Scientific Research Publishing

Psychology, 2026, 17(4), 477-491
https://www.scirp.org/journal/psych
ISSN Online: 2152-7199
ISSN Print: 2152-7180

The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Dark Side Personality Traits: A Study from Africa

Adrian Furnham[1], Nicola Taylor[2]

[1]Norwegian Business School (BI), Nydalveien, Oslo, Norway
[2]Department of Industrial Psychology and People Management, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa
Email: adrian@adrianfurnham.com

How to cite this paper: Furnham, A., & Taylor, N. (2026). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Dark Side Personality Traits: A Study from Africa. *Psychology, 17,* 477-491.
https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2026.174026

Received: March 7, 2026
Accepted: April 24, 2026
Published: April 27, 2026

Abstract

This study attempted to examine the Emotional Intelligence (EI) domain and facet correlates of the dark-side personality traits. Over 430 people completed two validated questionnaires: one measuring 11 derailment characteristics (HDS: Hogan Development Survey) and the other a revised measure of Emotional Intelligence (EQ-i 2.0). There were a few gender differences on both measures. Factor analysis (with Varimax rotation) of the HDS measure yielded four rather than three factors. Hierarchical regressions showed different EI facets related to the HDS higher order factors: Individuals in the *moving away* cluster were low on Self-Expression and Stress Management, while those high on *moving against* were high on both Self-Perception and Self-Expression but low on Decision Making. Analysis including the 15 EQ-i 2.0 facets, gave greater insight into the relationship between these two variables. Implications for selection and development, as well as limitations of the study, are considered.

Keywords

Derailers, EQ, Work Performance, Dark Side

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the relationship between dark side personality traits and emotional intelligence (EI). It has been argued in both popular books as well as academic papers that EI is essential for leadership and management success, and generally beneficial in all jobs in the workplace (Goleman, 1995, 1998). Key elements of EI that are said to contribute to success in the workplace are: the ability to recognize and manage one's own emotions appropriately, to maintain good

relationships with others, to make good decisions while under pressure, to manage stress effectively, and to be adaptable in the face of ambiguity (Stein & Book, 2011).

When individuals no longer manage their behavior appropriately in times of stress, this is often referred to as "derailing". Research has shown that derailment can be attributed to 11 personality characteristics popularly referred to as the "dark side" of personality. Both emotional intelligence and derailers have been correlated with the personality trait Neuroticism, depicting either end of the continuum of scores on the factor. This common conceptual origin means that there should be meaningful correlations between measures of emotional intelligence and measures of derailers.

There have been a number of papers that have examined the relationship between EI and the dark side, mainly looking at the dark triad (Austin et al., 2007; Gallitto et al., 2025; Hyde et al., 2020; Michels & Schulze, 2021; Miao et al., 2019). Indeed, there has been a review of the dark side of emotional intelligence. Davis and Nichols (2016) reviewed 34 papers and found negative effects of EI across multiple contexts (health, academic, occupational). They also found that self-perceptions (trait facets) or actual emotional skills contributed to poorer outcomes, particularly emotional awareness and management. A few of these studies relevant to this suggested that EI was often associated with psychopathy (Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013; Vidal et al., 2010).

1.1. Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace

Since the start of the millennium, there have been many studies on EI (Petrides & Furnham, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2006, 2007; Jordan et al., 2002; Quebbeman & Rozell, 2002). It has been argued that people with high EI are better at communicating their ideas, intentions, and goals. They are more articulate, assertive, and sensitive. Emotional intelligence is closely associated with teamwork social skills that are very important at work. Business leaders high in EI build supportive climates, which increase organisational commitment, which in turn leads to success (Stein & Book, 2011).

Two meta-analyses (Joseph & Newman, 2010; O'Boyle et al., 2010) that examined the predictive power of EI on job performance, while controlling for personality and cognitive ability, showed that EI accounted for unique variance in job performance. One meta-analysis found that ability measures did not add any incremental predictability above and beyond cognitive ability and personality (Joseph & Newman, 2010), while the other (O'Boyle et al., 2010) showed only a small effect size for ability measures above and beyond personality and cognitive ability. Although these meta-analyses provide support for the incremental predictability of EI on job performance, there is clear dissension about what work outcomes EI predicts, and how well it predicts them.

Joseph et al. (2015) conducted a follow-up study of O'Boyle et al.'s (2010) work in order to investigate the elements of self-reported EI that contribute to the pre-

diction of supervisor ratings of job performance. They found that when they combined measures of personality, self-rated performance, general self-efficacy, ability EI, and cognitive ability, then controlled for these in the prediction model, the originally meaningful correlation between self-rated EI and job performance was reduced to nothing. This suggests that self-rated measures of EI tap into a wide range of constructs that are critical to job performance, including elements of personality and ability.

1.2. Derailment in the Workplace

The Hogan Development Survey (HDS) assesses dysfunctional interpersonal themes that reflect distorted beliefs about others that emerge when people encounter stress or stop considering how their actions affect others. Over time, these dispositions may become associated with a person's reputation and can impede job performance and career success. The HDS assesses self-defeating expressions of normal personality, not personality disorders. The DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013: p. 647) makes this same distinction between behavioral traits and disorders. Dark side personality traits are self-defeating behaviors, such as those predicted by the HDS, that come and go depending on the context, but do not impair significant life functioning. In contrast, personality disorders are enduring and pervasive across contexts and lead to significant distress or impairment.

Karen Horney (1950, as cited in Coolidge et al., 2004) argued that children develop three normal and spontaneous patterns of relating to others. The three trends have been labelled *moving away* from others, *moving against* others, and *moving toward* others. The *moving away* trend consists of coping mechanisms characterized by isolation and pulling away from others to avoid situations that provoke basic anxiety. The *moving against* trend has a basic hostility and mistrustfulness at its center. People characterized by this trend cope with their basic anxiety by seeking power and control over others. The third trend of *moving toward* others is characterized by inhibition of one's own needs to appease others at almost any cost. Horney's theory explains why individuals consistently act in accordance with the derailment tendencies, even when it has obvious negative consequences (Coolidge, Segal, Benight, & Danielian, 2004; Foster & Gaddis, 2014).

The dark side personality traits of the HDS have shown a clustering around a three-factor structure readily interpretable using the above three trends, a finding that has been replicated in several studies (Coolidge, Moor, Yamazaki, Stewart, & Segal, 2001; Furnham & Crump, 2005; Furnham & Trickey, 2011; Furnham, Trickey, & Hyde, 2012; Hogan & Hogan, 2001).

The scales Excitable, Cautious, Reserved, Skeptical, and Leisurely load onto the *moving away* trend, while Mischievous, Bold, Colorful, and Imaginative load onto the *moving against* trend. Diligent and Dutiful load onto the *moving toward* factor. The moving away type has also been called Cluster A and is associated with odd and eccentric behaviour. The moving against type has also been called Cluster B and is associated with dramatic, emotional, and erratic behaviour, while the

moving toward type has also been called Cluster C and is associated with anxious and fearful behaviour.

Furnham, Trickey, and Hyde (2012) found *moving against* to be positively associated with managerial potential in a large working sample (n = 4943). In a meta-analysis, Gaddis and Foster (2015) concluded that the *moving away* trend was negatively associated with overall managerial performance and leadership values. The *moving against* trend negatively predicted managerial trustworthiness, but showed a mixed relationship with overall *performance* and a positive relationship with leadership ability. *Moving toward* others did not predict overall managerial performance.

1.3. The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Derailment

In 2010, Taylor and de Beer investigated the relationship between scores on the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) and the HDS in a sample of 478 South African employees. The results indicated meaningful relationships between a number of the EI scales and the derailers that led the authors to conclude that emotional intelligence could help to reduce the emergence of negative work behaviors. Factor analysis of the EQ-i scales and HDS scales revealed a single EI factor, and three clusters of the HDS aligned with the *moving away*, *moving against*, and *moving towards* scales. Because this research was conducted using an earlier version of the EQ-i, it is important to investigate whether the updated EQ-i 2.0 test produces similar results when related to the HDS scales.

Furnham and Rosen (2016) also investigated the relationship between the EQ-i and HDS in a sample of 329 British participants in a senior leadership program. They found that the HDS factored into three factors, confirming previous analyses, while the EQ-i had a single factor structure. The first factor (*moving against people*) was correlated negatively with the Stress scale on the EQ-i, while the second factor (labelled *moving away from people*) was negatively correlated with Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and Mood subscale scores. The hierarchical regressions showed that Cautious, Reserved, and Bold scales of the HDS were most consistently related to the EQ-i subscale scores.

2. This Study

This study is a partial replication of Furnham and Rosen's (2016) study. However, it differs in three ways. *First,* it uses the new EQ-i 2.0 test rather than the earlier Bar-On EQ-i. The more recent scale has both new facets and new composite scales added. *Secondly*, it has a larger and much more diverse sample. *Thirdly*, Furnham and Rosen (2016) were interested in the extent to which the dark-side traits predicted the EQ domain scores, whereas in this paper, we are interested in the extent to which the EQ domain and facets predict the higher order dark-side factors.

Based on previous research, we therefore tested four hypotheses. *First*, that the HDS would factor into three higher order factors: moving away from people; mov-

ing against people; and moving toward people. *Second*, that EQ scores at the domain and facet level will be (a) negatively correlated with the moving away factor because of the preference of these types often to minimize social interaction, (b) positively correlated with the moving against factor because of the interest in these types to control and manipulate others, and (c) positively correlated with the moving toward factor because of the interest in these types to receive approval and protection of others.

3. Method

3.1. Participants

Participants were all employed as middle to senior managers in a multinational African telecommunications company. There were 460 participants who completed the EQ-i 2.0, of which 328 were men and 103 women. Their ages ranged from 26 to 61 years, with a median of 42 years and a mean of 41.4 years (SD = 6.26 yrs). They came mainly from South and West African countries, with some from the UAE. Of the 324 who completed information regarding their ethnicity, 25% were White, 54% Black, and 20% Asian. There were 363 participants who also completed the Hogan Development Survey.

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Hogan Development Survey (HDS; Hogan & Hogan, 2009)

This study uses the Hogan Developmental Survey (HDS) to assess "dark side traits" in a normal population (Hogan & Hogan, 2009). This measure has been used in various studies to investigate dysfunctional behavior at work (Carson, Shanock, Heggestad, Andrew, Pugh, & Walter, 2012). The HDS is not a clinical measure, but rather measures dysfunctional personality in the working population, but uses a similar taxonomy to the classical personality disorders.

The HDS consists of 154 items that are completed via participants stating either their agreement or disagreement. It has been cross-validated with the MMPI personality disorder scales. Correlations (n = 140) range from 0.45 for Mischievous to 0.67 for Excitable (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Fico, Hogan and Hogan (2000) report coefficient alphas between 0.50 and 0.70 with an average of 0.64, and test-retest reliabilities (n = 60) over a three-month interval ranging from 0.50 to 0.80, with an average of 0.68. The items score for 11 scales: *Excitable*; *Skeptical*; *Cautious*; *Reserved*; *Leisurely*; *Bold*; *Mischievous*; *Colorful*; *Imaginative; Diligent*; and *Dutiful*. The scale has been found to predict work preferences (Furnham, Trickey, & Hyde, 2012).

The HDS focuses only on the core construct of each disorder from a dimensional perspective (Hogan & Hogan, 2001: p. 41). Various relatively small-scale studies have used the HDS and have shown it to be a robust, reliable, and valid instrument (De Fruyt et al., 2009). Various factor analytic studies of the HDS have also yielded a three-factor structure (Furnham & Trickey, 2011; Furnham et al., 2014a, 2014b). The reliability and validity of the HDS have also been demon-

strated in the South African context (Hogan & Hogan, 2014).

3.2.2. Emotional Quotient Inventory (MHS Staff, 2011)

The EQ-i 2.0 measures emotional intelligence. There are various measures of trait emotional intelligence, but this revised version is one of the most established. The EQ-i 2.0 is a revision of the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) developed by Bar-On (1997). It is a self-report measure designed to assess a number of constructs related to EI.

The EQ-i 2.0 gives an overall EQ score as well as scores for five composite scales and 15 subscales (MHS Staff, 2011). The five composite scales and their facets are: Self-Perception (Self-Regard, Self-Actualization, Emotional Self-Awareness) (Alpha .74), Self-Expression (Emotional Expression, Independence, Assertiveness) (Alpha .64), Interpersonal (Empathy, Social Responsibility, Interpersonal Relationships) (Alpha .74), Decision-Making (Impulse Control, Problem-Solving, Reality Testing) (Alpha .64), and Stress Management (Stress Tolerance, Flexibility, and Optimism) (Alpha .71). The alpha for the combined 15 facets was .89, while that for the five factors combined was .86. Earlier versions of the measure have been used in many studies (Butler & Chinowsky, 2006; Day, Therrin, & Carrol, 2005; Dawda & Hart, 2000; Ekermans, Saklofske, Austin, & Stough, 2011). The psychometric properties of the EQ-i 2.0 are well documented in the technical manual (MHS Staff, 2011), as well as in the South African literature. For the South African standardization sample, internal consistency reliability coefficients ranged from .72 (Flexibility) to .96 (Total EI).

3.3. Procedure

Participants were assessed by a South African-based psychological consultancy as part of the leadership talent management process in the organization. Participants provided permission to use the results for research during the informed consent process. All participants were given personal feedback on their scores. All personally identifiable information was removed from the final dataset once the scores had been combined. The company has also provided permission for the data to be used for this study.

4. Results

There was a very small amount of missing or incomplete data (<2%). However, this meant that the number of people completing both questionnaires varied very slightly between 431 and 436, as shown by the respective degrees of freedom in the tables below.

First, a MANOVA followed by specific ANOVAs was computed between men and women on both tests. **Table 1** and **Table 2** show that there were only three significant differences between men and women on the two scales. In accordance with various previous studies, men were more Mischievous and Imaginative but less Diligent than women on the HDS. However, the effect sizes were all small, and these differences are unlikely to be observable.

Table 1. Differences between gender groups on the HDS scales.

	Men		Women		t	*p*	d
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Excitable	3.60	2.52	3.36	2.57	−.80	.425	0.09
Skeptical	4.85	2.82	4.20	2.78	−1.93	.055	0.23
Cautious	3.34	2.46	3.33	2.52	−.03	.976	0.00
Reserved	4.54	2.98	4.57	2.44	.08	.933	0.01
Leisurely	4.48	2.48	4.02	2.33	−1.54	.124	0.19
Bold	9.68	2.51	9.16	2.68	−1.72	.086	0.20
Mischievous	7.68	2.78	7.00	2.85	−2.03	.043	0.24
Colorful	7.39	2.77	6.87	2.79	−1.57	.118	0.19
Imaginative	8.36	2.81	7.64	2.95	−2.08*	.038	0.25
Diligent	10.39	2.16	10.94	2.13	2.12*	.035	0.26
Dutiful	6.76	2.44	7.17	2.37	1.40	.162	0.17

Table 2. Differences between gender groups on the EQ-i composite scales.

	Men		Women		t	*p*	d
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Total EI	106.50	12.52	107.90	11.66	1.01	.315	.12
Self-Perception	106.37	11.57	107.98	11.61	1.23	.219	.14
Self Regard	107.29	13.60	108.15	11.60	.58	.563	.07
Self Actualization	110.45	11.89	111.27	12.28	.61	.543	.07
Emotional Self Awareness	103.82	12.81	105.99	13.18	1.49	.137	.17
Self-Expression	105.30	12.74	107.21	11.34	1.36	.174	.16
Emotional Expression	103.09	13.70	103.93	12.73	.55	.581	.06
Assertiveness	106.02	13.69	107.32	12.23	.86	.391	.10
Independence	103.49	12.40	105.77	11.41	1.66	.099	.19
Interpersonal Total	103.59	14.08	102.27	13.30	−.84	.403	.10
Interpersonal Relationships	102.76	14.96	103.22	14.09	.28	.779	.03
Empathy	101.13	13.32	99.90	13.50	−.81	.417	.09
Social Responsibility	105.97	13.67	103.52	13.21	−1.59	.112	.18
Decision Making Total	107.62	11.99	108.88	11.06	.95	.343	.11
Problem Solving	108.49	11.89	108.34	11.73	−.11	.911	.01
Reality Testing	105.28	12.44	106.18	13.30	.63	.526	.07
Impulse Control	105.25	13.17	107.52	10.99	1.59	.114	.19
Stress Management Total	104.16	13.64	106.74	12.71	1.70	.089	.20
Flexibility	100.94	15.08	105.09	14.65	2.45	.015	.28
Stress Tolerance	105.59	13.59	105.81	13.03	.14	.886	.02
Optimism	104.93	12.93	107.31	11.94	1.66	.099	.19

***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$.

Table 3 shows the correlations between the scales. A clear pattern emerged: All five *moving away* dark side traits (Excitable, Skeptical, Cautious, Reserved, Leisure) correlated negatively with all five EQ scores, while, with few exceptions, the *moving against* (Bold, Mischievous, Colorful, Imaginative) dark side traits were positively correlated with EQ. These results are similar to those found in previous research by Taylor and de Beer (2010), where the *moving against* scales of the HDS were positively related to interpersonal relationships and other aspects of intrapersonal emotional intelligence.

The eleven dark side scores were then subjected to various factor analyses with different rotations, which gave very similar results. The Varimax, orthogonal rotation analysis is shown in Table 4. We used the Eigenvalue > 1.00 rule to determine the number of factors.

Table 3. Correlations between HDS scales and EQ components.

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.
1. Age																	
2. Gender	−.08																
3. Excitable	−.01	−.04															
4. Skeptical	−.07	−.10	.58**														
5. Cautious	−.02	−.00	.44**	.31**													
6. Reserved	−.11*	.00	.47**	.37**	.40**												
7. Leisurely	−.12*	−.08	.34**	.43**	.45**	.40*											
8. Bold	−.10	−.09	.14**	.23**	−.10*	.05	.16**										
9. Mischievous	−.04	−.10*	.17**	.18**	−.18**	−.00	.05	.39**									
10. Colorful	−.08	−.08	−.09	.05	−.37**	−.26**	−.05	.37**	.48**								
11. Imaginative	−.02	−.11*	.25**	.12*	−.03	.07	.09	.46**	.51**	.26**							
12. Diligent	−.05	.11*	.23**	.18**	.16**	.15**	.10*	.16**	−.09	−.16**	.09						
13. Dutiful	−.10*	.07	.10*	.13**	.24**	−.03	.14**	.02	−.00	.06	−.05	.18**					
14. Self-Perception	.05	.06	−.31**	−.17**	−.41**	−.24**	−.26**	.22**	.09	.26**	.07	.07	−.03				
15. Self-Expression	.05	.07	−.36**	−.27**	−.52**	−.32**	−.33**	.11*	.10*	.28**	.06	.02	−.17**	.61**			
16. Interpersonal	.06	−.04	−.32**	−.23**	−.25**	−.45**	−.12*	.15**	.17**	.33**	.10	−.01	.13*	.57**	.48**		
17. Decision Making	.08	.05	−.39**	−.30**	−.35**	−.16**	−.21**	.04	−.11*	−.02	−.01	.06	−.15**	.59**	.56**	.39**	
18. Stress Management	.03	.08	−.54**	−.40**	−.53**	−.27**	−.30**	.01	.00	.19**	.00	−.11*	−.13*	.63**	.62**	.53**	.64**

Note. $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Table 4. Principle factor axis analysis of HDS scales.

Items	Factor			
	1 (Moving away)	2 (Moving against)	3 (Diligent)	4 (Dutiful)
Excitable	**.70**	.19	.17	.01

Continued

Skeptical	**.65**	.22	.02	.18
Cautious	**.63**	−.26	.19	.15
Reserved	**.65**	−.04	.12	−.18
Leisurely	**.60**	.05	.01	.15
Bold	.08	**.63**	.14	.07
Mischievous	.06	**.71**	−.16	−.04
Colorful	−.22	**.64**	−.39	.30
Imaginative	.11	**.68**	.19	−.17
Diligent	.15	.05	**.54**	.18
Dutiful	.11	−.02	.14	**.52**
Eigenvalue	2.94	2.37	1.14	1.00
Variance %	26.69	21.52	10.32	9.12

The first factor was clearly the *Moving Away* factor, and the second the *Moving Against* factor, but the third and fourth factors contained just one scale each (Diligent and Dutiful, respectively). Previous factor analyses of the HDS have shown, in effect, almost identical results (Furnham & Fudge, 2008; Carson et al., 2012).

Following this, four hierarchical regressions were computed with the factor scores from the above analysis as the criterion variable. Bivariate correlations suggested there was not a serious multicollinearity problem. In the first step, age and gender were entered, and in the second step, it was the five EQ scores. The first regression was significant and accounted for a third of the variance. People in the *moving away* factor tended to score low on Self-Expression and Stress Management. The second regression was significant and accounted for around a fifth of the variance. People in the *moving against* cluster had high scores on Self-Perception, Self-Expression, and Interpersonal but low scores on Decision Making. The third regression was significant and accounted for just under ten percent of the variance. Diligent people tended to score high on Decision Making but low on Stress Management. The fourth regression was significant and accounted for 17 percent of the variance. Dutiful people were high on Interpersonal but low on Self-Expression and Stress Management. This can be seen in Table 5.

The above regressions were repeated, but this time using the 15 facets rather than the five domain EQ scores. These are shown in Table 6. This allows for a finer-grained analysis of the relationship between the two variables. Again, all regressions were significant, accounting for between 16 and 43% of the variance. Two facets were closely related to the first factor: Those who scored high on *moving away* scored low on Emotional Expression and Flexibility. Three facets were closely related to the second factor: Those who scored high on *moving against* scored high on Assertiveness and Interpersonal Relations but low on Impulse Control. Six facets were closely related to the third factor: Diligent people scored high on Self-Actualization, Assertiveness, Problem Solving, and Impulse Control but low on Reality Testing and Flexibility. Finally, six facets were closely related to the fourth fac-

tor: Dutiful people scored high on Interpersonal Relations and Optimism but low on Assertiveness, Independence, Flexibility, and Stress-Tolerance.

Table 5. Regression analysis on HDS.

Variables	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4	
	Beta	**t**	**Beta**	**t**	**Beta**	**t**	**Beta**	**t**
Age	−.07	−1.70	−.12	−2.36*	−.03	−.51	−.11	−2.21*
Gender	.03	.78	.13	2.61*	−.11	−2.11*	−.05	−0.95
Self-Perception	.08	1.23	.30	4.06***	.07	0.95	.13	1.83
Self-Expression	−.27	−4.58***	.24	3.48**	−.12	−1.64	−.07	−1.07
Interpersonal	−.12	−2.17*	.15	2.36*	−.01	−0.14	.40	6.37***
Decision Making	−.03	−0.43	−.29	−4.18***	.30	4.07***	−.16	−2.31*
Stress Management	−.38	−5.92***	−.15	−1.94	−.30	−3.82***	−.29	−3.87***
F (7, 337)=	31.71***		10.46***		4.78***		10.53***	
Adj R^2	.39		.16		.07		.16	

Note. ***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$.

Table 6. Regression analysis.

Variables	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4	
	Beta	**t**	**Beta**	**t**	**Beta**	**t**	**Beta**	**t**
Age	−.04	−.85	−.10	−2.01*	−.05	−.88	−.14	−2.89**
Gender	.02	.37	.11	2.26*	−.11	−2.02*	−.04	−.82
Self-Regard	−.09	−1.66	.05	0.80	−.05	−0.79	.01	0.10
Self-Actualization	.05	0.93	.09	1.33	.24	3.48**	.13	2.05*
Emotional Self Awareness	.01	0.22	.13	1.83	.03	0.40	.06	0.87
Emotional Expression	−.22	−4.25***	.02	0.37	−.08	−1.19	.02	0.38
Assertiveness	−.10	−1.77	.13	1.86	.12	1.70	−.16	−2.48*
Independence	.11	2.07*	.13	2.06*	−.07	−1.12	−.09	−1.44
Interpersonal Relationships	−.15	−2.61**	.19	2.76**	−.12	−1.72	.31	4.75***
Empathy	.05	0.95	−.02	−0.32	.09	1.40	.03	0.54
Social Responsibility	.00	−0.05	.05	0.77	−.01	−0.09	.09	1.39
Problem Solving	−.08	−1.23	−.02	−0.32	.09	1.19	.02	0.27
Reality Testing	.03	.050	−.03	−0.45	−.13	−1.68	−.11	−1.53
Impulse Control	−.08	−1.66	−.27	−4.69***	.29	4.86***	−.03	−0.60
Flexibility	−.26	−4.90***	−.12	−1.91	−.19	−2.88**	−.28	−4.55***
Stress Tolerance	−.10	−1.61	−.01	−0.14	−.15	−2.03*	−.23	−3.36**
Optimism	−.08	−1.34	−.04	−0.65	−.05	−00.68	.16	2.49**
F (17, 325)=	16.76***		5.53***		3.91***		7.05***	
Adj R^2	.44		.18		.13		.23	

Note. ***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$.

5. Discussion

This study demonstrated that dark-side traits are systematically related to emotional intelligence. It replicates other studies with different measures of both EQ and the dark-side as well as on different populations. The results supported most, but not all, hypotheses tested, and compared to Furnham and Rosen (2016), the relationship between the two measures was stronger in this study.

The correlation results suggested that all five *moving away* dark-side traits were negatively correlated with all EQ scores, particularly stress management. This suggests that individuals with lower emotional intelligence literally move away from others during times of stress or change and hence do not learn the essential skills to manage negative behaviors effectively. Similarly, the overly brash and confident (moving against others) learn to manipulate others using these skills.

The HDS measure factored into four rather than three scales, which occasionally happens (Furnham & Rosen, 2016), because the two *moving towards* scales (Diligent and Dutiful) are sufficiently distinct not to load on the same factor. This was made clear in the regressions, where Decision Making was positively and Stress Management negatively related to Diligence, while Self-Perception and Stress Management were negatively and Interpersonal EQ strongly positively related to the Dutiful dark-side trait.

Compared to Furnham and Rosen (2016), the relationship between these two measures was much stronger. Thus, the regression on the *moving away* traits onto the five EQ domains accounted for a third of the variance, whereas in the Furnham and Rosen (2016) study, most regressions accounted for often less than ten percent of the variance. The analysis at the 15-facet level provided better insight into the associations between the two variables.

Most researchers suggest that EQ is an asset in the workplace. This study shows clearly that a number of people with elevated dark-side traits are unlikely to be emotionally intelligent. Those who are Cautious, Dutiful, Excitable, Leisurely, Reserved, and Skeptical tend to be low on emotional self-expression and stress management. However, those who are Bold, Mischievous, and Colorful have many high EQ scores. Indeed, it is this that makes them potentially dangerous in the sense that their EQ skills make them more effective at manipulating others. Data from many studies show that, paradoxically, some of the dark-side factors are associated with leadership potential and success as defined by such things as promotion to managerial level (Harms & Spain, 2015). One study showed that while high scores on the derailers seem associated with speed of promotion, they are also associated with later leadership failure (Furnham & Crump, 2013).

Further, there is evidence that the pattern of dark-side traits is very different between job types and sectors (Furnham, Hyde, & Trickey, 2014a). Three studies with data from different countries have shown that dark-side factors can help "climb the greasy pole" of leadership within organizations (Gøtzsche-Astrup, Jakobsen, & Furnham, 2016). This study, however, showed those from the Moving Against Others factor were very low on Impulse Control, which no doubt accounts

for their derailment as leaders.

A major limitation of the study is method-invariance and cross-sectional, which is particularly problematic with work-related studies. It also means that we cannot infer causation. Having only self-report measures presents two problems: first, it tends to increase the reported size of relationships, and also there may be problems associated with social desirability. However, the derailers have been shown not to have their validity threatened by social desirability problems (Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001). Yet, it would always be most desirable to have observation data (multi-source data) or, better still, behavioral data as work success criteria in future studies.

Data Availability

This is obtainable from the first author upon request.

Registration

This paper was not pre-registered with the journal.

Informed Consent

Participants gave consent for their anonymised data to be analysed and published.

Funding

There was no funding for this research.

Conflicts of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

References

American Psychiatric Association (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Publishing.

Austin, E. J., Farrelly, D., Black, C., & Moore, H. (2007). Emotional Intelligence, Machiavellianism and Emotional Manipulation: Does EI Have a Dark Side? *Personality and Individual Differences, 43,* 179-189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.11.019

Bar-On, R. (1997). Development of the BarOn EQ-I: A Measure of Emotional and Social Intelligence. In *105th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in Chicago.*

Butler, C. J., & Chinowsky, P. S. (2006). Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Behavior in Construction Executives. *Journal of Management in Engineering, 22,* 119-125. https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)0742-597x(2006)22:3(119)

Carson, M. A., Shanock, L. R., Heggestad, E. D., Andrew, A. M., Pugh, S. D., & Walter, M. (2012). The Relationship between Dysfunctional Interpersonal Tendencies, Derailment Potential Behavior, and Turnover. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27,* 291-304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9239-0

Coolidge, F. L., Moor, C. J., Yamazaki, T. G., Stewart, S. E., & Segal, D. L. (2001). On the Relationship between Karen Horney's Tripartite Neurotic Type Theory and Personality

Disorder Features. *Personality and Individual Differences, 30,* 1387-1400. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(00)00120-3

Coolidge, F. L., Segal, D. L., Benight, C. C., & Danielian, J. (2004). The Predictive Power of Horney's Psychoanalytic Approach: An Empirical Study. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 64,* 363-374. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11231-004-4324-z

Davis, S. K., & Nichols, R. (2016). Does Emotional Intelligence Have a "Dark" Side? A Review of the Literature. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7,* Article ID: 1316. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01316

Dawda, D., & Hart, S. D. (2000). Assessing Emotional Intelligence: Reliability and Validity of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (eq-I) in University Students. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28,* 797-812. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(99)00139-7

Day, A. L., Therrien, D. L., & Carroll, S. A. (2005). Predicting Psychological Health: Assessing the Incremental Validity of Emotional Intelligence Beyond Personality, Type a Behaviour, and Daily Hassles. *European Journal of Personality, 19,* 519-536. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.552

De Fruyt, F., De Clercq, B. J., Miller, J., Rolland, J., Jung, S., Taris, R. et al. (2009). Assessing Personality at Risk in Personnel Selection and Development. *European Journal of Personality, 23,* 51-69. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.703

Ekermans, G., Saklofske, D. H., Austin, E., & Stough, C. (2011). Measurement Invariance and Differential Item Functioning of the Bar-On Eq-I: Measure over Canadian, Scottish, South African and Australian Samples. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50,* 286-290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.10.004

Fico, J., Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2000). *Interpersonal Compass Manual and Interpretation Guide.* Hogan Assessment System.

Foster, J. L., & Gaddis, B. H. (2014). Personality Derailers: Where Do We Go from Here? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 7,* 148-151. https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12124

Furnham, A., & Crump, J. (2005). Personality Traits, Types, and Disorders: An Examination of the Relationship between Three Self-Report Measures. *European Journal of Personality, 19,* 167-184. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.543

Furnham, A., & Fudge, C. (2008). The Five Factor Model of Personality and Sales Performance. *Journal of Individual Differences, 29,* 11-16. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001.29.1.11

Furnham, A., & Rosen, A. (2016). The Dark Side of Emotional Intelligence. *Psychology, 7,* 326-334. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2016.73035

Furnham, A., & Trickey, G. (2011). Sex Differences in the Dark Side Traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50,* 517-522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.11.021

Furnham, A., Hyde, G., & Trickey, G. (2014a). Do Your Dark Side Traits Fit? Dysfunctional Personalities in Different Work Sectors. *Applied Psychology, 63,* 589-606. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12002

Furnham, A., Hyde, G., & Trickey, G. (2014b). The Dark Side of Career Preference: Dark Side Traits, Motives, and Values. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 44,* 106-114. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12205

Furnham, A., Trickey, G., & Hyde, G. (2012). Bright Aspects to Dark Side Traits: Dark Side Traits Associated with Work Success. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52,* 908-913. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.025

Gaddis, B. H., & Foster, J. L. (2015). Meta-Analysis of Dark Side Personality Characteristics

and Critical Work Behaviors among Leaders across the Globe: Findings and Implications for Leadership Development and Executive Coaching. *Applied Psychology, 64,* 25-54. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12017

Gallitto, E., Serghanuk, A. I., & Leth-Steensen, C. (2025). Emotional Intelligence and the Dark Triad Personality Traits: A Latent Profile Analysis. *Personality Science, 6*. (In Press)

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence.* Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. P. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More than IQ for Character, Health and Lifelong Achievement.* Bantam Books

Gøtzsche-Astrup, O., Jakobsen, J., & Furnham, A. (2016). The Higher You Climb: Dark Side Personality and Job Level in a Sample of Executives, Middle Managers, and Entry-Level Supervisors. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 57,* 535-541. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12305

Grieve, R., & Mahar, D. (2010). The Emotional Manipulation-Psychopathy Nexus: Relationships with Emotional Intelligence, Alexithymia and Ethical Position. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48,* 945-950. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.028

Grieve, R., & Panebianco, L. (2013). Assessing the Role of Aggression, Empathy, and Self-serving Cognitive Distortions in Trait Emotional Manipulation. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 65,* 79-88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-9536.2012.00059.x

Harms, P. D., & Spain, S. M. (2015). Beyond the Bright Side: Dark Personality at Work. *Applied Psychology, 64,* 15-24. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12042

Hogan, R. & Hogan, J. (2014). *Hogan Development Survey Technical Supplement Form 5.* Hogan Press.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan Personality Inventory Manual.* Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing Leadership: A View from the Dark Side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9,* 40-51. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00162

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2009). *Hogan Development Survey Manual* (2nd ed.). Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hyde, J., Grieve, R., Norris, K., & Kemp, N. (2020). The Dark Side of Emotional Intelligence: The Role of Gender and the Dark Triad in Emotional Manipulation at Work. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 72,* 307-317. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12294

Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J., & Hooper, G. S. (2002). Workgroup Emotional Intelligence: Scale Development and Relationship to Team Process Effectiveness and Goal Focus. *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 195-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-4822(02)00046-3

Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Emotional Intelligence: An Integrative Meta-Analysis and Cascading Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 54-78. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017286

Joseph, D. L., Jin, J., Newman, D. A., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2015). Why Does Self-Reported Emotional Intelligence Predict Job Performance? A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Mixed EI. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100,* 298-342. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037681

MHS Staff (2011). *Emotional Quotient Inventory v.2.0 Technical Manual.* Multi-Health Systems.

Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., Qian, S., & Pollack, J. M. (2019). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and the Dark Triad Personality Traits: A Meta-Analytic Review.

Journal of Research in Personality, 78, 189-197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.12.004

Michels, M., & Schulze, R. (2021). Emotional Intelligence and the Dark Triad: A Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 180,* Article 110961. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110961

O'Boyle, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2010). The Relation between Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32,* 788-818. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.714

Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (2001). Integrity Tests and Other Criterion-Focused Occupational Personality Scales (COPS) Used in Personnel Selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9,* 31-39. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00161

Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000). On the Dimensional Structure of Emotional Intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29,* 313-320. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(99)00195-6

Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait Emotional Intelligence: Psychometric Investigation with Reference to Established Trait Taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality, 15,* 425-448. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.416

Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2003). Trait Emotional Intelligence: Behavioural Validation in Two Studies of Emotion Recognition and Reactivity to Mood Induction. *European Journal of Personality, 17,* 39-57. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.466

Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2006). The Role of Trait Emotional Intelligence in a Gender-Specific Model of Organizational Variables. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36,* 552-569. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00019.x

Petrides, K. V., Pérez-González, J. C., & Furnham, A. (2007). On the Criterion and Incremental Validity of Trait Emotional Intelligence. *Cognition and Emotion, 21,* 26-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930601038912

Quebbeman, A. J., & Rozell, E. J. (2002). Emotional Intelligence and Dispositional Affectivity as Moderators of Workplace Aggression: The Impact on Behavior Choice. *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 125-143. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-4822(01)00054-7

Stein, J. S., & Book, E. H. (2011). *The EQ Edge: Emotional Intelligence and Your Success* (3rd ed). Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, N., & de Beer, J. (2010). *The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Derailment across Generations. Technical Report.* JvR Psychometrics.

Vidal, S., Skeem, J., & Camp, J. (2010). Emotional Intelligence: Painting Different Paths for Low-Anxious and High-Anxious Psychopathic Variants. *Law and Human Behavior, 34,* 150-163. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-009-9175-y