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1. Introduction. The research on leadership and narcissism crosses three fields of study—personality psychology, personality assessment, and leadership—and this is the context in which the topic should be placed in order to be properly understood. Our paper is organized in four sections. In the first, we define the key terms—personality, personality assessment, and leadership—discussions of these topics are often muddled due to the lack of clear definitions. The second section concerns narcissism as a component of personality; the third section is about the assessment of narcissism, and the final section deals with narcissism and leadership.

A. Personality. In his classic essay, MacKinnon (1948) noted that the Germans define personality as both personalitat and personlicheit. This parallels the distinction in English between "identity" and "reputation", that is, the distinction between how people think about themselves (identity), and how they are perceived by others (reputation). Over the past 100 years, personality research has focused almost exclusively on identity; this has produced a welter of conflicting ideas, few defensible generalizations, no agreed upon taxonomy of identity, and a meager measurement base. In contrast, the study of reputation has been productive. For example, there is a robust and virtually universally accepted taxonomy of reputation; it is the well-known Five-Factor Model (FFM; Wiggins, 1996—see Table One). The FFM is based on factor analytic studies of observer descriptions (reputational data) and provides the basis for developing systematic measures of personality (defined as reputation) and for organizing

The best predictor of future behavior is past behavior; reputation is a summary of past behavior and is, therefore, the best data source we have about future performance. The focus on reputation has been productive in terms of finding empirical relationships—links between reputation and important life outcomes. It is also the case that peoples’ self-perceptions are often inconsistent with their reputations—especially when dealing with narcissists. For example, Judge, Sepine and Rich (2006) found that supervisors’ narcissism was significantly and positively related to their self-described talent for leadership, but significantly and negatively related to others’ ratings of their leadership talent. Perception may be reality, but the reality lies in the perceptions of observers, not actors.

The distinction between reputation and identity reflects the distinction between prediction and explanation. We use reputation to predict what people will do; we use identity to explain why they do it. Thus, the two terms serve different logical purposes in personality psychology. For research, it is useful to focus on reputation; for theory development, identity is an important starting point.

It is also useful to distinguish two facets of reputation, which we refer to as “the bright side” and “the dark side”. The bright side reflects people’s behavior when they are on guard and engaged in self-monitoring—for example during an employment interview—and the FFM concerns the bright side. The dark side
refers to people’s behavior when they are “just being themselves”, when they let
down their guards, when they stop self-monitoring. Our research on the dark
side comes from our interest in managerial derailment (cf. Hogan, Hogan, &
Kaiser, 2010). Figure Two provides a workable taxonomy of the dark side. We
believe that the dark side dimensions are extensions of the bright side
dimensions past the point where the behavior is fully adaptable. We also believe
that there are positive and negative behaviors associated with high and low
scores on all the dimensions of both the bright and dark side.

B. Personality assessment. Bertrand Russell defined measurement as
assigning numbers to things according to a rule. Science mostly involves
comparing one set of measurement data with another set of observations or
measurement data. Personality assessment involves assigning numbers to
people according to rules and fits the definition of measurement. In addition, the
purpose of assessment is to predict significant non-test behavior, an inherently
scientific activity—i.e., comparing assessment scores with performance data.

These comments may seem obvious but consider the following. The first
important psychological assessment, Binet’s test (ref.), was designed to predict
academic performance; Terman believed his adaptation of Binet’s test, the
Stanford Binet (ref.) measured intelligence. The Minnesota Multiphasic
Personality Inventory (Hathaway & McKinley, 1943) and the California
Psychological Inventory (Gough; 1954) were designed to predict behavior,
whereas the 16 PF (ref.) and the NEO (ref.) are thought to measure traits.
Something changed. At Time One, the goal of assessment was to predict
behavior; at Time Two, the goal morphed into measuring entities (intelligence, traits). Nothing in Russell’s definition of measurement refers to entities. We are agnostic regarding the existence of entities, but we firmly believe that the goal of assessment is to predict outcomes, and that includes the assessment of narcissism.

C. Leadership. Leadership is defined in two very different ways in the academic literature, and these definitions have implications for understanding how narcissism is related to leadership. About 90% of the published literature defines leadership in terms of the persons who are in charge of a group, unit, or organization (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008). We call this form of leadership “emergence”; it depends on having the skill and motivation necessary to gain status in formal organizations, and to stand out from the crowd. We prefer a second definition of leadership, which starts from the observation that leadership involves getting work done through others. We think leadership is better defined in terms of the ability to build and maintain high performing teams (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). We call this kind of leadership “effectiveness”.

The distinction between emergent and effective leadership is important, but the two forms are related in interesting ways. For example, to be effective as a leader requires first emerging as a leader—emergence potentiates effectiveness. However, the skills required to negotiate a bureaucratic hierarchy are not the same as the skills required to build and maintain a high performing team—and vice versa. The two skill sets are only marginally related, and they are related to narcissism in very different ways, as we shall describe below.
2. **Narcissism as a Component of Personality.** As noted above, personality should be considered from two perspectives: identity and reputation. We refer to these as the perspective of the actor, and the perspective of the observer. These perspectives parallel the distinction between what an actor thinks he/she is trying to do, and how his/her efforts are evaluated by others.

Sociology, anthropology, and evolutionary psychology tell us that people always live in groups, and that every group has a status hierarchy. This suggests that the two big problems in life concern gaining social acceptance and gaining status—we call this “getting along” and “getting ahead” (Hogan, 1982). These problems have survival consequences—people who lack social support and status have poor career prospects, whereas people who are well liked and high ranking live longer and have better careers (cf. Marmot, 2004).

People pursue acceptance and status during social interaction, there are important individual differences in people’s skill at social interaction, and after every interaction, there is an accounting process in which the players gain or lose acceptance and respect (status). A person’s reputation at any given time is the sum of the post-interacation evaluations that have occurred up to that point. In terms of the Five-Factor Model (see Figure One), some people are seen as fearful and anxious, others are seen as brave and confident (Adjustment), some people are seen as shy and reserved, others are seen as outgoing and assertive (Ascendance), some people are seen as tough and critical, others are seen as warm and accepting (Agreeableness), some are seen as impulsive and non-conforming, others are seen as self-disciplined and socially appropriate
(Prudence), some are seen as concrete minded and parochial, others are seen as imaginative and curious (Openness). Every normal person’s reputation, when he or she is trying to behave, can be characterized in these terms, which are the dimensions of the bright side of personality.

But people also send signals about themselves through their “leaky channels” and some stylistic variations in interpersonal behavior are less attractive and desirable. Here we find attributions such as deceitful, erratic, overbearing, over-controlling, etc. As noted earlier, Figure Two presents our taxonomy of these syndromes of dark side behavior, one of which (Bold) concerns narcissism.

We should mention three further points about Figure Two. The first is that each syndrome in Figure Two has positive aspects: Excitable people bring passion to projects; Skeptical people are perceptive about organizational politics; Cautious people rarely make dumb decisions; Reserved people are fearless under pressure; Leisurely people have good social skills; Bold people will undertake daunting projects; Colorful people prosper in sales; Imaginative people excel at visioning; Diligent people have a strong work ethic; and Dutiful people are loyal to superiors.

Second, these syndromes persist because they work, these behaviors often create desirable outcomes. In the case of narcissism, for example, Bold people tend to rise in hierarchies and emerge as leaders. The problems occur when the interpersonal strategies in Figure Two are overused; when they are overused, they alienate others, especially subordinates. And this brings us to our
third point—these dimensions come from the study of managerial derailment (Hogan, et al. 2010)—they are the behaviors that prevent managers or leaders from being able to build and maintain a team.

The psychoanalytic tradition regards narcissism as a defense against feelings of insecurity, inadequacy, or other psychic wounds. We find this view excessively speculative, but we do believe that the dark side tendencies originate in childhood. Our preference would be to frame the origins of these tendencies in terms of something resembling attachment theory. We have had considerable experience with real narcissists, and our sense is that, in every case, the person was substantially indulged as a child, especially by his/her mother.

Consider Douglas McArthur, the commanding general of U.S. forces in the Pacific during World War II, and then again during the Korean War. McArthur is regarded as one of the most brilliant men ever to attend West Point, but as an officer he was difficult and overbearing, and his arrogance facilitated, but then ultimately ruined, his career. During the Korean War, he defied President Harry Truman, who was forced to relieve him of his command for insubordination.

William Jefferson Clinton, the 42nd President of the United States, was widely regarded as the most intelligent politician of his generation. His arrogance was also legendary, and most observers think his compulsively reckless sexual conduct ruined his legacy. That which both of these talented, charismatic, and arrogant men had in common was doting mothers. McArthur’s mother followed him to West Point and rented a room across the street from campus so she could be near him. Clinton’s mother personally enrolled him in college and found his
lodging for him. Freud, who was fabulously indulged by his mother at the expense of his talented sisters, was fond of saying that any man who enjoyed the exclusive attention of his mother was destined to think of himself thereafter in heroic terms—as a Conquistador.

The antithesis of narcissism is humility. Consider John Wooden, the legendary UCLA basketball coach, and NCAA Hall of Fame player and coach. Late in his career, Wooden was invited to speak at a coaches’ conference but was asked to wait outside while the other coaches spoke. The conference organizers feared that Wooden would overshadow the other speakers. A narcissist would have relished this evidence that he had eclipsed his peers. However, Wooden was “deeply disturbed”, and later wrote, “I had become a distraction, a disruption, someone who needed special handling…I only wanted to be a coach among other coaches.” He retired at the end of that season, after winning his tenth NCAA national championship (Wooden, 2003, p.xiv).

3. The Assessment of Narcissism. We assess narcissism using the Bold scale of the Hogan Development Survey (HDS; Hogan & Hogan, 2009). The HDS was developed to predict (poor) managerial performance, we have HDS data on over one million working adults, and the construct validity of the Bold scale is well established. The scale has 14 items organized in three components: (1) Entitlement: “In time people will realize how important I am” (T); (2) Excessive Confidence: “People often sense my power” (T); and (3) Fantasized Talent: “If I were in charge I could get this country moving again” (T). The internal consistency of the Bold scale is .71; the test-retest reliability is .78.
The Bold scale is uncorrelated with measures of neuroticism, agreeableness, or IQ. In terms of the Five-Factor Model, it correlates above .30 with Ascendancy and Openness, suggesting that high scorers seem energetic, talkative, and smart. On the MMPI, it correlates .44 with Hypomania (MA) and little else—more energy and verbal output. On the NEO, the Bold scale correlates .34 with Assertiveness and .40 with Achievement Striving. It correlates .39 with the Dominance scale of the 16 PF, and .45 with the Dominance scale of the CPI. On the Jackson Personality Inventory, it correlates .36 with Innovation, .45 with Social Self-confidence, and .32 with Energy Level—suggesting high scorers, again, seem energetic and talkative.

Observers (N = 140) describe persons with high scores on the Bold scale as Imaginative (.25), Inventive (.26), Original (.33), and Following through on Plans (.25). These descriptors reflect the positive aspects of narcissism. Executive coaches (N = 61), who know the target persons better, describe managers with high scores on the Bold scale as Very confident (.24), Arrogant (.36), Taking Advantage of Others (.30), Opinionated (.29), Expecting Special Consideration (.28), Direct and Assertive (.33), and Self-Promoting (.25). Thus persons who are in closer contact with the respondents begin to see the dark side of the Bold scale.

High scorers on the Bold scale are somewhat overbearing and self-promoting, and focus on getting ahead at the expense of getting along. But note also that the scale is uncorrelated with neuroticism, which means that a person with a high score for Bold can have a low, average, or high score for neuroticism.
Our impression, based on providing feedback to hundreds of managers and executives, is that persons with high scores for Bold and low scores for neuroticism are pompous and self-important, but persons with high scores for both Bold and neuroticism are arrogant, hyper-sensitive, volatile and abusive. Neuroticism seems to potentiate all that is undesirable in our measure of narcissism, it creates a sense of urgency around issues of self-worth, and a near frantic desire to impress others with one’s importance and stature.

Table One summarizes our archival data regarding the relationship between Bold scores and colleague’s ratings of managers. The meta-analytic correlations with Managing Change, Managing Performance, Presentation Skills and Work Skills show that narcissists have positive talents. However, their inability to perceive barriers (Vigilance), their pursuit of personal agendas rather than shared goals (Organizational Commitment), their lack of respect for others (Respects Others, Valuing Diversity and Teamwork), and carelessness about commitments (Trustworthiness) damage relationships and organizations.

Table Two presents data from spouses (married a minimum of two years) and from therapists and their clients. Volunteers participated in return for a donation to their church; they then completed the HDS and described their spouses using an adjective checklist. Therapists described their clients, who had completed the HDS, using adjective checklists for outpatients. Both spouses and therapists see narcissists as arrogant, entitled, and exploitive.

4. Narcissism and Leadership. To understand how narcissism interacts with leadership, it is important to recall the distinction between emergent and
effective leadership. Our reading of the literature suggests that, holding talent equal, narcissism promotes emergence—and little else—whereas modesty impedes emergence and promotes subsequent success.

Narcissists specialize in self-promotion. Bass (1954) pioneered the use of leaderless group discussions to study leadership. The notion was to see who, in a group of strangers, emerged as leaders, and then study them. A study by Sorrentino and Boutillier (1975) essentially brought leaderless group discussion research to an end, but for a very interesting reason. Sorrentino and Boutillier (1975) reported that ratings of leadership emergence were related to how much a person talked, and not to the content of his/her remarks. Narcissists say that they are usually the first person to speak in a group of strangers; thus, leaderless group discussions are a good way to identify narcissists.

Finklestein and Hambrick (1996) show that CEOs affect their organizations through their decisions about strategy, structure, and staffing. Their decisions vary in terms of strategic dynamism (how often and dramatically the strategy changes), strategic grandiosity (number and size of acquisitions), and performance (profitability). Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) extend the analysis by focusing on narcissism—which has implications for CEO decision making. They define narcissism in terms of: (1) arrogance—overestimating one’s talent and capabilities; (2) need to be in the spotlight; and (3) impulsivity—a predilection for risky choices and actions. In their model, narcissists are characterized by making big, bold, risky, high profile decisions, a decision making style will inevitably have an impact on an organization. They suggest that
narcissistic CEOs engage in big, highly visible initiatives, rather than incremental elaborations on the *status quo*, and tend to deliver extreme and fluctuating performance for their organizations. They identified a sample of 111 CEOs from 105 software and hardware companies. They then developed a measure of narcissism defined in terms of: (1) the prominence of the CEOs photograph in the annual report; (2) the prominence of the CEO in company press releases; (3) the frequency with which the CEO used the term “I” in public statements, and (4) the ratio of the CEO’s salary to the salary of the next highest paid person in the organization. Each of these components can be defined in quantitative terms, and the internal consistency reliability of this four item score was .76.

Chatterjee and Hambrick measured narcissism at Time One, then measured firm performance two years later. They used three criteria for firm performance which we listed above: (1) frequency of change in strategy; (2) acquisitions; and (3) variability in performance—big wins and big losses. They found significant correlations between CEO narcissism and firm performance defined in these terms. The narcissists changed strategy more frequently, made more and more expensive acquisitions, and their decisions yielded high variability in performance. Moreover, the relationship was linear, so that the more narcissism, the more extreme the firm's performance.

This study shows that specific CEO personality characteristics negatively affect firm performance. Chatterjee and Hambrick end their article with two observations. First, the conventional wisdom of the management literature is that CEOs have virtually no impact on organizational outcomes—for a variety of
structural reasons—and it is clearly wrong. Second, there is an enormous amount of anecdotal evidence in the business press that CEOs often engage in major strategic changes, some of which make no sense. As an example, they review the case of Jean-Marie Messier, CEO of *Compagnie Generale des Eaux* from 1996 to 2001. Based in Paris, CGE was a highly profitable, global leader in water, electrical, and waste utilities, facing the prospects of steady long term growth worldwide. Nothing about CGE’s environment, staff, or core competencies indicated *any* need for change. However, Messier was described by those who knew him as colorful, self-absorbed, egomaniacal, and needing drama to attract attention to himself. With no experience whatsoever in the world of media and entertainment, Messier transformed CGE to a media and entertainment enterprise that he named Vivendi, a transformation that turned into a financial disaster.

Narcissistic leaders tend to derogate employees, reject close working relationships, and make grandiose and unpredictable demands on their staff, and this can create negative health outcomes for the staff. In a longitudinal study of government workers in London (10,308 men and women aged 35-55), Kuper and Marmot (2003) found that an imbalance between worker responsibility and authority, lack of control over work pace and content, lack of opportunity to use relevant skills, and a lack of social support at work was correlated with coronary artery disease, time off work due to illness, and death rates.

Given the risks that narcissistic leadership brings to organization, one might ask why narcissists often emerge as leaders, and in the short run at least,
are successful. Our experience suggests that when private companies lack leaders who are confident, decisive and willing to take initiative, they don’t prosper. Therefore, confidence and eagerness to drive toward goals combined with the ability to communicate a compelling vision may be needed for success in competitive industries.

**Self-Perceptions of Narcissistic Leaders.** The Dunning Kruger effect (Kruger & Dunning, 1999) refers to a cognitive bias that causes individuals to perceive themselves as having superior abilities when in fact their skills are deficient (“frequently in error but seldom in doubt”). In a number of different studies, Dunning and his colleagues show that people who lack talent in certain defined areas of expertise consistently rate themselves higher on the ability to perform in that area than do persons who are actually talented. The talented underestimate their competence, the untalented overestimate their competence (cf. Ehringer, Johnson, Banner, Dunning, & Kruger (2008). Ames and Kammrath (2004) suggest that the tendency to overestimate one’s competence is a product of narcissism, a conclusion with which we fully agree. Watching former President Clinton move around suggests that he is poorly coordinated. He is an avid golfer, and his scores support the conclusion that he lacks talent for the game. Nonetheless, his golf partners report that he seriously considered going on the professional golf tour after he left office.

The next question concerns why narcissists overestimate their ability, often in the face of contradictory data. Dunning and Kruger attribute it to a deficit in cognitive ability, to a lack of what they call the capacity for meta-cognition, to
think about how one thinks about one’s performance. The existentialists would call this over-estimation self-deception, which starts with an inability to face up to *la situation humaine*, and then generalizes to everyday life. The role theorists call it a lack of role distance, an inability to regard oneself with ironic detachment. Others might see it as pluck and courage, an unusual ability to persevere in the face of reversals and misfortune. We think it may have something to do with the lack of talent for introspection. Introspective tendencies are normally distributed, and many highly successful people (Voltaire, U.S. Grant, Ronald Reagan) are constitutionally incapable of introspection. Narcissists are known to attribute failure to circumstances, and success to their own abilities, which is consistent with a failure of introspection.

*Coaching the Narcissistic Leader.* Coaching narcissists requires focusing on their need for self-enhancement. Appealing to their sense of loyalty to the team or to the value of participating in something greater than themselves will be ignored or rejected as naïve. In Dickens’ *A Christmas Carol*, Scrooge is asked to “make slight provision for the poor and destitute, who suffer greatly at the present time.” Scrooge refuses, saying that he already helps the poor by supporting work houses. The fund raisers note that “Many can’t go there; many would rather die”. Scrooge replies that “If they would rather die they had better do it, and decrease the surplus population.” When coaching narcissists, one must appeal only to their self-interest. We find it useful to tell narcissists that certain behaviors will harm their careers, and certain others will enhance them. The behaviors narcissistic leaders must learn to avoid are as follows:
1. Carelessness about accepted performance standards, restrictions or regulations. For example, investment bankers’ lax approach to assessing long-term risk and their successes at avoiding or reversing financial regulations resulted in a world-wide recession. As pilots often say, “Flight and airplane maintenance procedures are often written in blood.”

2. Increasingly risky decisions that yield short-term benefits but provide evidence (to more cautious team members) about their long-term negative consequences. Arrogant leaders often fail to measure their ideas against the long-term realities that most of the people on the team understand.

3. Rejecting and derogating anyone who is different or who presents disconfirming evidence. When solving complex problems, two heads are always better than one.

4. Blaming others for poor organizational outcomes. Blaming others is universally recognized as un-leaderlike; it is in everyone’s best interests to learn to accept responsibility for one’s choices.

5. Making secret unilateral decisions. Opaque decision-making reduces conflict. However, avoiding the conflict created by oversight also risks driving the team off a cliff.

The behaviors to be encouraged include the following:
1. Increase the frequency of *equitable* interactions with subordinates. Stop taking “victory laps” and start conveying inclusion and respect, and engage all employees with the organization.

2. Listen to the customer. Jeffrey Skilling, the failed CEO of Enron, started at McKinsey, a premier consulting firm. In a prototypically arrogant comment, a McKinsey consultant told *Forbes* (McLean and Elkind, 2003, p. 32), “We don’t learn from clients. Their standards are not high enough. We learn from other McKinsey partners.” A better path to building an organization is to recognize that the customers’ standards are the standards that truly matter.

3. Avoid special treatment for high-performing team members. Lavish treatment for senior executives is more likely to demoralize the staff than effectively reward achievement.

4. Perform after-action reviews for all major projects. Military organizations emphasize these reviews, and their documentation creates an archive of institutional knowledge. The reviews also require entitled leaders to practice looking at reality through others’ eyes.

5. Embrace equitably applied regulations as insurance against long-term risk.
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Table One: Meta-analytic Correlations between managers’ scores on the HDS Bold scale and colleagues’ performance ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respects Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 two tailed test  ** .01 two-tailed test  *** .001 two tailed test

Source: Hogan Assessment Systems. Inverse correlations are in bold type for clarity.
Table Two: Correlations between scores on the HDS Bold scale and ratings by spouses and therapists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Assertive</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensely Competitive</td>
<td>.26***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Therapist</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes Advantage of Others</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Strong Opinions</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expects Special Consideration</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promoting</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Assertive</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Figure One
The Dimensions of the Five-Factor Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment:</td>
<td>Anxious, self-doubting, and fearful vs. confident, stable, and brave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendence:</td>
<td>Shy, quiet, and restrained vs. outgoing, noisy, and assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness:</td>
<td>Tough, insensitive, and critical vs. warm, charming, and tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudence:</td>
<td>Spontaneous and non-conforming vs. self-controlled and conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness:</td>
<td>Narrow interests and incurious vs. wide interests and curious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Figure Two
### The Dimensions of the Dark Side

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitable</td>
<td>Easily upset, hard to soothe, intense emotional outbursts, unstable relationships, lacks persistence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeptical</td>
<td>Suspicious, argumentative, fault-finding, sensitive, and ready to attack when threatened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>Fearful of criticism, reluctant to make decisions, risk averse, conservative and resistant to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Tough, aloof, insensitive, uncommunicative, prefers to work alone and withdraws when criticized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisurely</td>
<td>Overtly cooperative but slow to respond, covertly resentful, stubborn, and vindictive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bold</td>
<td>Grandiose, self-promoting, demanding, taking excessive credit for success, blaming others for failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischievous</td>
<td>Charming, manipulative, impulsive, agenda driven, risk-taking, limit testing, and careless about commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorful</td>
<td>Entertaining, self-dramatizing, flirtatious, distractible, lacking in follow through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Eccentric, impractical, creative, preoccupied, distractible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>Stubborn, hardworking, controlling, detail oriented, perfectionistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutiful</td>
<td>Ingratiating, indecisive, loyal to superiors, unconcerned about subordinates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>