived darkness of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy.

Copyright American Psychological Association

Personality and Individual Differences, *53*, 884–889. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.06.020

Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2013a). The perceived attractiveness and traits of the dark triad: Narcissists are perceived as hot, Machiavellians and psychopaths not. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*, 582–586. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.005

Rauthmann, J. F., & Kolar, G. P. (2013b). Positioning the dark triad in the interpersonal circumplex: The friendly–dominant narcissist, hostile–submissive Machiavellian, and hostile–dominant psychopath? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*, 622–627. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.021

Ray, J. V., Poythress, N. G., Weir, J. M., & Rickelm, A. (2009). Relationships between psychopathy and impulsivity in the domain of self-reported personality features. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *46*, 83–87. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.09.005

Samuel, D. B., Simms, L. J., Clark, L. A., Livesley, W. J., & Widiger, T. A. (2010). An item response theory integration of normal and abnormal personality scales. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *1*, 5–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018136

Southard, A. C., Noser, A. E., Pollock, N. C., Mercer, S. H., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (in press). The interpersonal nature of dark personality features. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*.

Stoltenberg, S. F. (1997). Heritability estimates provide a crumbling foundation. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *20*, 525–532. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X97001519

Strickland, C. M., Drislane, L. E., Lucy, M., Krueger, R. F., & Patrick, C. J. (2013). Characterizing psychopathy using *DSM–5* personality traits. *Assessment*, *20*, 327–338. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191113486691

Thomas, K. M., Yalch, M. M., Krueger, R. F., Wright, A. G. C., Markon, K. E., & Hopwood, C. J. (2013). The convergent structure of *DSM–5* personality trait facets and five-factor model trait domains. *Assessment*, *20*, 308–311. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191112457589

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2003). "Isn't it fun to get the respect that we're going to deserve?" Narcissism, social rejection, and aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 261–272. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167202239051

Vazire, S., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Impulsivity and the self-defeating behavior of narcissists. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 154–165. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_4

Visser, B. A., Pozzebon, J. A., & Reina-Tamayo, A. (2014). Status-driven risk taking: Another "dark" personality? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, *46*, 485–496.

Whiteside, S. P., & Lynam, D. R. (2001). The five factor model and impulsivity: Using a structural model of personality to understand impulsivity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *30*, 669–689. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00064-7

Copyright American Psychological Association

Zeigler-Hill, V., Enjaian, B., & Essa, L. (2013). The role of narcissistic personality features in sexual aggression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *32*, 186–199. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2013.32.2.186

Zeigler-Hill, V., Southard, A. C., & Besser, A. (2014). Resource control strategies and personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 66, 118–123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.03.037

Zuroff, D. C., Fournier, M. A., Patall, E. A., & Leybman, M. J. (2010). Steps toward an evolutionary personality psychology: Individual differences in the social rank domain. *Canadian Psychology*, *51*, 58–66. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018472