

The Dark Side of Leadership: Does Boldness Predict Successful Interpersonal Behaviors?

Katarina Sokić

EFFECTUS - College for Law and Finance, Croatia

Đuro Horvat

EFFECTUS - College for Law and Finance, Croatia

Abstract

"Successful psychopaths" display psychopathic personality traits (i.e. lying, manipulating) in business environments but do not display deviant lifestyles. The Triarchic Psychopathy Model proposed that psychopathy encompasses three phenotypic constructs: boldness, meanness and disinhibition. In line with theoretical assumptions, boldness is adaptive component of psychopathy and can therefore be useful for identifying "successful" expressions of psychopathy. The aim of this research was to investigate whether boldness added incrementally in predicting emotional intelligence. Data was collected on 495 students (252 male) using the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM, Patrick, 2010), and Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS, Wong et al., 2002). Hierarchical regression analysis showed that boldness did add incrementally to meanness and disinhibition in accounting for variance in total WLEIS score (12%), Self-emotional appraisal (5%), Others' emotional appraisal (2%), Use of emotion (14%) and Regulation of emotion (6%). Results of this study indicate that boldness has adaptive potential and represent a helpful factor for successful interpersonal behaviors such as EI.

Keywords: psychopathy, boldness, emotional intelligence, research

JEL classification: I31

Introduction

Psychopathy and emotional intelligence

Psychopathy represents a complex construct characterized by manipulateness, social dominance and grandiosity, while at the same time having profound affective deficits, such as the lack of empathy/remorse, callousness, fearlessness, shallow emotions and immunity to stress, but also behavioural deficits such as poor impulse control, aggression and antisocial behaviour (e.g. Hare et al., 2008).

According to Triarchic psychopathy model (TriPM model) (Patrick et al., 2009), psychopathy includes three distinct element, i.e. boldness, meanness and disinhibition. The boldness component of psychopathy is underpresent in other psychopathy measures, but it is a component which is conceptually thought to underlie superficial psychological health in psychopaths known as "mask" features. Namely, boldness captures social assertiveness, venturesomeness, and stress resistance and has demonstrated stronger associations with adaptive functioning rather than aversive outcomes (e.g. Patrick et al., 2015). Meanness captures deficient empathy, lack of affiliative capacity, predatory exploitativeness, empowerment through cruelty or destructiveness, while disinhibition captures lack of inhibitory control, impulsiveness, difficulties in regulating emotions, hostility and

mistrust (Patrick et al., 2015).

Psychopathy includes a number of deficits in emotional area. They have reduced selective recognition of fearful, sad, and happy emotional expressions, but not disgusted and angry expressions (Marsh et al., 2008; Dawel et al., 2012) suggesting the lack of insight into these emotional states in others. Deficiency in emotional area, which is characteristic for psychopathy, suggests underlying impairment in emotional intelligence in individuals with psychopathic traits.

Emotional intelligence (EI) is defined as the “ability to perceive, manage and reason about oneself's and other's emotions, and to use this information for adaptive behaviour” (Mayer et al., 2004). Furthermore, regulation of emotion promote emotional and intellectual growth of an individual (Gutić et al., 2018). EI may be conceptualized as ability or as trait. EI as ability is measured as individuals' abilities on emotional tasks (Mayer et al., 2002), and EI as trait is measured with self-report measures assessing emotional abilities (e.g. Wang et al. 2002).

In undergraduate students, secondary psychopathy encompassing neurotic, emotionally disturbed psychopaths, measured by LSRP (Levenson et al., 1995), has been found to be negatively associated with trait EI (Grieve et al., 2010; Love et al., 2014), while primary psychopathy (i.e. emotionally stable psychopaths) manifested intact EI (Vidal et al., 2010). Psychopathy in incarcerated men, measured by Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (Hare, 2003) was found to be associated with low EI measured as ability, (Ermer et al., 2012). Thus, results suggested that in non-clinical samples only secondary psychopathy is related to low EI. However, there is no study investigating triarchically conceptualized psychopathy and EI. This is especially important since triarchic concept of psychopathy includes boldness, which is considered to be adaptive component of psychopathy and therefore should be differently (positively) associated with EI.

Can boldness have an adaptive function?

As Cleckley suggested, boldness can be adaptive for individuals (Skeem et al., 2011). Lilienfeld et al. (2012) have argued that Cleckley (1941) in “The Mask of Sanity” described psychopaths as “individuals characterized by appearance of robust mental health that masks a serious emotional disturbance characterized by egocentricity and irresponsibility”. Theoretically, boldness is based on biologically driven fearlessness, and associated with self-confidence, optimism, resilience, tolerance for uncertainty, and social assurance (Patrick et al., 2009). A notable feature of the TriPM model is its delineation of boldness as a distinct facet of psychopathy. Although clearly represented in some influential accounts of the disorder, boldness is either not included or is underrepresented in other models (Lilienfeld et al., 2016). Boldness was found to be associated with socially adaptive characteristics, comprising persuasiveness, stress immunity, conventional value orientation and well-being, immunity to anxiety/distress, fearlessness, low hostility, high extraversion, emotional stability/low neuroticism (e.g., Blagov et al., 2016; Fanti et al., 2016; Ljubin-Golub et al., 2016; Poy et al., 2014; Sica et al., 2016). On the other hand, boldness is associated also with grandiosity, verbal aggression, specific features of impulsive-antisociality and low agreeableness, narcissism, thrill seeking, lack of empathy, risk taking, dishonesty, guiltlessness, lack of altruism, erratic lifestyle and emotional insensitivity (Drislane et al., 2016; Drislane et al., 2014; Fanti et al., 2016; Miller et al., 2011; Sica et al., 2015; Sellbom et al., 2013; Stanley et al., 2013).

Current study and hypotheses

Hypotesis 1: Consistent with the notion that boldness indexes adaptive traits such as emotional resilience, absence of anxiety or neurotic symptoms (Drislane et al., 2014; Lilienfeld et al., 2016; Patrick et al., 2009), we expect that boldness would be positively related to self-emotion appraisal.

Hypotesis 2: Based on the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy and empirical evidence of the negatively association between boldness and impulsiveness (Gatner et al., 2016; Sokić, 2017), we expect that boldness would be related to high regulation of emotion.

Hypotesis 3: Based on the theory that boldness entails a tolerance for unfamiliarity and danger, social poise, assertiveness and persuasiveness, bravery, and venturesomeness (Patrick et al., 2009; Patrick et al., 2015) and in line with findings that psychopathy is positively associated with grandiose manipulative traits, machiavellian features including desire for control/status (Fanti et al., 2016), we expect that boldness would be positively related to use of emotion.

Hypotesis 4: In light of the positive associations between boldness and adaptive traits (e.g., Crego et al., 2014; Miller et al., 2012; Poy et al., 2014; Sica et al., 2015), we tested whether boldness added incrementally to established components of psychopathy (i.e., meanness and disinhibition) in predicting EI dimensions. In view of expectation that, at the bivariate level, boldness would be related with SEA, UOE and ROE, we hypothesized that boldness would add incrementally to meanness and disinhibition in predicting these criteria.

Methodology

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 495 undergraduates from faculties and colleges in Zagreb (252 male, 243 female), $M_{age} = 21.78$, $SD = 4.57$. Most of them (86%) were from financing and law, and 14% were from engineering and computing. Participants completed all questionnaires during regular class. All participants were informed about the aim of the study, confidentiality, and agreed to voluntarily participate.

Measures

The Triarchic Psychopathy Measure (TriPM, Patrick, 2010) is a 58-item self-report measure of triarchically conceptualized psychopathy, yielding scores on three subscales of Boldness, Meanness, and Disinhibition, and a Total Psychopathy score. Items are scored using a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (False) to 3 (True). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha coefficients for boldness, meanness and disinhibition subscales were .79, .86 and .83, respectively.

Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS; Wong et al., 2002) is a self-report measure of emotional intelligence. It consists of four scales each having four items: Self-emotion appraisal (SEA; e. g. I really understand what I feel), Others' emotion appraisal (OEA; e.g. I am a good observer of others' emotions), Use of emotion (UOE; e.g. I would always encourage myself to try my best), and Regulation of emotion (ROE, e.g. I am quite capable of controlling my own emotions). All items were scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). A higher mean score indicates higher degree of EI. The internal consistency (alpha) reliabilities were .85 for SEA, .78 for OEA, .86 for UOE and .87 for ROE.

Data Analyses

Two main analytic approaches were used. First, zero-order correlations (Pearson's r) were used to quantify basic bivariate relationships between TriPM scale variables and EI subscales. Additionally, a further set of hierarchical regression analyses was performed in order to assess for unique (incremental) variance in different aspects of EI explained by the individual TriPM component. In these regression model, boldness was entered in Step 2 of the analysis, after controlling for age, gender and the two other TriPM components (meanness and disinhibition) at Step 1 (Table 2).

Results

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations are presented in Table 1, together with Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the whole sample. All scales and subscales demonstrated an adequate range and internal psychometric characteristics in terms of reliability.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics and internal consistency values for overall sample. $N = 495$ (252 male, 243 female).

	M (SD)	Actual range	Maximal range	α
TriPM				
Total	124.81 (16.45)	81-197	58-232	.86
Boldness	52.01 (7.64)	28-70	19-76	.79
Meanness	35.60 (8.40)	20-64	19-76	.86
Disinhibition	37.20 (8.06)	21-68	20-80	.83
WLEIS				
Total	84.20 (12.79)	33-112	16-112	.87
SEA	21.35 (4.51)	4-28	4-28	.85
OEA	20.64 (4.08)	7-28	4-28	.78
UOE	21.90 (4.59)	4-28	4-28	.86
ROE	20.31 (5.02)	4-28	4-28	.87

Note: TriPM = Triarchic Psychopathy Measure; WLEIS= Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale; SEA = Self-Emotion Appraisal; OEA = Other's Emotion Appraisal; UOE = Use of Emotion; ROE = Regulation of Emotion. α = Cronbach's α .

Source: Authors' work

Inter-correlations among TriPM components and EI dimensions

Bivariate correlations (Table 2) showed that boldness correlated high with UOE, ROE and SEA, but boldness wasn't related to OEA. In contrast to boldness, disinhibition generally shared moderate to large negative correlations with mostly WLEIS dimensions (e.g. UOE, ROE, SEA). Furthermore, meanness was negatively associated only with OEA.

Table 2

Hierarchical Regression Investigating Incremental Value of Boldness in Understanding Emotional Intelligence. $N = 495$ (252 male, 243 female).

	Step 1		Step 2	Model statistic	
	Meanness r/β	Disinhibition r/β	Boldness r/β	Step 1 R^2	Step 2 ΔR^2
WLEIS					
Total	-.18**/.02	-.44**/-.45**	.39**/.38**	.20**	.12**
SEA	-.11/.06	-.34**/-.37**	.27**/.24**	.12**	.05**
OEA	-.43**/-.39**	-.17**/.01	.00/.14*	.19**	.02*
UOE	.03/.20**	-.30**/-.38**	.45**/.40**	.12**	.14**
ROE	-.05/.13*	-.41**/-.47**	.33**/.26**	.19**	.06**

Note: Step 1 of the hierarchical regression includes age and gender as control. r = Pearson's correlation. β = standardized beta coefficient. Standardized regression coefficients (β) and R^2 (squared multiple R) are from regression models including all three TriPM scales as predictors of criterion measures. $R^2\Delta$ = R change for the Boldness entered in separate step after controlling two Meanness and Disinhibition. WLEIS = Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale; SEA = Self-Emotion Appraisal; OEA = Other's Emotion Appraisal; UOE = Use of Emotion; ROE = Regulation of Emotion. * $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$.

Source: Authors' work

Incremental effect of boldness in predicting EI

As predicted, results from hierarchical regression analyses (Table 2) showed that boldness predicted UOE ($\beta = .40$, $p < .001$). Also, boldness predicted ROE ($\beta = .26$, $p < .001$) and SEA ($\beta = .24$, $p < .001$). Also, these results showed that the relationships of boldness and OEA grow to significance when controlling for meanness and disinhibition, thus suggesting that the insignificant zero-order association between meanness and these scale was attributable to overlap of boldness with meanness and disinhibition. Furthermore, results showed that boldness did add incrementally to meanness and disinhibition in accounting for variance in WLEIS total ($\Delta R^2 = .12$, $F[1, 489] = 46.72$, $p < .001$), SEA ($\Delta R^2 = .05$, $F[1, 489] = 21.42$, $p < .001$), OEA ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F[1, 489] = 25.84$, $p < .01$), UOE ($\Delta R^2 = .14$, $F[1, 489] = 34.41$, $p < .001$) and ROE ($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $F[1, 489] = 33.01$, $p < .001$). Meanness negatively predicted OEA ($\beta = -.39$, $p < .001$), and positively UOE ($\beta = .20$, $p < .001$). Disinhibition showed unique negative relationship with mostly dimensions of EI (i.e. SEA, UOE and ROE).

Discussion

The aim of this study was to explore the relations between boldness and dimensions of emotional intelligence (e.g. SEA, OEA, UOE, ROE), and whether boldness added incrementally to established components of psychopathy (i.e. meanness and disinhibition) in predicting these outcomes. In general, the results supported the hypotheses and showed that boldness was positively related with all EI dimensions.

As we expected, boldness was positively predicted WLEIS total, SEA, OEA, UOE, ROE.

This is consistent with the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy which proposed that boldness encompasses social effectiveness, stress resistance imperturbability, and social assertiveness (e.g. Patrick et al., 2015), and consistent with previous studies which shown that boldness negatively associated with impulsiveness (e.g. Gatner et al., 2016; Sokić, 2017). Unexpected, boldness was found to be positive predictor in explaining OEA which relates to peoples' ability to

perceive and understand the emotions of those people around them. This is consistent with the neurobiological model of successful and unsuccessful psychopathy which proposed that successful psychopaths “have normal or even superior cognitive functioning” (Gao et al., 2010).

These findings are consistent with previous studies showing that boldness were related to emotional stability (e.g. Fanti et al., 2016; Sica et al., 2015). Our findings support previous findings that boldness were related to low anxiety/distress and emotional stability (e.g. Fanti et al., 2016; Sica et al., 2015). One possible explanation is that boldness lead to lower levels of neuroticism (e.g., Poy et al., 2014; Sica et al., 2015), which is associated with low personal distress (Alterman et. al., 2003).

These results are in line with theoretical assumptions that boldness is adaptive component of psychopathy which indexes adaptive traits such as emotional resilience, absence of anxiety or neurotic symptoms (Drislane et al., 2014), and can therefore be useful for identifying “successful” expressions of psychopathy (Hall et al., 2006; Patrick et al., 2015). This is consistent with the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy which proposed that boldness encompasses social effectiveness, stress resistance imperturbability and social assertiveness (e.g. Patrick et al., 2015). Our results are in line with findings that boldness is positively associated with grandiose manipulative traits, machiavellian features including desire for control/status (Fanti et al., 2016).

Overall, the present study showed that boldness added incrementally to our understanding of the some successful interpersonal behaviors, such as individual's ability to understand and express their deep emotions, ability to regulate emotions, and ability of individuals to make use of their emotions by directing them towards constructive activities and personal performance.

Conclusion

Results of this study indicated that boldness has adaptive potential and represent a helpful factor for successful interpersonal behaviors such as EI and protective factor for experiencing emotional distress. On the other hand, this study showed that disinhibition was associated with indices of maladjustment.

Study limitations and future directions

The study has several limitations. First, the study is correlational and, therefore, no causal relationships are confirmed. Second, the samples used are undergraduate students, which limits external validity. Third limitation refers to reliance of self-report measures which may inflate the associations between the variables. Therefore, further investigation is needed to elucidate whether boldness would interact with meanness or disinhibition in their prediction of outcome variables. Examining whether boldness has a synergistic effect with meanness and disinhibition would test complex nature of Triarchic model of psychopathy.

References

1. Alterman, A. I., McDermott, P. A., Cacciola, J. S., Rutherford, M. J. (2003), “Latent structure of the Davis structure of the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index in methadone maintenance patients“, *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, Vol. 25, No. 4., pp. 257–265.
2. Blagov, P. S., Patrick, C. J., Oost, K. M., Goodman, J. A., Pugh, A. T. (2016), “Triarchic psychopathy measure: validity in relation to normal-range traits, Personality pathology, and psychological adjustment“ pathology, and psychological adjustment“, *Journal of Personality Disorders*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 71-81.

3. Cleckley, H. (1941), *The mask of sanity: an attempt to reinterpret the so-called psychopathic personality*, Mosby, Oxford, UK.
4. Crego, C., Widiger, T. A. (2014), "Psychopathy, DSM-5, and a caution", *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 335–347.
5. Dawel, A., O'Kearney, R., McKone, E., Palermo, R. (2012), "Not just fear and sadness: meta-analytic evidence of pervasive emotion recognition deficits for facial and vocal expressions in psychopathy", *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, Vol. 36, No. 10, pp. 2288-2304.
6. Drislane, L. E., Patrick, C. J. (2016), "Integrating alternative conceptions of psychopathic personality: A latent variable model of triarchic psychopathy constructs", *Journal of Personality Disorders*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 1–23.
7. Drislane, L. E., Patrick, C. J., Arsal, G. (2014), "Clarifying the content coverage of differing psychopathy inventories through reference to the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure", *Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 350–362.
8. Ermer, E., Kahn, R. E., Salovey, P., Kiehl, K. A. (2012), "Emotional intelligence in incarcerated men with psychopathic traits", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 103, No.1, pp. 194–204.
9. Fanti, K. A., Kyranides, M. N., Drislane, L. E., Collins, O. F., Andershed, H. (2016), "Validation of the Greek Cypriot translation of the Triarchic psychopathy measure", *Journal of Personality Assessment*, Vol. 98, No. 2, pp. 146-154.
10. Gao, Y., Raine, A. (2010), "Successful and unsuccessful psychopaths: A neurobiological model", *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 194-210.
11. Gatner, D. T., Douglas, K. S., Hart, S. D. (2016), "Examining the incremental and interactive effects of boldness with meanness and disinhibition within the Triarchic Model of Psychopathy", *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 259-268.
12. Grieve, R., Mahar, D. (2010), "The emotional manipulation-psychopathy nexus: Relationships with emotional intelligence, alexithymia and ethical position", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 48, No. 8, pp. 945–950.
13. Gutić, D., Horvat, Đ., Jurčević, M. (2018), *Human Resources Management in Theory and Practice*, EFFECTUS - College for Law and Finance, Zagreb.
14. Hall, J. R., Benning, S. D. (2006), "The "successful" psychopath: Adaptive and subclinical manifestations of psychopathy in the general population", in C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy*, New York: Guilford Press, pp. 459-478.
15. Hare, R. D. (2003), *Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R, 2nd ed.)*, Multi-Health Systems, Toronto, ON, Canada.
16. Hare, R. D., Neumann, C. S. (2008), "Psychopathy as a clinical and empirical construct", *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 4, pp. 217–246.
17. Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995), "Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 68, No. 1, pp. 151–158.
18. Lilienfeld, S. O., Patrick, C. J., Benning, S. D., Berg, J., Sellbom, M., Edens, J. F. (2012), "The role of fearless dominance in psychopathy: Confusions, controversies, and clarifications", *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 327–340.
19. Lilienfeld, S. O., Smith, S. F., Sauvigné, K. C., Patrick, C. J., Drislane, L. E., Litzman, R. D., Krueger, R. F. (2016), "Is boldness relevant to psychopathic personality? Meta-analytic relations with non-Psychopathy Checklist-based measures of psychopathy", *Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 28, No. 10, pp. 1172-1185.
20. Ljubin-Golub, T., Sokić, K. (2016), "The relationships between triarchic psychopathic traits and value orientations in men and women", *Psihološka istraživanja*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 185-203.
21. Love, A. B., Holder, M. D. (2014), "Psychopathy and subjective well-being", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 66, 112-117.
22. Marsh, A. A., Blair, R. J. R. (2008), "Deficits in facial affect recognition among antisocial populations: a meta-analysis", *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, Vol. 32, No. 3, 454-465.

23. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R. (2002), Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) User's manual, MHS, Inc., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
24. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R. (2004), „Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications“. *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 197-215.
25. Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R. (2012), “An examination of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory's nomological network: A meta-analytic review“, *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 305–326.
26. Miller, J. D., Watts, A., Jones, S. E. (2011), “Does psychopathy manifest divergent relations with components of its nomological network depending on gender?“, *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 50, No. 5, pp. 564–569.
27. Patrick, C. J. (2010), “Operationalizing the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Preliminary description of brief scales for assessment of boldness, meanness, and disinhibition“, Unpublished test manual, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
28. Patrick, C. J., Bernat, E. M. (2009), “Neurobiology of psychopathy: A two-process theory“. in Berntson, G. G., Cacioppo, J. T. (Eds.), *Handbook of neuroscience for the behavioral sciences*, Vol. 2, John Wiley & Sons Inc., Hoboken, NJ, US, pp. 1110–1131.
29. Patrick, C. J., Drislane, L. E. (2015), “Triarchic model of psychopathy: Origins, operationalizations, and observed linkages with personality and general psychopathology“, *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 83, No. 6, pp. 627–643.
30. Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., Krueger, R. F. (2009), “Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness“, *Development and Psychopathology*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 913–938.
31. Poy, R., Segarra, P., Esteller, À., López, R., Moltó, J. (2014), “FFM description of the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy in men and women“, *Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 69–76.
32. Sellbom, M., Phillips, T. R. (2013), “An examination of the triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy in incarcerated and nonincarcerated samples“, *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, Vol. 122, No. 1, pp. 208–214.
33. Sica, C., Drislane, L., Caudek, C., Angrilli, A., Bottesi, G., Cerea, S., Ghisi, M. (2015), “A test of the construct validity of the Triarchic Psychopathy Measure in an Italian community sample“, *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 82, pp. 163–168.
34. Skeem, J. L., Polaschek, D. L. L., Patrick, C. J., Lilienfeld, S. O. (2011), “Psychopathic personality: Bridging the gap between scientific evidence and public policy“, *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol. 12, No 3., pp. 95–162.
35. Sokić, K. (2017), “Examination of The Triarchic Model of Psychopathy“. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, available at <http://darhiv.ffzg.unizg.hr/9239/1/Soki%C4%87%2C%20Katarina.pdf> (18 May 2018)
36. Stanley, J. H., Wygant, D. B., Sellbom, M. (2013), “Elaborating on the construct validity of the triarchic psychopathy measure in a criminal offender sample“, *Journal of Personality Assessment*, Vol. 95, No. 4, pp. 343–350.
37. Vidal, S, Skeem, J, Camp, J. (2010), “Emotional intelligence: Painting different paths for low-anxious and high-anxious psychopathic variants“, *Law & Human Behavior*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 150–163.
38. Wong, C-S., Law, K. S. (2002), “The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study“, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 243-274.

About the authors

Katarina Sokić, Ph.D. works as a lecturer at the EFFECTUS College for Law and Finance in Zagreb. She graduated at the University of Zagreb, Faculty of Law. At the same faculty she received her MA degree in a civil law. She got her PhD in Psychology from the University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, with the topic Examination of The Triarchic Model of Psychopathy in 2017. In his

research work, she mainly deals with psychology of individual differences and personality psychology. The author can be contacted at ksokic@vsfp.eu.

Đuro Horvat, Ph.D. works as the Assistant professor at the EFFECTUS College for Law and Finance in Zagreb. He got his PhD in Faculty of Economics in Osijek. His research interests are management, leadership and organizational design. He taught at several universities as an associate and guest lecturer. He is an author and co-author of the research (53) and professional (35) work papers as well as a large number of studies in management, organization, new forms of organization-clusters and competitiveness of enterprises. He has published ten books as an author, co-author or editor. The author can be contacted at dhorvat@vsfp.eu.