USP University Student Publishing Alliance.

Journal of Psychology, Crime and Justice Studies

Find us at:
www.publishyourdissertation.com

2024

The Power of the "Dark Side": Is there a relationship between the Dark Triad, Emotional Intelligence and levels of punishment?

Megan Brenik[1]

University of Bolton, UK

Abstract

There has been a wealth of research into the Dark Triad (DT: Psychopathy, Machiavellianism and Narcissism). This study predicted that through assessments for an individual's sense of power (gSPS) and Trait Emotional Intelligence (EI: TEIQUE-sf) combined with the presence of the DT, an individual might support punishment towards another. The researcher developed a punishment scale with high internal validity ($\alpha = 0.78$), as pre-existing scales did not seem appropriate for such research. In this present study (n = 146) weak significant positive correlations occurred between Emotional Intelligence with Machiavellianism ($p < .001$) and Narcissism ($p < .001$), as well as general sense of power with Machiavellianism ($p < .001$) and Psychopathy ($p < .001$). Additionally, a weak significant positive correlation occurred between Machiavellianism and EI subscale 'Self-Control' with general sense of power ($p < .05$). The same occurred when Machiavellianism was exchanged for Psychopathy ($p < .05$). Furthermore, a weak significant positive correlation occurred between global EI with punishment subscale 'Offender Rehabilitation' and general sense of power ($p < .005$). Findings showed that there are significant relationships between certain variables within the DT, EI, punishment and general sense of power. Limitations for this study include the use of short-form assessments for measuring personality traits, and the potential for social desirability with regard to the socially sensitive statements used in the self-report assessments. Results obtained using this punishment scale indicate that future research might benefit from a more targeted study population and the inclusion of qualitative aspects through observation studies combined with EEGs to build on current findings.

Keywords: *Dark Triad, Emotional Intelligence; Psychopathy; Narcissism; Punishment.*

[1] **Publication based upon dissertation research conducted and submitted in partial fulfilment for the Degree BSc in Criminological and Forensic Psychology at the University of Bolton (2018).**

1. Introduction:

1.1 The Dark Triad

The Dark Triad (DT) was a term first used by Paulhus and Williams (2002) who, when studying personality, observed an overlap of behavioural tendencies from psychopathic, narcissistic and Machiavellian traits. Psychopathic traits include a behavioural style that is emotionally cold, thrill-seeking, impulsive and antisocial in regards to levels of empathy towards others (Nagler, Reitner, Furtner & Rauthmann, 2014; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Boduszek, Debowska, Sherretts, & Willmott, 2018). Narcissism incorporates traits that result in an individual holding a grandiose self-opinion, with disproportionate levels of self-interest, a lack of empathy and a thirst for status and power amongst peers (Nagler et al, 2014, Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013). To be described as Machiavellian would suggest an individual who exhibits traits such as lacking emotional involvement, holding a cynical view of others, and is motivated by power, potentially leading to the ability to manipulate and control others to satisfy their own ego (Christie & Geis, 1970; Debowska et al., 2018; Fehr, Samson & Paulhus, 1992; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013; Willmott, Boduszek & Robinson, 2018).

Therefore, when Paulhus and Williams (2002) introduced the DT term, they were describing an individual whose character was an amalgamation of the above but was especially high in levels of self-promotion, low in emotionality, and demonstrated an attitude of grandiosity, superiority and sense of power (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

Paulhus and Williams' (2002) ideology created an escalation of interest in the idea of a 'dark side' of personality, as it evidenced that there was a crossover of behavioural traits with associations between (1) Machiavellian and psychopathic traits, (2) narcissistic and psychopathic traits and (3) Machiavellian and narcissistic traits. The above mentioned research into the DT has led to further research into associations between the DT and Emotional Intelligence (EI) due to similarities between such traits.

1.2 The Dark Triad and Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence (EI) has been defined as more than being attentive to how others may be feeling, it also involves how the individual uses the information gathered from others to determine their own actions in social situations (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; De Raad, 2005; Goleman, 2004). EI is recognised for its positive associations with social interaction skills, with Goleman (2004) proposing that having a high EI can be more socially powerful then having a high IQ, and also has been linked with other traits including social intelligence (Nagler et al, 2014; Salovey & Mayer, 1990), the ability to mediate and calm others as well as holding positive mental and physical health (Austin, Farrelly, Black & Moore, 2007; Austin & O'Donnell, 2013; O'Connor & Athota, 2013). Yet studies have shown some contradictory information regarding EI, suggesting that some of these individuals are lacking in interpersonal skills and have traits of Machiavellianism, therefore linking the presence of EI with DT traits (Austin et al, 2007; Fehr et al, 1992; Ioannides & Willmott, 2018). These studies acknowledge the positive associations of EI, as previously mentioned, but also imply that holding such an awareness of one's own, and others' emotions, can lead to influential and manipulative

behaviour towards others in order to achieve self-interested goals (Davis & Nichols, 2016; Nagler et al, 2014; Austin et al, 2007).

Studies have shown that there are two subclasses of EI: trait EI (TEI) and ability EI (AEI). TEI is measured from an individual's personality and character from numerous self-report assessments (Willmott, Mojtahedi, et al., 2017). Such assessments are used to measure an individual's empathy and sociability, as well as their perception of their own EI and how their level of awareness then determines their attitudes and predicted behaviour (Petrides & Furnham, 2001; De Raad, 2005; Lishner, Swim, Hong & Vitacco, 2011). AEI is measured via the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT: Mayer, Salovey, Caruso; 2002) and consists of numerous maximal performance tasks which measure traits including perception of emotions, and does this by comparing results from the tasks with a predetermined typical normative (Lishner et al, 2011; Davis & Nichols, 2016).

The majority of research that includes a comparison between DT traits and EI use self-report TEI assessments as well as only reporting a single DT trait. Therefore for the purposes of this study, TEI was focused upon over AEI as this allowed a direct comparison between this study that will compare all three DT traits with TEI, and past papers that have used self-report TEI assessments and single DT traits. Examples of papers with significant correlations between TEI and a DT trait include Fix and Fix (2015) and Hyde and Grieve (2014), whose papers agreed that TEI was a strong indicator of Psychopathy. Issues that arise with both of these papers include participants either being all male psychology students (n = 111: Fix & Fix, 2015) or predominately female

members of the general public (n = 193: Hyde & Grieve, 2014).

Opposing papers that show no correlation include those of Lishner and colleagues (2011) and Vidal and colleagues (2010), which identified how individuals with psychopathic traits struggle to manage emotion and therefore result in no correlation with EI. The participants included in both studies were undergraduate students (n = 151: Lishner et al, 2011; n = 188: Vidal, Skeem and Camp, 2010) and both used the MSCEIT assessment (Mayer et al, 2002). As argued by Lishner and colleagues (2011), after the use of the MSCEIT assessment (Mayer et al, 2002) in their research, a possible reason for a lack of correlation could have been that the individuals were not able to identify emotional expressions and therefore did not have the opportunity to demonstrate the ability to manage such emotions. However, as mentioned by Vidal and colleagues (2010), who also used the MSCEIT (Mayer et al, 2002), but used a categorisation of psychopathic traits as either Primary or Secondary Psychopathy dependent on the individuals regard to emotional stability, their results showed that individuals in the Secondary psychopathic traits category had a significantly lower EI. Vidal and colleagues (2010) furthered this by stating that an individual with Primary psychopathic traits would be able to skilfully identify the correct emotion portrayed and the emotion required for the situation given in the assessment without fully understanding why such a reaction was the required norm.

Such observations from the above mentioned papers are interesting in regards to the use of the MSCEIT (Mayer et al, 2002), as its use created differing interpretations regarding correlation despite the MSCEIT having high internal validity (α = .91: Mayer

et al, 2002).

1.3 The Dark Triad and Punishment

Research has been conducted to try and decipher what is behind an individual's morals, and how these could then be used in regards to making a decision. The Fuzzy Trace Theory (FTT: Reyna & Brainerd, 1991, cited in Carre & Jones, 2017) proposes that there is a continuum regarding decision-making, with verbatim (specific information from a present situation) on one end, and gist (stored in long term memory, a past knowledge and meaning) at the other (Reyna & Brainerd, 1995; Carre & Jones, 2017). In order for an individual to create gist that subconsciously guides morals, research has found that there are five principle foundations: Harm, Fairness, In-group, Authority, and Purity (Carre & Jones, 2017), and when a decision is to be made a dual process will start and a battle between gist and verbatim will occur. Due to the automatic function of gist over the slower functioning of verbatim, it is an individual's gist that will determine the 'gut feeling' and verbatim that contends with it (Reyna & Brainerd, 2011). Recent research conducted showed that participants from the general public would punish others who had shown selfish behaviours, and it was suggested that the level of punishment given was anger-based retaliation as well as an enforcement of self perceived social norms (Böckler, Sharifi, Kanske, Dziobek, & Singer, 2017; Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004).

It is possible to partner the FTT with the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB: Ajzen, 1985, cited in Ajzen, 1991), which is the idea that an individual's intention is cause of

behaviour derived from attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control. It is suggested that the strength of intention is dependant on social pressure and the required effort for an individual to perform an act (Ajzen, 2002). Therefore, linking together the need and want to perform an act based on the TPB (Ajzen, 1991, 2002) with the FTT's (Carre & Jones, 2017) foundations guiding moral development, which then pre-determines a punishment, it could be suggested that an individual that displays traits of the DT should show behaviours that are against the social norm. This is seconded by Graham, Haidt and Nosek (2009) who suggest DT individuals lack a moral compass, or choose to disregard it, therefore it can be predicted that individuals high in DT traits will select more aggressive, violent punishment types that reflect the individual's attitudes and beliefs towards retribution and redress.

However, Jonason and colleagues (2015) agree with the idea of a dysfunctional morality within DT individuals, but showed that it is not the presence of DT traits alone. Rather, it is dependant on the majority singular DT trait that determines the individual's moral compass being in line with social norms (Jonason, Strosser, Kroll, Duineveld & Baruffi, 2015). Results from this 2015 paper showed that depending on the situation Machiavellian individuals are morally flexible, individuals with high psychopathic traits hold weak morals, and Narcissistic individuals have strong morals when their decision was relating to social desirability (Jonason et al, 2015). Participant size was large (n = 585) and consisted of members of the general public, but the results above can be questioned in accuracy as the initial study was completed using the DT assessment, The Dirty Dozen (Jonason & Webster, 2010), and then this was replaced in the second study (n = 252 male college students) with the longer 27-item Dark Triad measure (SD3: Jones

& Paulhus, 2014), leading to inconsistencies within total results (Jonason, et al, 2015). Because of such inconsistencies, it is important to study current papers for each of the DT traits and decisions on punishment to see if there is a relationship that could possibly link these proven outcomes of morality within such individuals.

1.3(a) Machiavellianism and Punishment:

In regard to an individual having Machiavellian traits and how such traits could determine punishment, current research suggests these individuals are especially receptive to reward and less so to punishment, using manipulation and interpersonal behaviours for personal gain (Birkás, Csathó, Gács, & Bereczkei, 2015; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). The IOWA Gambling Task (IGT) showed a significant correlation that identified high Machiavellians as being more likely to select the unfavourable deck (Birkás et al, 2015). Relating these results to the FTT strengthens the idea that such individuals are self-absorbed, in that decisions made ensure selfish realisation and altruistic behaviour occurs only when the decision is in public or around others, and that such altruism happens only when there is a potential for reward (Carre & Jones, 2017). Such moral flexibility within Machiavellians (Jonason et al, 2015) could be a result of the subconscious process within the gist, allowing them to make decisions that result in personal gain but are against their morals (Reyna & Brainerd, 1995). With regard to the previous research mentioned above, the majority of studies analyse decision-making in relation to the self, but what about when the punishment decided is to be given to an other? It would be interesting to see whether moral flexibility occurs under such a decision in Machiavellian individuals.

1.3(b) Narcissism and Punishment:

Past research regarding Narcissism with punishment has led to results that cannot be simply categorised as either significant or non-significant. Due to the traits of a narcissistic individual being charismatic and manipulative (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), Blinkhorn and colleagues (2016) found that such individuals support violent and authoritarian ideologies, including accepting the occurrences of war, the punishment of criminals and the use of aggressive physical force (Blinkhorn, Lyons & Almond, 2016).

However, Jonason and colleagues (2015) found that narcissists desire a social group, leading to their morals reflecting social desirability, and therefore such individuals will make decisions to gain social approval. It should be noted that such altruistic and social behaviour will only occur when the individual is in public (or within a laboratory based setting when other people are present), as research by Carre and Jones (2017) has shown that, if given the chance, high narcissistic individuals will show retaliation and punish an other when given the chance. To further this, Böckler and colleagues (2017) conducted research that included anonymity between two participants (n = 121) via an online risk-taking gambling game. Results obtained showed a significant correlation between the presence of narcissistic traits and prosocial decision-making, and how this could have been a direct result of the anonymity (Böckler et al, 2017). Such control and manipulation within social settings and decision-making could suggest that there is a similarity in the expectation of gist development and moral flexibility between narcissistic individuals and Machiavellian individuals (Carre & Jones, 2017).

Therefore with regard to the above mentioned previous research, laboratory settings and the presence of others determine behaviours in narcissistic individuals, but what about when the assessment used is self-report? Could the inclusion of such anonymity create similar results as those in past research for such individuals with regard to social decision-making?

1.3(c) Psychopathy and Punishment:

Research has shown that individuals who are high in psychopathic traits tend to have little concern for others, be antisocial, and if committing a criminal act it is usually impulsive and unplanned (Blair, Morton, Leonard & Blair, 2006; Boduszek, Debowska & Willmott, 2018; Prospero-Luis, Moreira, Paiva, Teixeira, Costa & Almeida, 2017). Reasons for such behaviour can be linked to the suggestion that such individuals have weak morals (Jonason et al, 2015), and this approach can be furthered by Carre and Jones (2017) whose research has shown that high psychopathic traits lead to a majority verbatim-based process during decision-making, implying a possible absence of gist leading to relaxed or non-existent morals.

Additionally, Blair and colleagues (2004, 2006) conducted numerous laboratory-based research (Differential-Reward/Punishment Learning Task) on Category B prisoners (n = 21) who had scored high in psychopathic traits, and they found that due to reduced levels of anxiety and fear such individuals showed impairments when choosing between reward-stimuli and punishment-stimuli. This can also then be linked to

research suggesting that there is an emotional deficiency within such individuals when in real life situations regarding decision-making towards antisocial behaviour (Blair, Mitchell, Leonard, Budhani, Perschardt & Newman, 2004; Boduszek et al., 2017; Prospero-Luis et al, 2017). An interesting study from Cima and colleagues (2010) using clinically diagnosed psychopaths (n = 14) against a control group (n = 23), suggests that psychopathic individuals are aware of and understand the differences between right and wrong, but actively choose to ignore such norms and show arrogance towards the consequences of their amoral antisocial behaviour. As well as this, when provoked, they could not give rational reasoning for the answers they selected in the assessment (The Moral Dilemma Test: Greene et al, 2004 cited in Cima, Tonnaer, & Hauser, 2010) and others saw these answers as morally inappropriate behaviours. Therefore with regard to the above mentioned previous research, could the use of self-report combined with anonymity, and therefore lack of applying reason to answers selected, result in similar findings for psychopathic individuals?

1.4 Power

Keltner and colleagues (2003) describe how holding power can create influential authority within an individual, and how such power can determine the individual's social behaviours and moral judgements. To further this, Van Kleefe and colleagues (2008) define social power within an individual as having a sense of control and an exertion of influence over others and their outcomes (Van Kleefe, Oveis, van der Löwe, LuoKogan, Goetz & Keltner, 2008). The Approach/Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner, Anderson & Gruenfeld, 2003) describes how the ownership of power activates either

the behavioural approach system (which regulates behaviours in response to rewards) or the behavioural inhibition system (the behaviour generated in response to perceived threat or punishment) in an individual (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006). The determining factor for whether the Approach or the Inhibition system is activated is the level of power that is held by the individual. Past results showing this include a study by Anderson and colleagues (2006) that used a small group of undergraduate students who scored high on power (n = 36; that had been predetermined via pre-study in the same paper) to imagine positive and negative events occurring in their own lives, as well as recalling a time when either they had power over an other or someone else had power over them. Their results showed that when an individual was recalling having power over an other, their approach system was activated. This was explained by Anderson and colleagues (2006) as the concept that having power would result in a more positive outlook, as well as receiving fewer challenges from others to their positive outlook and decisions (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006).

A second paper that complements the above is from Van Kleefe and colleagues (2008) whose research included undergraduate students (n = 118) that were randomly paired up and then asked to individually recall and discuss a personal event that caused them emotional suffering. Results showed that higher power individuals reacted less to their partner's experience, and lower power individuals showed more empathy and understanding of emotions shown by their partner. Interestingly, this result was interpreted as higher power individuals being less motivated to respond to another's emotional needs, and that social power weakens emotional reactions (Van Kleefe et al, 2008).

The available research into power with relation to this study is limited. Power, for this study, is to be seen as an ideology held within the individual with regard to how power determines decisions and outcomes. From the research found and mentioned, it would suggest that high power individuals hold a positive image of themselves and the world around them (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006), but also lack the motivation to connect emotionally with others (Van Kleefe et al, 2008). Linking this with the traits of the DT, it would seem apparent that there is an association between the ideas mentioned from the Approach/Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al, 2003) and the traits of Machiavellianism and Narcissism.

1.5 Rationale

1.5(a) The Dark Triad and Punishment

Machiavellianism and Punishment:

Past research has measured Machiavellianism via the IOWA gambling task to reflect the use of manipulation for immediate personal gain (Birkás et al, 2015). The use of such a laboratory-based assessment shows how such individuals use manipulation and how the majority of times will pick the unfavourable deck. This can be interpreted as a short-term personal gain, but a long-term punishment on the self (Birkás et al, 2015). Past research has also shown that when Machiavellian individuals are in the presence of others they will practice altruistic behaviours if there is a chance for reward (Carre

& Jones, 2017), which leads to the idea that such individuals are morally flexible. This idea is supported by the research of Reyna and Brainerd (1995) who also show that unlike psychopathic individuals who have weak or no morals, Machiavellian individuals show flexible morality.

This present study moves the focus away from possible self-inflicted punishment for potential gain, to the individual having the opportunity to reflect on a decision already made regarding punishing another person. This is a concept that has proven difficult to find papers on, therefore it will be interesting to see if the anonymity and self-report form of the punishment assessment results in either of the above findings for Machiavellian individuals.

Narcissism and Punishment:

As mentioned previously in Section 1.3(b), past research has included contradictory findings and creates an argument that narcissistic traits both can and cannot be used as a predictor for punishment (Carre & Jones, 2017; Böckler et al, 2017). Research has shown that such individuals hold an acceptance for the concept of violence (Blinkhorn et al, 2016), but this concept is determined on whether the individual is in a social setting surrounded by others or whether the individual is unaccompanied (Carre & Jones, 2017).

Therefore with this present study using self-report assessments, it will be interesting to see whether individuals that score high in narcissistic traits will show a significant correlation with punishment type as past research has suggested that, when

anonymous, the need for social desirability minimises within such individuals (Böckler et al, 2017; Carre & Jones, 2017).

Psychopathy and Punishment:

Past research in regards to the moral values and decision-making process made by individuals with psychopathic traits has been contradictory. One school of thought is that psychopathic traits lead to weak morals, therefore when making decisions, especially those concerning antisocial behaviour, a psychopathic individual will not sense any wrongdoing when their choice goes against the social norm if they believe their decision is right (Jonason et al, 2015; Carre & Jones, 2017; Blair et al, 2004, 2006). Research has also shown that such individuals hold positive attitudes towards antisocial behaviour (Prospero-Luis et al, 2017; Dlamini et al., 2017) as well as showing little accountability for the effects of actions upon themselves and others (Blair et al, 2006). However, opposing research has shown that individuals with psychopathic traits are aware of right and wrong, but choose to ignore the social norm as well as choose to overlook accountability for their actions (Cima et al, 2010).

The above findings relate to this present study because it can be predicted that when members of the public with psychopathic traits complete the anonymous self-report punishment assessment, they will hold unsympathetic views of those being punished and therefore score higher on this scale. Also, the past papers mentioned use clinically diagnosed psychopaths as their participants (Cima et al, 2010; Blair et al, 2004, 2006;

Sherretts et al., 2017; Sherretts & Willmott, 2016), therefore in this study it will be interesting to see if results obtained using the general public yield similar results.

1.5(b) Emotional Intelligence and Punishment

With regard to EI and punishment, it has been problematic finding papers with these two variables included. The majority of research available seems to mention leadership roles in business with EI with relation to self-image and external motivators, which seems an understandable connection and does link with power with Narcissism as mentioned previously in Section 1.4 (Dahling, Whitaker & Levy, 2009).

Therefore, in this present study it can be hypothesised that there will be a relationship between EI and punishment, with EI as the predictor towards punishment. This prediction could lead to either a positive or negative correlation. A negative relationship could be based on research of EI stating that individuals who have high levels of EI and therefore high levels of empathy (Goleman, 2004; O'Connor & Athota, 2013) will show less support for the punishment of another person. A positive relationship could be based on the contradictory research carried out by Austin and colleagues (2007) and Fehr and colleagues (1992) who state that EI can lead to manipulative, unempathetic, dominant and selfish behaviours, much like those of the DT traits, and therefore may result in support towards the punishment of another. It seems necessary to add such a prediction into this present study, as it may strengthen any potential association between the DT traits with punishment.

1.5(c) The Dark Triad and Emotional Intelligence

A recent literature review by Davis and colleague (2016) included 38 EI empirical studies and resulted in majority support of a 'dark side' to EI. Following on from such literature requires the need for research as to why some papers have found correlations between the DT and EI (Nagler et al, 2014; Austin, Saklofske, Smith, & Tohler, 2014; Davis & Nichols, 2016) and others showed no support for this relationship (Austin et al, 2007; O'Connor & Athota, 2013). An example of a study that supports a correlation is Nagler and colleagues (2014) who suggest that the presence of the DT in an individual equates to a lack of interpersonal skills, therefore EI is used by the individual as a tool of manipulation. Results in the mentioned 2014 paper presented a positive correlation with EI and narcissistic traits, which evidences the earlier proposition that EI can be used as a tool for personal gain but only when aspects of the DT are present (Nagler et al, 2014). A conflicting paper by Austin and colleagues (2007) agrees with the manipulative element of EI but proposes that there must be a lack of empathy in such individuals to be able to benefit themselves through the use of an other. Results in this paper suggest there is no correlation between EI and emotionally manipulative behaviour, a negative correlation between Machiavellianism and EI, and individuals scoring high in Machiavellianism struggled to manage their own and others' emotions (Austin et al, 2007).

This present study will assess TEI as this allows the measure of a person's self-perception and understanding of their own EI, which compliments the other assessments used in this study to measure self-perception for one's own sense of power.

1.5(d) Emotional Intelligence and Power

Finding previous research concerning EI as a predictor towards power has proven challenging. As mentioned previously in Section 1.4, the results in Van Kleefe and colleagues' paper (2008) highlighted a negative correlation between holding social power and emotional response to an other's suffering. It should be noted that emotional response and EI differ in that an individual may emotionally react to a situation to follow a social norm if others are present, but their EI may oppose the reaction. This will be especially apparent if the individual has aspects of the DT (particularly Machiavellianism and Narcissism), as it has been proven that these traits lead to moral flexibility for social approval (Carre & Jones, 2017: Section 1.3).

Therefore for the purposes of this paper and using the above results, as well as those obtained regarding the Approach/Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al, 2003; Section 1.4), it could be fair to expect that individuals who hold a higher general sense of power with activated behavioural Approach system may show less compassion towards an other's suffering.

1.6 Hypotheses

H^1 – There will be a significant positive correlation between the score on the punishment scale and the presence of the 'Dark Triad' traits in the general public.

H^2 – There will be a significant positive correlation between the presence of Emotional Intelligence and the score on the punishment scale in members of the general public.

H^3 – There will be a significant positive correlation between Emotional Intelligence, the 'Dark Triad' traits and score on the punishment scale.

H^4 – There will be a significant positive correlation between the presence of Emotional Intelligence and the individual's score on the general sense of power scale.

2. Method:

2.1 Design

All participants would be answering all of the questions available, leading to a collection of quantitative and parametric data. A correlational design was used in this study to allow analysis of numerous variables. Variables being measured included subsections from the Dark Triad: 1) Machiavellianism, 2) Narcissism and 3) Psychopathy. Variables for Emotional Intelligence: 4) Well-being, 5) Self-control, 6) Emotionability, 7) Sociability, as well as 8) a global Emotional Intelligence Trait Score. The remainder of the variables include 9) General Sense of Power, 10) Emotional and Physical Punishment, 11) Consequential Punishment, 12) Offender Rehabilitation and 13) a total Punishment score.

2.2 Participants

Participants totalled 146 individuals (108 female, 38 male) from the general public. Participants were recruited via random sampling through an online anonymous questionnaire that was advertised over a two-week period (the link was made live 25/10/17 and closed 08/11/17). Studying Table 1, it can be noted that 50 percent of participants were aged between 26 and 35 (M = 29), and that sub-category 'Other' for demographic 'Role at Work' was the majority selected by the participants (n = 60). Further breakdown of the employment roles given by these participants include teaching and education (n = 28), health (n = 8), and voluntary and charity work (n = 5).

Table 1

Demographics table including majority group selected by the participants.

Demographic	n	Majority Group	Total
Gender	146	Female	108 (74%)
Age	146	26-35	50 (34%)
Occupation	146	Full Time	66 (45%)
Role at work	146	Other	60 (41%)
		Office Worker	19 (13%)
		Manager	19 (13%)
		Customer Services	19 (13%)
Country of residence	146	United Kingdom	142 (97%)

2.3 Materials

Within this paper there were four scales used; 1) The Dirty Dozen (DD: Jonason & Webster, 2010), 2) Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short Form (TEIQUE-sf: Petrides & Furnham, 2006), 3) The Punishment Scale (PS), and 4) The General Sense of Power Scale (gSPS: Anderson, John & Keltner, 2005 cited in Anderson & Galinsky, 2006).

Once the questionnaires were decided, they were collated and placed within a GoogleForm that was available via a web link (Appendix 1). When the link was accessed, the Participant Information sheet was the landing page, which included information regarding the study, guidelines for completing the questionnaires, consent information, and the Samaritans contact details were available, if any general confidential advice was required. After this page, the following section would be the start of the questionnaires following the format of GoogleForms (Appendix 3). The questionnaires were numbered rather than titled, as to avoid creating biases within the participants, as well as to possibly decrease social desirability (Questionnaire 1 = DD, Questionnaire 2 = TEIQUE-sf, Questionnaire 3 = PS, Questionnaire 4 = gSPS).

The Dirty Dozen.

The Dirty Dozen (DD: Jonason & Webster; 2010) consists of 12 linear-scale items that are scored via a nine-point Likert Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 9 = Strongly Agree) and none of the statements are reverse scored at the point of analysis (scoring key is provided in Appendix 4).

The DD is comprised of 3 subscales, (a) Machiavellianism ('I have used flattery to get my own way'), (b) Psychopathy ('I tend to be unconcerned with the morality of my actions'), and (c) Narcissism ('I tend to want others to like me'), and was used instead of the 91-item 'Dark Triad' (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), to help combat fatigue within the participant and increase concentration.

Past research has shown that the DD (Jonason & Webster, 2010) had an increased efficiency as well as maintaining a high test-retest reliability (α = 0.93: Austin et al, 2014; Jonason & Webster, 2010).

Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short Form.

The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short Form (TEIQUE-sf: Petrides & Furnham; 2006) consists of 30 linear-scale items that are scored via a seven-point Likert Scale (1 = Completely Disagree, 7 = Completely Agree), and was used instead of the 58-item 'Managing the emotions of others' scale (MEOS: Austin et al, 2007) as past research had found that the two scales had similar findings and both scales maintained high internal validity (TEIQUE-sf α = .88: Austin et al, 2014). Using the shorter assessment also allowed higher levels of attentiveness from the individual.

The items within the TEIQUE-sf can either be used for an individuals' global trait score (this is calculated by adding up the total from the answers, and then dividing by the amount of items), or the 30 items can be used to comprise 4 subscales, (a) Well-Being

('I generally don't find life enjoyable'), (b) Self-Control ('I usually find it difficult to regulate my emotions'), (c) Emotionality ('Expressing my emotions with words is not a problem for me'), and (d) Sociability ('I can deal effectively with people'). If these subscales are to be used, numerous items are to be removed from the data analysis, and both uses of the TEIQUE-sf include fifteen reverse-scored items (a scoring key is provided in Appendix 5).

Originally, materials for this research were going to include a mixed methods approach. The above two questionnaires were to be used plus vignettes which would introduce a qualitative element. This idea was based on previous research providing the strong argument that to include a qualitative element allows an individual to portray their response to a real life scenario and therefore counter-balance the experimental setting created from a questionnaire (Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010). It is further argued that qualitative data permits a deeper understanding into that individual's feelings, attitudes and judgements towards the scenario (Austin & O'Donnell, 2013; Alexander & Becker, 1978).

The main element of the vignettes would have been to measure the level of punishment an individual would have placed upon an other, possibly allowing an insight into choice when a position of power was specified. This factor led to the development of 4 vignettes (Appendix 6) but due to the inability of being able to associate results obtained to personality assessments, or the results lacking a numerical total, it was decided that the research would use strictly quantitative methods. This led to the below two assessments being included in place of the vignettes.

The Punishment Scale.

The researcher developed the Punishment Scale (PS) as it was apparent that scales available did not seem appropriate regarding measuring punishment. Past research showed that samples used in journals mainly consisted of students (Courtright & Mackeys, 2004; Chen & Einat, 2017) or inmates (Prospero-Luis et al, 2017). If the general public was used as the sample, then the thesis of the paper tended to lean towards obtaining a more general public attitude towards theory of crime (Maruna & King, 2009), rehabilitation (Sundt, Cullen, Applegate & Turner, 1998), violence (Anderson, Benjamin, Wood & Bonacci, 2006; Debowska, Boduszek & Willmott, 2018) or to study public attitudes towards sex offenders (Harper & Hogue, 2014; Church, Wakeman, Miller, Clements, & Sun, 2008). Therefore a more specific measure was developed to try and focus attention towards the agreement or disagreement of a form of punishment given to another individual.

The PS was created through taking aspects from scales used in current research including the inclusion of offenders treatment whilst imprisoned, as well as attitudes towards rehabilitation (Punitive Attitudes Scale: Courtright & Mackeys, 2004; Rehabilitative Ideal: Sundt et al, 1998), as well as using statements to decipher beliefs and disciplinary principles of the individual completing the questionnaire (Perceptions of Sex Offenders & Community Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders: Harper & Hogue, 2014; Punitive Scale: Maruna & King, 2009).

The PS consisted of 14 linear-scale items scored via seven-point Likert Scale (1 = Completely Disagree, 7 = Completely Agree) and scores could either comprise a total punishment score (this is calculated by adding up the total from the answers, and then dividing by the number of items) or 3 subscales as developed by the researcher as; (a) Emotional and Physical Punishment, (b) Consequential Punishment and, (c) Offender Rehabilitation. For either use of this assessment, there are two items that are reverse scored at the point of analysis (a scoring key is provided in Appendix 7).

Emotional and Physical Punishment subscale consists of an amalgamated definition as statements within this sub-section consist of the individual being aware of physical punishments occurring to an other ('I think that a parent should be able to slap their misbehaving child in their home without repercussions'), as well as being knowledgeable of emotional punishments occurring ('I feel that rehabilitation and educating inmates is a waste of time as they will re-offend as soon as they are out of prison'). Therefore during these statements the individual answering would be aware (conscientiously or not) that their level of agreement to the statement would be inflicting suffering to the other (Falcón y Tella & Falcón y Tella, 2014).

Consequential Punishment was defined by the researcher for the use in this subscale as either a single punishment given or a level of punishment agreed by an individual that is the direct result of an antisocial act carried out by the other ('A child did not complete all of their homework, resulting in their parent withholding their spending money – I believe that the parent has acted fairly). The definition of this subscale proved difficult to find papers on due to the above mentioned reasons behind the

creation of this scale. Definitions in past research, for the punishments given were either predetermined towards sex offenders (Harper & Hogue, 2014) or inmates (Prospero-Luis et al, 2017), therefore a definition that could be used for the general public was created.

The Offender Rehabilitation definition, for the purposes of this subscale, is based on the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974. Especially with regards to supporting the reintegration of inmates once they have been released from prison (Ministry of Justice, 2014) but also includes attitudes towards prisoners and recidivism upon release ('I feel that rehabilitation and interventions are beneficial, as it can deter re-offending upon release from prison').

The General Sense of Power Scale.

The General Sense of Power Scale (gSPS: Anderson, John & Keltner, 2005 cited in Anderson & Galinsky, 2006) consists of 8 linear-scale items scored via a seven-point Likert Scale (1 = Completely Disagree, 7 = Completely Agree), with four of the items being reverse scored at the point of analysis (a scoring key is provided in Appendix 8).

The gSPS equates to a global score that reflects an individual's personal sense of power ('I can get people to listen to what I say'), and previous research had shown that the internal validity of the gSPS was high (α = .88: Anderson & Galinsky, 2006).

2.4 Procedures

The link was made live on 25th October 2107, and then closed two weeks later on 8th November 2017. The link was advertised through the researchers Twitter, Facebook and LinkedIn account, the British Psychological Society (BPS) were emailed the signed ethics form allowing the BPS to share the link via Twitter (Appendix 9), as well as a blog-post on the researchers blog (Appendix 10). The link was also emailed to the researchers family and co-workers, as well as companies that the researcher volunteers for (for full timeline of link activity, please see Appendix 11). The freedom of the questionnaire being online meant that results obtained were organic and could not be traced, therefore allowing and encouraging honesty through anonymity. After the link was closed, the data collected was transferred into an Excel spreadsheet provided by GoogleForms, which was then entered manually into the SPSS data set.

3. Results:

3.1. Preparation of raw data

Once the questionnaire link had been closed, the results were exported from the GoogleForm into a SPSS spread sheet. Total scores for the questionnaires were then created through transforming the data into variables, ensuring to reverse score the required statements (as mentioned in Section 2.3), as well as create variables of subscales and global score for the assessments.

All of the data collected were used at point of analysis and internal validities were measured. The Dirty Dozen (DD) was consistent with past research as each DT trait had high internal consistency (Machiavellianism α = 0.73, Psychopathic α = 0.65, and Narcissism α = 0.78). Emotional Intelligence (EI) was lower then previous research had shown (α = 0.42). Global score for the punishment scale gave a high internal consistency (α = 0.78), as did punishment sub-scales Emotional and Physical Punishment (α = 0.76), and Offender Rehabilitation (α = 0.70). However, subscale Consequential Punishment gave the lowest internal consistency (α = 0.56). And general sense of power scale (gSPS) had high internal consistency (α = 0.85: Appendix 12).

3.2. Descriptive Statistics

Studying Table 3 it can be said that global score for Emotional Intelligence (EI: TEIQUE-sf-Global), and levels of punishment (PS) have the highest mean (*M*), with Machiavellianism and Narcissism having the lowest.

Table 3

Mean, Standard Deviation and Sample Size for the assessments total scores.

Assessments	Assessment Subscales	*M*	Range	SD	*n*
The Dirty Dozen	Machiavellian	13.36	4 - 30	5.96	146
	Psychopathic	10.21	4 - 31	4.86	146
	Narcissism	14.82	4 - 31	6.50	146
Trait Emotional Intelligence Scale (Short Form)	Global Score	119.60	81 - 151	11.28	146
	Well-Being	26.45	14 - 41	3.59	146
	Self-Control	25.00	13 - 38	4.04	146
	Emotionality	26.51	15 - 38	4.84	146
	Sociability	25.04	17 - 36	3.48	146
Punishment Scale	Global Score	58.00	33 - 84	10.25	146
General Sense of Power Scale	Global Score	30.24	20 - 39	3.38	146
	Valid N (listwise)				146

Two extreme outliers (at the multiple of 3, and not 1.5) were discovered via boxplots for global score on the general sense of power scale (gSPS). It was decided to replace these outliers with *M* (30.23) generating a new *M* (30.24) and a lower standard deviation of 3.38, from 3.69, enabling more accurate analysis of the data. No other variables had extreme outliers.

3.3. Inferential Statistics

When conducting the Pearson's r, some of the variables did not meet the assumptions of the parametric test, upon further investigation; this was due to outliers at the multiple of 1.5. As these outliers where not at the multiple of 3 (extreme outliers), all data was included for analysis.

Table 4 shows correlations from the total scores from each of the assessments, with the Dark Triad traits (Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism) having significant positive correlations. The strongest predictor being Psychopathy with Machiavellianism (r = .60, p < .001), then Narcissism with Machiavellianism (r = .53, p < .001), and the weakest predictor being Narcissism with Psychopathy (r = .32, p < .001).

Table 4 also shows weak positive correlations between Emotional Intelligence (EI) with Machiavellianism (r = .28, p < .001), and EI with Narcissism (r = .31, p < .001), as well as weak positive correlations between an individual's sense of power with Machiavellianism (r = .28, p < .001), and an individuals sense of power with Psychopathy (r = .28, p < .001).

Table 4

Descriptive statistics and Correlation matrix showing Pearson's (r) between the Dark Triad, Emotional Intelligence, Punishment and Sense of Power.

	Machiavellian	Psychopathic	Narcissism	EI global	PS global	gSPS global
Machiavellian	1					
Psychopathic	.60*	1				
Narcissism	.53*	.32*	1			
EI Global	.28*	.15***	.31*	1		
PS Global	-.08***	-.14***	-.15***	.02***	1	
gSPS Global	.28*	.24*	.19**	.21**	.12***	1

Notes: * correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); ** correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); *** correlation is non significant.

Therefore using the collected data, several regressions were conducted to analyse and decipher relations between the assessments.

Hypothesis 1 (H^1)

There will be a significant positive correlation between the score on the punishment scale and the presence of each of the 'Dark Triad' traits in the general public.

A simple linear regression was conducted for each subscale within the Dark Triad (Psychopathy, Narcissism and Machiavellianism) as a predictor for global score on the punishment scale. Findings were non-significant for subscale Psychopathy with global

punishment (r = -.14, p = .09), for subscale Narcissism (r = -.15, p = .07), and with subscale Machiavellianism (r = -.08, p = .34).

Hypothesis 2 (H^2)

There will be a significant positive correlation between the presence of Emotional Intelligence and the score on the punishment scale in members of the general public.

A second simple linear regression was conducted using the global score of Emotional Intelligence (EI) as a predictor for global score on the punishment scale. This resulted in a non-significant outcome (r = .02, p = .84).

Hypothesis 3 (H^3)

There will be a significant positive correlation between Emotional Intelligence, each of the 'Dark Triad' traits and score on the punishment scale.

Multiple regressions were conducted that included predictors global Emotional Intelligence (EI) with each of the three Dark Triad traits (Psychopathy, Narcissism and Machiavellianism), with the global score on the punishment scale.

Psychopathy, EI and Global Punishment score:

Findings were non-significant for subscale Psychopathy with global Emotional Intelligence (EI) and global punishment score (r = -.14, p = .09) with proportion of

variance explained being 2 percent, but also not being significant (R^2 = .02[.01], f = .09) with a non-significant analysis of variance (F (2,143) = 1.49, p = .29).

Machiavellian, EI and Global Punishment:

Findings were non-significant for subscale Machiavellianism with global EI and global punishment score (r = -.09, p = .29) with proportion of variance explained being less then 1 percent, and not significant (R^2 = .01[-.01], f = .30) with a non-significant analysis of variance (F (2,143) = .58, p = .56).

Narcissism, EI and Global Punishment:

In regards to subscale Narcissism with global EI and global punishment score, results were on the cusp of significance for a weak negative correlation (r = -.17, p = .051) with proportion of variance explained being 3 percent, but not significant (R^2 = .03[.01], f = .51) with a non-significant analysis of variance (F (2,143) = 1.95, p = .15).

Hypothesis 4 (H^4)

There will be a significant positive correlation between the presence of Emotional Intelligence and the individual's score on the general sense of power scale.

A simple linear regression was conducted using predictor global EI for an individuals sense of power. This resulted in a weak positive correlation (r = .21, p < .05). To try and strengthen this significance, the subscales of Emotional Intelligence (Well-being, Self-

Control, Emotionability, and Sociability) were correlated with the global score from the general sense of power scale via a multiple regression. This resulted in EI subscale 'Self control' being the strongest and single predictor towards an individual's sense of power (r = .27, p < .005), with all other subscales being non-significant.

3.4 Additional Investigations:

As EI subscale 'Self control' was revealed as the strongest predictor towards general sense of power, it seemed apparent to include the Dark Triad traits (Psychopathy, Narcissism and Machiavellianism), into further analysis. Therefore to possibly enhance the above results, a multiple regression was conducted for each subscale of the dark triad.

The first being subscale Machiavellianism with EI Subscale 'Self-control' and global score for general sense of power. The addition of such predictor led to a positive correlation (r = .22, p < .05) and increased the proportion of variance explained to 12 percent (R^2 = .12[.11], f < .05) from a previous 5 percent (with Global EI), with a significant analysis of variance (F (1,144) = 6.65, p < .05).

A second multiple regression was then conducted replacing subscale Machiavellianism, with subscale Psychopathy, resulting in a significant positive correlation (r = .19, p < .05) with the same variance explained being 11 percent (R^2 = .11[.01], f = < .05) and a significant analysis of variance (F (1,144 = 5.58, p < .05).

A third multiple regression was conducted replacing subscale Psychopathy with subscale Narcissism, and resulted in a non-significant finding (r = .13, p = .11) with proportion of variance explained being less then 1 percent, and not significant (R^2 = .10[.08], f = .11) with a non-significant analysis of variance (F (1,143) = 2.60, p = .11).

With regards to the punishment scale, to try and improve previous non-significant findings in H^1, H^2, and H^3, simple linear regressions were run with global score for Emotional Intelligence (EI) being a predictor for punishment subscales (Physical and Emotional punishment, Consequential punishment, and Offender Rehabilitation). These tests resulted in subscale 'Physical and Emotional Punishment' with global EI being non-significant (r = -.11, p = .18), and subscale 'Consequential Punishment' with global EI being non-significant (r = .03, p = .74). The third punishment subscale, 'Offender Rehabilitation' showed a significant weak positive correlation with predictor global EI (r = .26, p < .005).

To further this finding, a multiple regression was conducted adding predictor global general sense of power scale. This resulted in a weak positive correlation, with 12 percent of proportion variance explained (R^2 = .12[.11], f < .05), with a significant analysis of variance (F (1,144) = 8.45, p < .005).

4. Discussion:

4.1 Main Findings

The results obtained in this study found that the Dark Triad traits are not predictors towards global score on the punishment scale, therefore leading to the rejection H^1. The analyses conducted did not find a significant relationship between EI score with score on the punishment scale, which leads to the rejection of H^2. Out of the three DT traits, it was only Narcissism that was on the edge of significance regarding being a predictor towards score on the punishment scale when accompanied with EI. However, due to being outside of the statistical threshold for significance, H^3 was rejected. The analyses showed there was a significant positive relationship between EI subscale 'Self control' and score on the general sense of power scale. This therefore leads to the acceptance of H^4.

Through studying the data closer, it showed that there was a significant positive correlation between predictor EI with punishment subscale 'Offender Rehabilitation' and general sense of power. As well as variables Machiavellianism and Psychopathy being predictors towards the EI subscale 'Self control' with general sense of power.

4.2 Previous theory and findings with present results

The following subsections discuss how some of the results obtained support previous research, and some results do not, with reference to theories and rationale discussed in Section 1. Findings that were not hypothesised in this study will also be discussed.

4.2(a) Dark Triad and Emotional Intelligence:

In their research, Paulhus and Williams (2002) reference an intersection between the Dark Triad (DT) traits. Within the results obtained in this study, this overlapping was also apparent, supporting the existence of the DT within members of the general public, with Psychopathy and Machiavellianism having the strongest correlation (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

The inclusion of Emotional Intelligence (EI) also supported previous research regarding significant correlations between EI and Machiavellism (Austin et al, 2007; Fehr et al, 1992; Davis & Nichols, 2016; Nagler et al, 2014), Narcissism and EI (Nagler et al, 2004), as well as supporting results from former papers stating that there is no correlation between Psychopathy with EI (Lishner et al, 2011; Vidal et al, 2010).

4.2(b) The Dark Triad with Global Punishment:

Results obtained showed that there was no relationship with the DT and global score on the punishment scale. Consequently, this meant that there was no association

between the Fuzzy Trace Theory (FTT: Reyna & Brainerd, 1991, cited in Carre & Jones, 2017) and these variables. Reason for initial inclusion of the FTT (Reyna & Brainerd, 1991) was based on past research, which indicated that verbatim, gist and decision-making reflected morals, which then influenced behaviours (Carre & Jones, 2017, Böckler et al, 2017; Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004; Reyna & Brainerd, 2011). However, results obtained in this study did not support such indications.

Similarly, the results of this study do not support the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB: Ajzen, 1985, cited in Ajzen, 1991) as the lack of relationship between global punishment and the DT traits reflects a lack of intention within members of the general public to perform (or support) the punishing act (Ajzen, 2002).

Narcissism being a predictor for global score on the punishment scale was on the edge of significance. Therefore this result does not support the idea that moral flexibility occurs in such individuals to meet social desirability (Jonason et al, 2015). Consequently the indication that increased anonymity for such individuals would lower the need for social desirability was not evidenced (Carre & Jones, 2017).

The idea that Psychopathy was a predictor for a higher score on the punishment scale was not demonstrated from the results obtained. However, this lack of correlation could be seen to support research regarding emotional deficiency within such individuals, especially with regard to lack of empathy and accountability towards others and the people that their actions affect (Blair et al, 2004; Prospero-Luis et al, 2017). This could possibly explain the lack of correlation obtained, as an individual who is high

in Psychopathic traits may not empathise with the fictional characters in the statements of the punishment scale.

Results obtained for Machiavellianism being a predictor for score on the punishment scale were non-significant. This prediction was based on current research which focused upon the IOWA gambling task, especially within Machiavellian individuals and their selection of the unfavourable deck (Birkás et al, 2015), along with the FTT (Reyna & Brainerd, 1991) identifying moral flexibility being dependant on the possibility of reward for Machiavellians (Carre & Jones, 2017). The non-significant finding in this present study does not support this prediction. However, it could possibly support the notion that such individuals are more suited for laboratory-based assessments using physical rewards to measure attitudes, instead of using anonymous self-report (Birkás et al, 2015) as this could further research showing that Machiavellian individuals are morally flexible and only react when social desirability is obtainable (Carre & Jones, 2017).

4.2(c) The Dark Triad and Power:

Results obtained supported previous significant findings between the DT traits Machiavellianism and Psychopathy with general sense of power (Anderson et al, 2006). These results could also then be used to support the link between such variables and the Approach/Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al, 2003), with regards to the individual activating the Approach system when holding power over an other (Anderson et al, 2006; Van Kleefe et al, 2008).

4.2(d) Emotional Intelligence, Punishment and Sense of Power:

A significant positive relationship occurred between global EI with punishment subscale 'Offender Rehabilitation' and global score on the general sense of power scale. This prediction was not expected, and finding past papers to explain and substantiate such a relationship has proven challenging. However, through collating information from past research, there does seem support towards a significant negative correlation between the presence of EI with a decreased support for punishment (Goleman, 2004; O'Connor & Athota, 2013) and that holding a higher sense of power leads to such individuals having a more positive outlook which then possibly supports a belief in rehabilitation to mitigate recidivism (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006).

4.2(e) The Dark Triad, Emotional Intelligence and Sense of Power:

Results obtained showed that there was a significant relationship between the DT traits Machiavellianism and Psychopathy with self-control (EI subscale) as predictors towards an individual's general sense of power. Even though this relationship was not predicted, it does support previous findings regarding such DT traits, stating that both traits lack in interpersonal skills (Austin et al, 2007; Fehr et al, 1992) as well as supporting the concept of a negative correlation between social power and emotional response (Kleefe et al, 2008).

This significant relationship also positively supports the Approach/Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al, 2003) and TPB (Ajzen, 1985, cited in Ajzen, 1991), because high

self-control (as a subscale of EI) leads to a stronger regulation of impulses and more control toward acting in response to external pressures (Petrides & Furnham, 2006, Ajzen, 2002).

4.3 Limitations

Potential limitations for the present study include the assessments used. Although it was decided that brief assessments would mitigate potential participant fatigue, the criticisms of concise assessments must be acknowledged. Miller and colleagues (2012) specifically evaluate the use of the Dark Triad (DT: Paulhus & Williams, 2002) assessment, The Dirty Dozen (DD: Jonason & Webster, 2010), stating that that DD is not be used as a standalone measure for any of the single traits (Psychopathy, Narcissism and Machiavellianism). Reasons given by Miller and colleagues (2012) for such criticism stem from each trait of the DT being measured in the DD by only four statements, which challenges the accuracy of the assessment. Miller and colleagues (2012) also identify that components of the DT traits are neglected in the DD, the example given from the mentioned paper being that the Psychopathy statements used in the DD do not measure 'impulsive control', 'disinhibition' and 'manipulativeness' of an individual, all of which are characteristics of Psychopathy (Miller, Few, Seibert, Watts, Zeichner, & Lynam, 2012).

With regard to this present study, and the mentioned concerns of the accuracy of the DD assessment (Miller et al, 2012), it could be argued that the inclusion of additional assessments in this present study may have addressed the neglected components of

the traits. An example of this is the inclusion of the assessment to measure Emotional Intelligence (TEIQUE-sf: Petrides & Furnham; 2006), as this includes the subscale 'Self control' and could therefore be used as a substitute for measuring 'impulsive control' of Psychopathy.

Another issue with the DD (Jonason & Webster, 2010) is that the four subscales may not measure the intended behavioural traits, as highlighted by Rauthmann and colleague (2013) who, in their paper, recognise how the four statements for Psychopathy could be more suited to measure Machiavellianism, and how the four statements used to measure Machiavellianism could be more suited to measure Psychopathy (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013). Relating this to the results obtained in this study, Psychopathy and Machiavellianism both significantly correlated with the same variables, including general sense of power, as well as punishment subscale 'Offender Rehabilitation' with general sense of power. It should also be noted that the strongest internal correlation in this study between the DT traits was Psychopathy with Machiavellianism. Therefore, to avoid Rauthmann and colleague's (2013) criticism of the DD, it may be beneficial to exchange the statements for Psychopathy and Machiavellianism, as well as expand length of the assessment, to determine that results obtained correctly identify the presence these traits within an individual.

As the researcher created the Punishment scale, the possibility of researcher bias must be considered. Past research has shown that researcher bias can influence results obtained to meet predicted hypotheses, however this is shown to occur more frequently when a study collects qualitative data due to researcher coding and the

subsequent interpretation of this data (Chenail, 2011; Mays & Pope, 1995). Therefore, as only one of the punishment subscales in this present study significantly correlated and because this study used quantitative data, it could be reasoned that researcher bias did not occur during this study.

The method for collecting data for this present study was through self-report. Possible limitations with this method could include social desirability: individuals completing the questionnaires and giving answers that are thought to be the most socially appropriate instead of truthful (Kowalski, Rogoza, Vernon & Schermer, 2018). Past research has shown that social desirability is at its highest level if the questions are deemed socially sensitive (van de Mortel, 2008), which may apply to the sensitive nature of statements within the Punishment scale. However, a recent paper by Kowalski and colleagues (2018) that used the DD (Jonason & Webster, 2010) as well as assessments measuring social desirability and self-monitoring, found that there was a strong negative correlation between higher levels of Machiavellianism or Psychopathy and lower levels of social desirability. The above mentioned result does not eradicate social desirability, however, it suggests that social desirability may not be a strong factor for individuals with high levels of Machiavellianism or Psychopathy.

4.4 Future Research

With regard to possible ideas for future research based on this present study, it may be appropriate to replace some of the brief assessments with more in-depth measures

to obtain more accurate results. An example would be the replacement of the Dirty Dozen (DD: Jonason & Webster, 2010) with the Short Dark Triad (SD3: Jones & Paulhus, 2014), increasing the assessment from 12 statements to 27 statements measured on a 5-point Likert scale, instead of the previous 9-point Likert scale. This in-depth assessment could avoid the above mentioned issues regarding DD statements measuring Machiavellianism and Psychopathy (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2013), as well as allow possible use of the SD3 (Jones & Paulhus, 2014) as a standalone assessment for measuring the presence of the Dark Triad (DT) traits within an individual (Miller et al, 2012; Jonason & Paulhus, 2014).

To possibly strengthen the findings from this study, as well as lower the possibility of social desirability, laboratory assessments could be used in addition to the self-report assessments. In particular, it could be beneficial to recreate the study by Ward and colleague (1998) measuring situational power through observing a group of three individuals. One individual is randomly assigned authority over the group, who are then left to talk amongst themselves for 30 minutes before an assistant enters the room with a plate of 5 cookies, at which point the assistant leaves the room and the group are observed for a further 30 minutes (Ward & Keltner 1998, cited in Keltner et al, 2003). Results obtained in this study showed that the high-power individual was more likely to take a second cookie before either of the other individuals, as well as chew with their mouth open (Ward & Keltner 1998, cited in Keltner et al, 2003). To use this observation study, but possibly add more opportunities for the high-power individual to manipulate and abuse their power role, opportunities could include the option for the high-power figure to wear a badge stating their power role and therefore acting as

a permanent visual reminder to the others of their authority, or the choice of a seat either at the head of the table or a seat alongside the other individuals. Such observations, with self-report assessments for the DT (SD3: Jones & Paulhus, 2014) and Emotional Intelligence (EI: TEIQUE-sf: Petrides & Furnham; 2006) to be completed before and after the observation study, may increase the presence of significant correlations that support past research, especially that of the Fuzzy Trace Theory (FTT: Reyna & Brainerd, 1991, cited in Carre & Jones, 2017) regarding the concept of moral flexibility within Machiavellian and Narcissistic individuals in social situations.

Another possibility for future research could be to focus upon the Punishment scale, to address why there was only a significant correlation with one if its subscales. One option could be to target a prison population, where research has shown that the presence of the DT traits is higher (Prospero-Luis et al, 2017; Graham et al, 2009; Blair, 2005), therefore potentially increasing support towards violence and aggressive behaviour and consequently increasing the probability of a significant correlation.

The inclusion of an electroencephalogram (EEG) would be interesting with this study in regard to conducting such research upon individuals that are predetermined as having the DT traits. The EEG would be performed upon the individual whilst being asked questions based on the punishment scale statements. This would allow a direct comparison between parts of the brain activated and verbal answers given. Such a comparison could be used to support the FTT regarding moral flexibility within such individuals (Reyna & Brainerd, 1991, cited in Carre & Jones, 2017). This research could also be used to support past studies that show abnormalities within parts of the brain

that recognise emotion (the amygdala and orbitofrontal cortex) during social decision making of individuals that have psychopathic traits (Prospero et al, 2017; Umbach, Berryesse & Raine, 2015). This inclusion of an EEG could create in-depth results not found within this present study regarding support or opposition towards punishment on an other when the DT traits are present.

In addition to the inclusion of an EEG, another avenue of future research could be to compare different cultural populations. Reasons for this include that the expression of emotion between Western and Eastern populations has been shown to differ, as discussed by Matsumoto (2006) who identified that cultural norms can impact the expression of emotion by an individual, leading to a perceived high or low EI level by an other. Therefore it would be interesting to target diverse cultural populations for a comparison of results, with regard to cultural differences in determining levels of punishment with specific reference to EI and DT traits. Such a study would also benefit from the use of an EEG as discussed above.

4.5 Concluding Statement

The aims of this present study were to determine whether there is a relationship between the Dark Triad traits (DT: Paulhus & Williams, 2002) and Emotional Intelligence (EI), and whether such occurrences within an individual will heighten or lower support for a punishment being given to an other. Findings within this study did support the existence of the DT, as well as supporting previous findings of traits Machiavellianism and Narcissism with EI. However, the Punishment scale, even though

showing high internal validity (α = 0.78), did not present any significant findings, except the reverse-scored subscale 'Offender Rehabilitation' correlating with EI and general sense of power. As well as this, other significant correlations occurred between EI subscale 'Self-Control', general sense of power with DT traits Machiavellianism and Psychopathy. Therefore to conclude, it can be fair to state that significant positive correlations between mentioned variables did occur, but it was through focusing upon the subscales that allowed deeper understanding of the results obtained, suggesting that future research is to be more in-depth (via EEGs or observation studies) to try to strengthen current findings.

References:

Ajzen, I. (1991). Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Organisational Behaviour and human processes, 50*, 179-211.

Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived Behavioural Control, Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(4), 665-683.

Alexander, C.S., & Becker, H.J. (1978). The Use of Vignettes in Survey Research, *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 42*(1), 93-104.

Anderson, C.A, Benjamin, A.J., Wood, P.K., & Bonacci. (2006). Development and Testing of the Velicar Attitudes Toward Violence Scale: Evidence for a Four-Factor Model. *Aggressive Behavior, 32,* 122-136. DOI: 10.1002/ab.20112.

Anderson, C., & Galinsky, A.D. (2006). Power, Optimism, and Risk-taking. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36,* 511-536. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.324.

Anderson, C., John, O.P., & Keltner, D. (2005) The Subjective sense of power: Structure and Antecedents. Manuscript in preparation cited in Anderson, C., & Galinsky, A.D. (2006). Power, Optimism, and Risk-taking. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36,* 511-536. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.324.

Atzmüller, C., & Steiner, P.M. (2010). Experimental Vignette Studies in Survey Research. *Methodology, 6*(3), 128-138. DOI: 10.1027/1614-2241/a000014.

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. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2006.11.019.

Austin, E.J., & O'Donnell, M.M. (2013). Development and preliminary validation of a scale to assess managing the emotions of others. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55*, 834-839. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2013.07.005.

Austin, E.J., Saklofske, D.H., Smith, M., & Tohler, G. (2014). Associations of the managing the emotions of others (MEOS) scale with personality, the Dark Triad and trait EI. *Personality and Individual Differences, 65*, 8-13. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.060.

Birkás, B., Csathó, Á., Gács, B., & Bereczkei, T. (2015). Nothing ventured nothing gained: Strong associations between reward sensitivity and two measures of Machiavellianism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 74*, 112-115. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.046.

Blair, K.S., Morton, J., Leonard, A., & Blair, R.K.R. (2006). Impaired decision-making on the basis of both reward and punishment information in individuals with

psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*, 155-165. DOI: 1.1016/j.paid.2005.11.031.

Blair, R.J.R. (2005). Applying a cognitive neuroscience perspective to the disorder of psychopathy. *Development and Psychopathology, 17*, 865-891. DOI: 10.1017/S0954579405050418.

Blair, R.J.R., Mitchell, D.G.V., Leonard, A., Budhani, S., Peschardt, K.S., & Newman, C. (2004). Passive avoidance learning in individuals with psychopathy: modulation by reward but not by punishment. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 1179-1192. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2003.12.001.

Blinkhorn, V., Lyons, M., & Almond, L. (2016). Drop the bad attitude! Narcissism predicts acceptance of violent behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences, 98*, 157-161.

Böckler, A., Sharifi, M., Kanske, P., Dziobek, I., & Singer, T. (2017). Social decision making in narcissism: Reduced generosity and increased retaliation are driven by alterations in perspective-taking and anger. *Personality and Individual Differences, 104*, 1-7. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.07.020.

Boduszek, D., Debowska, A. & Willmott, D. (2017). Latent profile analysis of psychopathic traits among homicide, general violent, property, and white-collar offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 51*, 17-23. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.06.001

Boduszek, D., Debowska, A., Sherretts, N., & Willmott, D. (2018). Psychopathic Personality Traits Scale (PPTS): Construct validity of the instrument in a sample of US prisoners. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 9:1596, 1-9. DOI 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01596

Boduszek, D., Debowska, A., & Willmott, D. (2018). *Psychopathic Personality Traits Model (PPTM): a new approach to defining psychopathy*. In M. DeLisi (Eds.). Routledge International Handbook of Psychopathy and Crime (pp. 216-224). Oxon: Routledge.

Carre, J.R., & Jones, D.N. (2017). Decision making, morality, and Machiavellianism: The role of dispositional traits in gist extraction. *Review of General Psychology, 21(1)*, 23-29. DOI:10.1037/gpd0000093.

Chen, G., & Einat, T. (2017). To Punish or Not to Punish – That is the Question: Attitudes of Criminology and Criminal Justice Students in Israel Toward Punishment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 61*(3), 347-367. DOI: 10.1177/0306624X15595061.

Chenail, R. J. (2011). Interviewing the Investigator: Strategies for Addressing Instrumentation and Researcher Bias Concerns in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report, 16*(1), 255-262.

Christie, R., & Geis, F.L. (1970). *Social Psychology: A Series of Monographs, treatises and texts. Studies in Machiavellianism.* London: Academic Press.

Church, W.T., Wakeman, E.E., Miller, S.L., Clements, C.B., & Sun, Fei. (2008). The Community Attitudes Toward Sex Offenders Scale: The Development of a Psychometric Assessment Instrument. *Research on Social Work Practice, 18*(3), 251-259. DOI: 10.1177/1049731507310193.

Cima, M., Tonnaer, F., & Hauser, M. D. (2010). Psychopaths know right from wrong but don't care. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 5*, 59–67.

Courtright, K.E., & Mackey, D.A. (2004). Job Desirability amoung Criminal Justice Majors: Exploring relationships between Personal Characteristics and

Occupational Attractiveness. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 15*(2), 311-326.

Dahling, J.J., Whitaker, B.G., & Levy, P.E. (2009). The Development and Validation of a new Machiavellianism Scale. *Journal of Management, 35(2)*, 219-257. DOI: 10.1177/014206308318618.

Davis, S.K., & Nichols, R. (2016). Does Emotional Intelligence have a "Dark" side? A review of the literature. *Personality and Social Psychology, Frontiers on Psychology, 7*(1316), 1-10. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01316.

De Raad, B. (2005). The trait-coverage of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 673-687. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2004.05.002.

Debowska, A., Boduszek, D., & Willmott, D. (2018). Psychosocial correlates of attitudes towards male sexual violence in a sample of property crime, financial crime, general violent, and homicide offenders. *Sexual Abuse, 30*(6), 705-727. DOI:10.1177/1079063217691966

Debowska, A., Boduszek, D., Dhingra, K., Sherretts, N., Willmott, D., & DeLisi, M. (2018). Can we use Hare's Psychopathy model within Forensic and Non-Forensic Populations? Empirical Investigation. *Deviant Behavior, 39*(2), 224-242. DOI: DOI:10.1080/01639625.2016.1266887

Dlamini, T., Willmott, D., & Ryan, S. (2017). The Basis and Structure of Attitudes: A Critical Evaluation of Experimental, Discursive, and Social Constructionist Psychological Perspectives. *Psychology and Behavioral Science, 6*(1), 1-6. DOI: 10.19080/PBSIJ.2017.06.555680

Falcón y Tella, M. J., & Falcón y Tella, F. (2014). *Punishment and Culture: A Right to Punish?* London: BRILL.

Fehr, B., Samson, D., & Paulhus, D.L. (1992). The construct of Machiavellianism: Twenty years later. In C.D. Speilberger and J.N. Butcher (Eds.), *Advances in Personality Assessments.* (pp. 77-116). London: Taylor & Francis Group.

Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004). Social norms and human cooperation. *Trends in cognitive sciences, 8*(4), 185-190.

Fix, R.L., & Fix, S.T. (2015). Trait psychopathy, emotional intelligence, and criminal thinking: Predicting illegal behaviour among college students. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 42*, 183-188. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2015.08.024.

Goleman, D. (2004). *Emotional Intelligence & Working with Emotional Intelligence: Omnibus.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B.A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely in different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 1029-1046. DOI: org/10/1037/a005141.

Harper, C.A., & Hogue, T.E. (2014). Measuring public perceptions of sex offenders: reimagining the Community Attitudes Toward Sex Offenders (CATSO) Scale. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 21*(5), 452-470. DOI: 10.1080/1068316X.2014.989170.

Hyde, J., & Grieve, R. (2014). Able and Willing: Refining the measurement of emotional manipulation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 64*, 131-134. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.036.

Ioannides, A. & Willmott, D. (2018). Do Psychopathic Traits, Sexual Victimisation Experiences and Emotional Intelligence Predict Attitudes Towards Rape? Examining the Psychosocial correlates of Rape Myth Beliefs among a cross-sectional community sample. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 54*(3), 217 - 228.

DOI: 10.24425/ppb.2023.148054

Jonason, P.K., Strosser, G.L., Kroll, C.H., Duineveld, J.J., & Baruffi, S.A. (2015). Valuing myself over others: The Dark Triad traits and moral and social values. *Personality and Individual Differences, 81,* 102-106. DOI: doi.org/j.paid.2014.10.045.

Jonason, P.K., & Webster, G.D. (2010). The Dirty Dozen: A Concise Measure of the Dark Triad. *Psychological Assessment, 22*(2), 420-432. DOI: 10.1037/a0019265.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Introducing the short-Dark Triad (SD3): A brief measure of dark personality traits. *Assessment, 21*, 28–41.

Keltner, D., Anderson, C., & Gruenfeld, D.H. (2003). Power, Approach, and Inhibition. *Psychological Review, 110*(2), 265-284. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265.

Kowalski, C.M., Rogoza, R., Vernon, P.A., & Schermer, J.A. (2018). The Dark Triad and the self-preservation variables of socially desirable responding and self-monitoring. *Personality and Individual Differences, 120*, 234-237. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2017.09.007.

Lishner, D.A., Swim, E.R., Hong, P.Y., & Vitacco, M.J. (2011). Psychopathy and ability emotional intelligence: Widespread or limited association among facets? *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*, 1029-1033. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2011.01.018.

Maruna, S., & King, A. (2009). Once a criminal, Always a Criminal?: 'Redeemability', and the Psychology of Punitive Public Attitudes. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 15*, 7-24. DOI: 10.1007/s10610-008-9088-1.

Matsumoto, D. (2006). Are cultural differences in emotion regulation mediated by personality traits? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37*, 421-437.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) users manual.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: MHS Publishers.

Mays, N., & Pope, C. (1995). Rigour and qualitative research. *British Medical Journal, 311*(6997), 109.

Miller, J.D., Few, L.R., Seibert, A., Watts, A., Zeichner, A., & Lynam, D.R. (2012). An examination of the Dirty Dozen of Psychopathy: A cautionary tale about the costs of brief measures. *Psychological Assessment, 24*(4), 1048-1053.

Ministry of Justice. (2014). New Guidance on the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974. London: Home Office.

Nagler, U.K.J., Reitner, K.J., Furtner, M.R., & Rauthann, J.F. (2014). Is there a "dark intelligence"? Emotional intelligence is used by dark personalities to emotionally manipulate others. *Personality and Individual Differences, 76*, 232-237. DOI: 10.1016.j.pad.2014.01.025.

O'Connor, P.J., & Athota, V.S. (2013). The intervening role of Agreeableness in the relationship between Trait Emotional Intelligence and Machiavellianism: Reassessing the potential dark side if EI. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55(7*), 750-754. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2013.06.006.

Paulhus, D.L., & Williams, K.M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556-563.

Petrides, K.V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait Emotional Intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality, 15*, 425-448. DOI: 10.1002/per.416.

Petrides, K.V., & Furnham, A. (2006). The Role of Trait Intelligence in a Gender-Specific Model of Organised Variables. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(2), 552-569.

Prospero-Luis, J., Moreira, P.S., Paiva, T.O., Teixeira,C.P., Costa, P., & Almeida, P.R. (2017). Psychopathy, criminal intentions, and abnormal appraisal of the expected outcomes of theft. *Legal and Criminological Perspectives, 22*, 314-331. DOI: 10.1111/lcrp.12103.

Rauthmann, J.F., & Kolar, G.P. (2013). 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. DOI: 10.1016.j.paid.2012.11.012.

Reyna, V.F., & Brainerd, C.J. (1995). Fuzzy-Trace Theory: An interim synthesis. *Learning and Individual Differences, 7*(1), 1-75.

Reyna, V.F., & Brainerd, C.J. (2011). Dual processes in decision-making and developmental neuroscience: A fuzzy-trace model. Developmental Review, *31,* 180-206.

Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9,* 185-211.

Sherretts, N., Boduszek, D., Debowska, A. & Willmott, D. (2017). Comparison of murderers with recidivists and first time incarcerated offenders from U.S. prisons on psychopathy and identity as a criminal: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 51*, 89-92. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.03.002

Sherretts, N., & Willmott, D. (2016). Construct Validity and Dimensionality of the Measure of Criminal Social Identity using Data drawn from American, Pakistani,

and Polish inmates. *Journal of Criminal Psychology, 6*(3), 134-143. DOI:10.1108/JCP-07-2016-0020

Sundt, J.L., Cullen, F.T., Applegate, B.K., & Turner, M.G. (1998). The Tenacity of the Rehabilitative Ideal Revisited: Have attitudes toward offender treatment changed? *Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 25*, 426-442.

Umbach, R., Berryesse, C.M., & Raine, A. (2015). Brain imaging research on psychopathy: Implications for punishment, prediction, and treatment in youth and adults. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 43*, 295-306.

Van de Mortel, T. (2008). Faking it: Social desirability response bias in self-report research. *School of Health and Human Sciences, 25*(4), 40-48.

Van Kleefe, G.A., Oveis, C., van der Löwe , I., LuoKogan, A., Goetz, J., & Keltner, D., (2008). Power, Distress, and Compassion: Turning a blind eye to the suffering of others. *Association for Psychological Science, 19*(12), 1315-1322.

Vidal, S., Skeem, J., & Camp, J. (2010). Emotional Intelligence: Painting different paths for low-anxious and high-anxious psychopathic variants. *Law and Human Behaviour, 34*, 150-163. DOI: 10.1007/s10979-009-9175-y.

Ward, G., & Keltner, D. (1998). Power and the consumption of resources. Unpublished manuscript cited in Keltner, D., Anderson, C., & Gruenfeld, D.H. (2003). Power, Approach, and Inhibition. *Psychological Review, 110*(2), 265-284. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265.

Willmott, D., Boduszek, D. & Robinson, R. (2018). A Psychoanalytical-Behaviourist Investigation of Russian Sexual Serial Killer Andrei Chikatilo. *Journal of Forensic Psychology and Psychiatry, 29*(3), 498-507, DOI: 10.1080/14789949.2017.1416658

Willmott, D., Mojtahedi, D., Ryan, S., Sherretts, N., Simpson, O. & Dlamini, T. (2017). Psychometric tests as a measure of Personality: A Critical Assessment of Trait versus Situationalist Positions and the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). *EC Psychology and Psychiatry, 3*(1), 13-18.

Appendices:

Appendix 1:

Participant Information Sheet.

Participant Information Sheet

My name is Megan Robinson and I am conducting research as a final year Criminological and Forensic Psychology student at the University of Bolton under the supervision of Dr. Gill Allen.
I am working on my Honours Project, and am researching personality type with attitudes toward punishment.

How do I take part?
If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete the multiple-choice questionnaires, which will take between 5-10 minutes to complete.

Is the information collected confidential?
Yes, all of the information collected **will be confidential** and used only for the purposes of this study. The data will be collected and stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1988 and will be disposed off in a secure manner.

Can I be identified through the information I give?
No, the information will be used in a way that will **not allow identification.**

Do I have to take part?

No, participation in this study is **completely voluntary.** If you do not wish to participate in this research, then please close down the link and you will not be asked to justify your reasons and it will not affect you in any way.

PLEASE NOTE THAT BY CONTINUING TO THE NEXT SECTION YOU ARE CONSENTING TO THE COLLECTION OF YOUR RESPONSES TO BE ANALYSED FOR THE RESEARCH PROJECT, AND WILL NOT BE ABLE TO WITHDRAW YOUR RESPONSES.