



ELSEVIER

Aggression as a trait: the Dark Tetrad alternative

Delroy L Paulhus¹, Shelby R Curtis² and Daniel N Jones²

Aggression is often construed as a unitary trait fully captured by the Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ). Our review of the literature questions that assumption in several respects. Instead of a top-down approach, we argue for a bottom-up conception based on the Dark Tetrad of personality, that is, narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and sadism. We highlight research showing that each member of the tetrad responds to different provocations. We conclude that the unitary trait conception of aggression has yielded more confusion than understanding. The term aggression should be reserved for outcomes, with many possible trait × situation predictors. Future research should continue the investigation of moderators as well as cognitive mediators to clarify the triggering of aggression in the individual tetrad members.

Addresses

¹ University of British Columbia, Canada

² University of Texas at El Paso, USA

Corresponding author: Paulhus, Delroy L (dpaulhus@psych.ubc.ca)

Current Opinion in Psychology 2017, 19:88–92

This review comes from a themed issue on **Aggression and violence**

Edited by **Brad J Bushman**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.04.007>

2352-250X/© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

In common parlance, aggression is a trait, that is, a stable and enduring style of thinking, acting, and feeling that can be measured on a continuum of individual differences [1]. By far the most popular trait measure is the Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ) [2] and its predecessor. Because of that popularity, much of the research on trait aggression has assumed the reality of that construct as the starting point. Unfortunately, that assumption has led to much confusion as to the nature of the trait. Factor analyses and other decompositions have yielded a broad range of content including assault, verbal aggression, suspicion, neurotic aggression, impulsive aggression, social-cognitive aggression, instrumental aggression, hostile aggression, alienation, anger, irritability, and social desirability, among others [3,4*]. Given this jumble of precipitators, processes and outcomes, it is questionable that the revered BPAQ actually captures a fundamental personality construct.

The evaluation of links to fundamental personality models, namely, the Big Five or HEXACO, has further undermined the case for a unitary understanding of trait aggression. To begin with, no aggression factor emerges in such comprehensive factor models. Instead, a spate of studies have linked the BPAQ with specific combinations of fundamental traits. Considering that the Big Five and HEXACO factors were designed to be orthogonal, this complexity of associations precludes a simple understanding of aggression and its relation to other traits.

In the present review, we question the value of reifying aggression with the assumed gold standard, that is, the BPAQ. Instead of this a top-down approach, we will argue for a bottom-up approach beginning with an underlying set of malevolent traits, namely, the Dark Tetrad [5**]: That is, narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and sadism.

Before we elaborate on that model, it is worth acknowledging another key weakness with a unitary trait approach. It has become clear that individual differences in personality interact with situational settings to provoke aggressive behaviors. That perspective was supported in the definitive meta-analysis by Bettencourt *et al.* [4*]. They found that whereas some personality traits (*e.g.*, irritability) predict aggression across all situations, other traits are associated with aggression only under specific conditions. Such moderator elements are evident in much of the subsequent research on aggression [6–9]. The specificity of situational triggers was exemplified in a daily diary study: The authors identified five categories of anger and aggression triggers, which, despite the inclusion of personality traits, captured the majority of variance in daily aggression and feelings of anger [10].

In this article, we not only acknowledge moderator elements but go further to suggest that aggression is an intrinsically interactive process. We honor these notions while advancing the argument that moderation effects should be investigated at the level of the Dark Tetrad traits, rather than at the level of a (questionable) unitary trait. To update our earlier review [11], we will emphasize work from the last decade.

Personality, situational, and mediating factors

Before we cover the Dark Tetrad literature, it is important to review two key topics from mainstream aggression research: (a) cognitive explanations of trait aggression and (b) links to standard trait models. Both bear on our critique of a simple unitary trait model for aggression.

Big Five/HEXACO factors

It has become standard practice in trait research to differentiate other traits from fundamental sets such as the Big Five or HEXACO. That requirement applies to the study of trait aggression. The most consistent links are with low Conscientiousness, low Agreeableness and high Neuroticism [12–14]. The first two factors tend to be linked to impulsivity whereas neuroticism is commonly linked to anger issues. Although these links can be theoretically justified, it seems impossible to build a unitary trait by postulating a common theme among three orthogonal factors.

The HEXACO factor model includes the Big Five plus an extra factor—Honesty/Humility. In the most recent germane study, Agreeableness predicted three of five bullying categories; but Honesty–Humility was linked to all five, including verbal, physical, social, sexual, and racial subtypes [15].

The role of cognition

The traditional temperament model assumes that genetic differences explain trait differences in aggression [16]. That approach has been challenged by cognitive approaches advocating that social information structures can trigger aggression or, at least, intervene between the impelling force of traits and overt aggression. Most influential is the *hostile attributional bias*: here, individual differences in aggression are explained as a reaction to assuming hostile intent in others. Recent evidence supports that claim across time and culture [17*].

Although the framework is more comprehensive, cognitive elements are also central to the *General Aggression Model* [18]: It holds that social knowledge structures, including scripts and schemas, are critical to the decision to aggress or not to aggress. Such social knowledge can be very elaborate and differentiated: Hence this model can also accommodate a great degree of personality \times situation complexity. Most supportive are recent studies indicating significant mediation between traits and aggressive behavior [19]. One recent study included the Big Five traits and General Aggression Model social knowledge variables [20*]. Results indicated that cognitive variables including situational triggers provided virtually complete mediation between the Big Five traits and aggressive behavior.

The demonstration of cognitive mediation is important in questioning the direct impact of a unitary aggression construct. Along with the added complexity of moderator effects, mediation effects suggest that intervening psychological processes play a key role.

The Dark Tetrad: empirical links with aggression

In recent years, research on individual differences on aggression has turned to a small set of personality

constructs known as the *Dark Tetrad* [5**]. The tetrad consists of four inter-correlated personality traits (Machiavellianism, narcissism, psychopathy, and sadism). Although theoretically distinct, current measures of the four variables tend to overlap substantially [21]. The common core appears to be callous manipulation [22*]. Rather than criminal or clinical samples, most of this research has been conducted on normal (*e.g.*, student, work, and community) samples. Undoubtedly, the dramatic surge in research has been facilitated by the publication of Dark Triad combination measures [23,24*]. Now available is a more comprehensive inventory that includes the fourth component of the Dark Tetrad, that is, the sadistic personality [25].

The tetrad members tend to show different patterns of associations with aggression, whether self-reported, observer-reported, or behavioral. Strongest and most consistent are links with psychopathy [26,27]. This pattern is consistent with the short-term mating strategy associated with psychopathy: These individuals (especially men) seek indiscriminate sexual contacts [23,28]. Individual links of aggression with narcissism [29,30] and sadism [31] have also been found.

Most important for our model are studies that include three or four of the dark personalities. This multivariate methodology helps control for the overlap among members, thereby avoiding possible misattribution of the effect of one tetrad member to another unmeasured member. To date, the bulk of such research has involved the Dark Triad (all but sadism) but work with the full tetrad is growing. The studies below follow the multivariate recommendation by including multiple dark personalities as predictors.

Psychopathy

One example is a recent latent variable approach to the Dark Triad and dispositional aggression [32]. Although the data confirmed a common factor linking the Dark Triad core (callousness manipulation) to the common core of aggression, psychopathy added unique variance. In particular, psychopathy had a strong and direct link to physical aggression, above and beyond the common variance of the Dark Triad. This finding is consistent with other research indicating that, in predicting aggression, psychopathy out-performs other triad members as well as the Big Five [28,33–35].

Narcissism

When narcissism and self-esteem are pitted head-to-head in predicting aggression, narcissism typically wins the day [30]. (In fact, contrary to conventional wisdom, low self-esteem does not predict aggression [36]). But when other tetrad members are controlled, narcissism has little association with aggression under normal circumstances—presumably any aggressive component is accounted for

by other members. Although their callous and disagreeable qualities may signal violence, grandiose narcissists continue to believe others admire them and therefore only aggress when such beliefs are threatened.

This moderator effect was evident in a recent laboratory study [37**]. In a white noise paradigm, participants were provoked either with (a) an insult to their intellectual ability, or (b) a physical attack (a surprise, gratuitous blast of high-volume noise). Consistent with an earlier finding [38], narcissists showed aggressive responses to the ego-threat whereas psychopaths showed aggressive responses to the physical threat. That narcissism result was confirmed in a followup study on costly aggression [39].

Sadism

The sadistic personality is unique among the Dark Tetrad in involving an appetite for cruelty—as opposed to callous indifference [5**]. Only sadistic individuals are willing to pay a price (perform a boring task) for the opportunity to harm others [40**]. In a study of males only, sadism predicted sexual aggression [31]; in females, the link with sadism was fully mediated by sexual attitudes [41].

With human communication increasingly occurring online, a new phenomenon – cyber-aggression – has emerged. This ugly variant is largely defined in similar terms to other forms of aggression, but is delivered via electronic means [42]. Recent research indicates that the Dark Tetrad, especially sadism, are key predictors of trolling and bullying behaviors online [43**]. Although all four tetrad constructs show positive associations with cyberbullying and aggression, sadism has the strongest link and narcissism, the weakest [44]. In both adolescents and adults, psychopathy and sadism have emerged as unique predictors of cyberbullying [45,46]. The emergence of sadism as the primary predictor in the online context suggests that anonymity can unleash the darker side of human nature [21].

Machiavellianism

By contrast, few studies reveal a unique link between Machiavellianism and aggression in adults. Presumably this follows from their careful, strategic methods of interpersonal engagement [5]. Among children, however, Machiavellianism has been linked with relational aggression, that is, aggression used to establish social hierarchies or to assert power [47*]. Recent research on couples suggests possible gender differences where, among women only, Machiavellianism is associated with direct aggression [48]. More generally, Machiavellians exploit others when profitable [49], but are normally restrained enough to realize that direct aggression is seldom worthwhile.

Conclusion

We have argued two main points regarding the trait approach to aggression. One is that the top-down approach – that is, reifying and then breaking down the Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire [2] – has led to confusion about the nature of trait aggression. The plethora of facets, processes, and outcomes included in that measure do not capture a coherent trait. We believe that the term aggression should be reserved for overt outcomes, with many possible trait predictors. Second, the argument for a unitary trait approach is challenged by the wealth of studies indicating interactions with context.

Instead, we argue for a bottom-up approach where aggression emerges in distinct ways from four lower level traits known as the Dark Tetrad. Together, these propositions point a new way forward. Instead of using a single broad measure, trait aggression should be tapped with joint measures of psychopathy, narcissism, Machiavellianism, and sadism (for example, the Short Dark Tetrad, SD4). Subsequent hypotheses must acknowledge the specific context because each tetrad member responds aggressively to unique provocations. Put another way, aggression appears to be intrinsically interactional.

However, the cognitive mediators of Dark Tetrad variables have yet to be explored. The General Aggression Model social knowledge mediators as well as the hostile attribution bias may help clarify qualitative differences in aggressive responding. It is through research on such mediators that the complex personality × situation effects of the Dark Tetrad on violence can be better understood.

Conflict of interest

Nothing declared.

References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

- of special interest
 - of outstanding interest
1. McCrae RR, Costa PT Jr: **Personality trait structure as a human universal**. *Am. Psychol.* 1997, **52**:509-516.
 2. Buss A, Perry M: **The aggression questionnaire**. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 1992, **63**:452-459.
 3. Becker G: **The Buss–Perry aggression questionnaire: some unfinished business**. *J. Res. Pers.* 2007, **41**:434-452.
 4. Bettencourt BA, Talley A, Benjamin AJ, Valentine J: **Personality and aggression under provoking and neutral conditions: a meta-analytic review**. *Psychol. Bull.* 2006, **132**:751-777.
- This meta-analysis was the first to systematically differentiate predictors of aggression across situations of provocation. The findings support the perspective that personality traits interact with situational factors to influence the likelihood of aggressive behavior.
5. Paulhus DL: **Toward a taxonomy of dark personalities**. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 2015, **2**:421-426.
- This review provides an update on the complete set of dark personalities known as the Dark Tetrad. They include narcissism, Machiavellianism,

psychopathy, and sadistic personality. Rather than clinical or criminal levels, they are studied at the subclinical or 'everyday' level.

6. Brees JR, Mackey JD, Martinko M, Harvey P: **The mediating role of perceptions of abusive supervision in the relationship between personality and aggression.** *J. Lead. Org. Stud.* 2014, **21**:403-413.
7. DeWall CN, Gillath O, Pressman SD, Black LL, Bartz JA, Moskowitz J, Stetler DA: **When the love hormone leads to violence: oxytocin increases intimate partner violence inclinations among high trait aggressive people.** *Soc. Psychol. Pers. Sci.* 2014, **5**:691-697.
8. Lobbestael J, Cima M, Lemmens A: **The relationship between personality disorder traits and reactive versus proactive motivation for aggression.** *Psychiatry Res.* 2015, **229**:155-160.
9. Kokko K, Simonton S, Dubow E, Lansford JE, Olson SL, Huesmann LR, Boxer P, Pulkkinen L, Bates JE, Dodge KA, Pettit GS: **Country, sex, and parent occupational status: moderators of the continuity of aggression from childhood to adulthood.** *Aggress. Behav.* 2014, **40**:552-567.
10. Kashdan TB, Goodman FR, Mallard TT, DeWall CN: **What triggers anger in everyday life? Links to the intensity, control, and regulation of these emotions, and personality traits.** *J. Pers.* 2015, **84**:737-749.
11. Paulhus DL, Jones DN: **Individual differences in aggression.** In *Aggression and Violence: A Social Psychological Perspective.* Edited by Bushman BJ. Taylor and Francis; 2016:105-118.
12. Barlett CP, Anderson CA: **Direct and indirect relations between the Big Five personality traits and aggressive and violent behavior.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2012, **52**:870-875.
13. Egan V: **The Big Five: neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness as an organisational scheme for thinking about aggression and violence.** In *Personality Disorder and Violence.* Edited by McMurrin M, Howard RC. Wiley & Sons; 2009:63-84.
14. Jones SE, Miller JD, Lynam DR: **Personality, antisocial behavior, and aggression: a meta-analytic review.** *J. Crim. Justice* 2011, **39**:329-337.
15. Farrell AH, Della Cioppa V, Volk AA, Book AS: **Predicting bullying heterogeneity with the HEXACO model of personality.** *Int. J. Adv. Psychol.* 2014, **3**:30-39.
16. Raine A: **From genes to brain to antisocial behavior.** *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 2008, **17**:323-328.
17. Dodge KA, Malone PS, Lansford JE, Sorbring E, Skinner AT, Tapanya S, Uribe Tirado LM, Zelli A, Alampay LP, Al-Hassan SM et al.: **Hostile attributional bias and aggressive behavior in global context.** *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2015, **112**:9310-9315.

One of few aggression studies to incorporate a longitudinal methodology, this research confirms the case for HAB predicting aggressive behavior across both culture and time.

18. Anderson CA, Bushman BJ: **Human aggression.** *Ann. Rev. Psychol.* 2002, **53**:27-51.
19. Anderson CA, Bushman BJ: **General aggression model.** *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* (this issue).
20. Hosie J, Gilbert F, Simpson K, Daffern M: **An examination of the relationship between personality and aggression using the general aggression and five factor models.** *Aggress. Behav.* 2014, **40**:189-196.

This study shows that although personality traits are associated with aggression, cognitive processes mediate this relationship, supporting the General Aggression model (GAM).

21. Book A, Visser BA, Blais J, Hosker-Field A, Methot-Jones T, Gauthier NY, Volk A, Holden RR, D'Agata MT: **Unpacking more evil: what is the core of the dark tetrad.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2016, **90**:269-272.
22. Jones DN, Figueredo AJ: **The core of darkness: uncovering the heart of the Dark Triad.** *Euro. J. Pers.* 2013, **27**:521-531.

After extracting the common core of the Dark Triad, the researchers found that each construct was uniquely related to different forms of aggression. Psychopathy was positively associated with physical aggression, Machiavellianism was positively associated with hostility, and Narcissism was negatively associated with hostility.

23. Jonason PK, Webster GD: **The dirty dozen: a concise measure of the dark triad.** *Psychol. Assess.* 2010, **22**:420.
24. Paulhus DL, Jones DN: **Measures of dark personalities.** In *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Constructs.* Edited by Boyle GJ, Saklofske GJ, Matthews G. Academic Press; 2016:556-563.

This chapter includes a variety of individual measures of narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and sadism. Also included are two combination measures: Short Dark Triad and Dirty Dozen.

25. Jones DN, Plouffe, R, Saklofske, D., Buckels EE, Paulhus, DL. **A short measure of the Dark Tetrad (SD4).** Unpublished instrument.
 26. Paulhus DL, Neumann CS, Hare RD: *Manual for the Self Report Psychopathy scale.* Toronto: Multi-health systems; 2016.
 27. Hecht LK, Berg JM, Lilienfeld SO, Litzman RD: **Parsing the heterogeneity of psychopathy and aggression: differential associations across dimensions and gender.** *Pers. Disord. Theory Res. Treat.* 2016, **7**:2-14.
 28. Webster GD, Gesselman AN, Crysel LC, Brunell AB, Jonason PK, Hadden BW, Smith CV: **An actor-partner interdependence model of the Dark Triad and aggression in couples: relationship duration moderates the link between psychopathy and argumentativeness.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2016, **101**:196-207.
 29. Barnett MD, Powell HA: **Self-esteem mediates narcissism and aggression among women, but not men: a comparison of two theoretical models of narcissism among college students.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2016, **89**:100-104.
 30. Paulhus DL, Robins RW, Trzesniewski KH, Tracy JL: **Two replicable suppressor situations in personality research.** *Multivar. Behav. Res.* 2004, **39**:303-328.
 31. Russell TD, King AR: **Anxious, hostile, and sadistic: maternal attachment and everyday sadism predict hostile masculine beliefs and male sexual violence.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2016, **99**:340-345.
 32. Jones DN, Neria AL: **The Dark Triad and dispositional aggression.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2015, **86**:360-364.
 33. Burtäverde V, Chraif M, Anîei M, Mihăilă T: **The incremental validity of the dark triad in predicting driving aggression.** *Accid. Anal. Prev.* 2016, **96**:1-11.
 34. Baughman HM, Dearing S, Giammarco E, Vernon PA: **Relationships between bullying behaviours and the Dark Triad: a study with adults.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2012, **52**:571-575.
 35. Westhead J, Egan V: **Untangling the concurrent influences of the Dark Triad, personality and mating effort on violence.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2015, **86**:222-226.
 36. Bushman BJ, Baumeister RF, Thomaes S, Ryu E, Begeer S, West SG: **Looking again, and harder, for a link between low self-esteem and aggression.** *J. Pers.* 2009, **77**:427-446.
 37. Jones DN, Paulhus DL: **Different provocations trigger aggression in narcissists and psychopaths.** *Soc. Psychol. Pers. Sci.* 2010, **1**:12-18.
- Using a white noise paradigm to operationalize aggression, this study suggests that members of the Dark Triad aggress under different provocations. Specifically, researchers found that narcissistic individuals are aggressive in response to an ego threat, while psychopathy uniquely predicts aggression in the face of a physical provocation.
38. Bushman BJ, Bonacci AM, van Dijk M, Baumeister RF: **Narcissism, sexual refusal, and aggression: testing a narcissistic reactance model of sexual coercion.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 2003, **84**:1027-1040.
 39. Lämmle L, Oedl C, Ziegler M: **Don't threaten me and my dark side or even self-harm won't stop me from hurting you.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2014, **67**:87-91.

40. Buckels EE, Jones DN, Paulhus DL: **Behavioral confirmation of everyday sadism.** *Psychol. Sci.* 2013, **24**:2301-2309.
Across two studies, sadism predicted higher willingness and enjoyment of aggression. Further, those higher in sadism were willing to work to have an opportunity to be aggressive against an innocent partner.
41. Russell TD, Doan CM, King AR: **Sexually violent women: the PID-5, everyday sadism, and adversarial sexual attitudes predict female sexual aggression and coercion against male victims.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2017, **111**:242-249.
42. Grigg DW: **Cyber-aggression: definition and concept of cyberbullying.** *Aust. J. Guid. Couns.* 2010, **20**:143-156.
43. Buckels EE, Trapnell PD, Paulhus DL: **Trolls just want to have fun.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2014, **67**:97-102.
This study was the first to show that internet trolls have sadistic personalities. Moreover, they reported that their primary motivation for trolling was pleasure, that is, the unique motivator of sadistic personalities.
44. Goodboy AK, Martin MM: **The personality profile of a cyberbully: examining the Dark Triad.** *Comp. Hum. Behav.* 2015, **49**:1-4.
45. Pabian S, De Backer CJS, Vandebosch H: **Dark Triad personality traits and adolescent cyber-aggression.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2015, **75**:41-46.
46. Van Geel M, Goemans A, Toprak F, Vedder P: **Which personality traits are related to traditional bullying and cyberbullying? A study with the Big Five, Dark Triad and sadism.** *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2017, **106**:231-235.
47. Kerig PK, Stellwagen KK: **Roles of callous-unemotional traits, narcissism, and Machiavellianism in childhood aggression.** *J. Psychopath. Behav. Assess.* 2010, **32**:343-352.
Among children, narcissism and Machiavellianism were differentially associated with manifestations of aggression. Psychopathy was consistently related to all forms of aggression, but Machiavellianism only predicted relational aggression.
48. Hamel J, Jones DN, Dutton DG, Graham-Kevan N: **The CAT: a gender-inclusive measure of controlling and abusive tactics.** *Violence Vict.* 2015, **30**:547-580.
49. Jones DN, Paulhus DL: **Duplicity among the Dark Triad: three faces of deceit.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* (in press).