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Abstract

This dissertation relates job desires and outcomes to the Dark Personality (Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, Narcissism, Low Agreeableness, Low Honesty-Humility) in the United States Army. It purports that individuals high on the Dark Personality desire more power, money, and status, and that they obtain jobs that afford them these luxuries by using manipulation at work. Two pilot studies used samples of United States Army members to create and test index variables: Dark Personality, Total Manipulation in the workplace, Desire for Job Success, and Total Job Success in the Army. Individual personality traits, manipulation tactics, and job desires were examined in secondary analyses.

Using a sample of 468 United States Army Members, central analyses indicated that Army members high on the Dark Personality desired Job Success. Likewise, army members higher on the Dark Personality used more Manipulation tactics at work, including the egregious tactics. Yet, using more Manipulation tactics at work predicted lower levels of Job Success in the Army. Most manipulation tactics had a negative impact on Job Success, with the exception of soft tactics like Reason and Responsibility Invocation. Together, these results indicate that selective use of soft manipulation predicted Job Success, but use of more manipulation tactics predicted less Job Success in the Army. Curvilinear results indicated that being either very low or very high on the Dark Personality predicted more Job Success in the Army, whereas having intermediate levels of the Dark Personality predicted less Job Success. Finally, possessing the Dark Personality and using more Manipulation tactics at work, together, predicted less Job Success in the Army.

Collectively, the results indicate that army members with intermediate levels of the Dark Personality want more powerful and high paying jobs, yet their strategy of manipulating their
coworkers to move up the job ladder does not result in higher ranking, higher paying Army positions. However, Army members highest on the Dark Personality achieved job success, defying the maladaptive influence that antisocial personality traits and manipulative behaviour had on job success for most Army members. Therefore, this dissertation indicates that successful corporate scoundrels exist in the Army, but there are few of them.
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Chapter 1

General Introduction

The popular media has long created iconic characters who are defined by their dark personality traits. From the psychopathic serial killer to the manipulative, narcissistic CEO, these cold, manipulative, “evil” characters draw a lot of fan attention in a variety of films and television programs. Personality research has introduced a construct that summarizes the characteristics of these dark individuals, namely, the Dark Triad of personality (Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, Narcissism; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Prior research has demonstrated that the Dark Triad of personality is related to an absence of desirable normal personality traits, like low trait Agreeableness and low Honesty-Humility (Lee & Ashton, 2005). For the purposes of this dissertation, a novel personality construct will be created, namely the Dark Personality, which is conceptualized as a personality style characterized by Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy, as well as low levels of both trait Agreeableness and Honesty-Humility. The Dark Personality characterizes individuals who are manipulative, antagonistic, and exploitative in their interpersonal interactions with other people. Individuals who score high on the Dark Personality style are immodest, disingenuous in their interpersonal relations, and are concerned with personal status and power.

Although the Dark Personality traits are often conceptualized as maladaptive due to the interpersonal harm they are associated with, there are theoretical arguments (e.g., O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012; Glenn, Kurzban & Raine, 2011; Hawley, 2006; Wilson, Near, & Miller, 1996) that there may be adaptive aspects of the Dark Personality and interpersonal influence. In the next chapter, my review of the literature will indicate that the Dark Personality, and Low Honesty-Humility in particular, are robustly associated with a desire
to obtain money and power for oneself. Moreover, the research to follow will demonstrate that individuals with the Dark Personality traits may actually achieve positions of power and status in the workplace. This dissertation aims to decipher whether the Dark Personality style can facilitate the attainment of positive work outcomes, such as personal money, power, and status.

The research reviewed in the next chapter will indicate that the Dark Triad and Low-Honesty Humility relate to the use of interpersonal manipulation tactics in intimate relationships and other domains of functioning. In this dissertation I propose that individuals with higher levels of the Dark Personality desire job advancement in order to achieve wealth and power over other people, and I further propose that the mechanism that these individuals use to achieve Job Success is the use of interpersonal manipulation tactics at work. One objective of this dissertation is to demonstrate empirically that the Dark Personality is linked to a desire for Job Success (i.e., wanting to obtain personal power, money, and status). The primary objective of this dissertation is to demonstrate a relationship between the Dark Personality and the attainment of Job Success and to show that the relationship is partially explained by the use of interpersonal manipulation tactics in the workplace.

Members of the United States Army were chosen as participants to test these research questions for several reasons. For instance, higher levels of the Dark Personality traits may be present in individuals in the Army, relative to the normal population, because being self-confident and direct facilitate quick decisions in difficult situations. Furthermore, the United States Army has a very structured and hierarchical job advancement system comprised of Army Rank (i.e., power and status) and Army Pay Grade (i.e., money), which will enable development of an interpretable measure of Job Success in this work environment. Thus, in the context of this research project, Job Success will be defined as the attainment of an Army Rank and Pay Grade
that affords high levels of power, money, and status for the individual. This line of research will contribute to a sparse literature that relates socially negative aspects of personality, namely, subclinical socially malevolent Dark Personality traits and manipulation tactics, to job outcomes, and it will contribute to our understanding of how manipulation tactics may be the mechanism linking personality traits and workplace outcomes.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The Dark Personality

The Dark Triad of personality consists of three antisocial subclinical personality traits: Machiavellianism (i.e., cynical world view and interpersonal manipulation), Narcissism (i.e., feelings of grandiosity, entitlement, and superiority of the self), and Psychopathy (i.e., high impulsivity and thrill seeking accompanied by low empathy and anxiety; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). We now understand how a higher order construct like the Dark Triad cluster of personality relates to a nomological network of allied personality traits and theoretical downstream correlates. Specifically, within the Five Factor Model, the Dark Triad has shown robust relationships with Low Agreeableness (e.g., Stead, Fekken, Kay, & McDermott, 2012; Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006). Likewise, within the HEXACO model, the Dark Triad has shown robust relationships with Low Honesty-Humility (Lee & Ashton, 2005). The Honesty-Humility dimension of personality is operationalized as desiring fairness, being sincere, avoiding greed, and being modest; the behaviour of individuals low in the Honesty-Humility dimension of personality would be characterized by impropriety, insincerity, immodesty, and self-indulgence (Lee & Ashton, 2005). As such, individuals low in Honesty-Humility are more likely to commit fraud or corruption, be immodest and disingenuous in interpersonal relations, and focus on obtaining personal wealth and social status. It appears, then, that individuals with high levels of the subclinical Dark Triad traits hold beliefs and engage in behaviours that are characteristic of being low in Agreeableness and being low in Honesty-Humility. There are theoretical advantages of including both the normal personality and subclinical personality trait domains when constructing a comprehensive anti-social personality construct; as such, the Dark
Personality consists of the Dark Triad traits, Low trait Agreeableness, and Low trait Honesty-Humility.

People with high levels of the Dark Personality traits are generally depicted as reckless, selfish, and dangerous individuals, who are known to cause interpersonal harm (e.g., Baughman, Dearing, Giammarco, & Vernon, 2012). Of course, the interpersonal harm they cause to other people is often viewed as ultimately maladaptive to the people with the Dark Personality themselves because those people they exploit often recognize their manipulative behaviour and punish high Dark Personality people or terminate the relationship. For example, in romantic relationships, mates of individuals high on the Dark Triad are more likely to defect from the relationship despite the use of varied mate retention strategies by individuals high on the Dark Triad (Jonason, Li & Buss, 2010). Yet, the Dark Personality may not be entirely maladaptive in attaining personal success in one’s job, where success is often relative to or even at the expense of one’s fellow employees or external competitors.

**The Dark Personality and Desire for Job Success**

The literature suggests that individuals with the Dark Personality traits desire life outcomes that relate to Job Success. Research indicates that those who possess the Dark Personality traits tend to disproportionately desire personal power, money, and status when compared to individuals low on these traits (e.g., Lee et al., 2012). In particular, Low Honesty-Humility has been related to materialism and power seeking (Ashton & Lee, 2008), and to extrinsic life aspirations like money, image, and fame (Lee et al. 2012). In addition, Low Honesty-Humility and Low Emotionality predict higher levels of status driven risk taking, which is the willingness to accept physical risk in the pursuit of wealth and power (Ashton, Lee, Pozzebon, Visser, & Worth, 2010). Finally, both the Dark Triad traits and Low Honesty-
Humility predict desire for power, conspicuous consumption, and materialism (Lee et al., 2012). Thus, the literature provides strong support for the argument that individuals with the Dark Personality traits desire power, money, and status for themselves more than individuals low on the Dark Personality traits. Therefore, the first research question aims to confirm that people with high levels of the Dark Personality desire a job that provides personal power, social status, and money.

**The Dark Personality and Job Success**

Given their strong desire for power and wealth, the next research question then becomes, do people with the Dark Personality traits actually obtain their desired powerful, high paying positions? There is some preliminary evidence that has focused on Psychopathy and Narcissism that indicates that they do obtain success. Dutton (2012) provides survey data on the professions with the largest number of psychopaths (i.e., CEOs, lawyers, media persons in TV/radio, salespersons, and surgeons), which provides potential support for the contention that people with some or all of the Dark Personality traits achieve positions of power, status, and wealth. Dutton (2012) argues that psychopaths are fearless, confident, charismatic, ruthless, and focused, which enables them to obtain success in society. These traits appear to facilitate the attainment of a position that offers a high salary and interpersonal power and status.

Similarly, there is some modest empirical support that the Dark Personality traits, and aspects of Narcissism in particular, can facilitate leadership progression in the context of the United States Military (e.g., Paunonen, Lonnqvist, Verkasalo, Leikas, & Nissinen, 2006; Nissinen, 2001). Specifically, Paunonen and colleagues (2006) found that Military cadets rated the best leaders in the Military as high on Narcissistic egotism and self-esteem, but low on Narcissistic manipulation. Furthermore, the Military has a many-tiered hierarchy of leaders,
with high ranking leaders influencing the people in the lower strata of the Military, and even being responsible for many lives in times of war. Finally, there is some research that supports the argument that people high in the Dark Personality may seek out Military positions. Furnham, Hyde, and Trickey (2014) indicated that people with particular dispositions seek out vocational settings that fulfill various personal drives. Thus, given the high degree of power, status, and money that high ranking Military positions offer, it is likely a career path that will attract individuals high in the Dark Personality because obtaining a senior Military rank would fit with their definition of Job Success.

In this dissertation, I will use a sample of active members of the United States Army to test these propositions. Given the mixed findings in the literature, this dissertation will contribute to the existing research by addressing the nature of the relationship between the Dark Personality and Job Success in the Army (e.g., directionality, linearity).

**The Dark Personality and Interpersonal Manipulation**

One of the intriguing questions about the relationship between personality traits and high status outcome variables, such as Job Success, concerns the mechanism that may link the two. In the current context, of key interest is the question of how these more disagreeable, selfish, and manipulative individuals become more likely to obtain powerful positions at work relative to their more honest, humble, and agreeable coworkers. Social exchange theory provides a theoretical framework for explaining how possessing the Dark Personality style can result in Job Success. According to social exchange theory, employees work for employers in exchange for concrete and socio-emotional rewards. This exchange creates a relationship between employees and employers that is strengthened when the rewards are valued, the partners trust each other and are committed to each other, and the exchange is judged to be fair. But for individuals high on
the Dark Personality, their valuation of the rewards and costs, their willingness to ignore promises and reciprocity, and their lack of emotional commitment to others, tends to undermine the binding influence of interpersonal relationships that other employees feel (O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012; Glenn, Kurzban & Raine, 2011; Hawley, 2006; Wilson, Near, & Miller, 1996). As a result, individuals with high levels of the Dark Personality traits may be more likely to break the cooperative interpersonal rules of the workplace, which emphasize the collective good, and they may choose rather to extract resources for themselves.

One key way in which people high on the Dark Personality traits are likely to take advantage of an interpersonal situation is through the use of interpersonal manipulation. Research conceptualizes interpersonal manipulation into a series of specific tactics used to obtain acquiescence from other people. These manipulation tactics are not specific to the workplace and range in coerciveness, from tactics that are gently persuasive to tactics that are primarily forceful and interpersonally unpleasant. Buss (1992) empirically identified twelve manipulation tactics used in interpersonal relationships: (1) Charm, (2) Reason, (3) Coercion, (4) Silent Treatment, (5) Debasement, (6) Regression, (7) Responsibility Invocation, (8) Reciprocity, (9) Monetary Reward, (10) Pleasure Induction, (11) Social Comparison, and (12) Hardball (i.e., threats, lies, violence). In addition, Bolino and Turnley (1999) empirically identified impression management strategies and behavioral tactics used by employees at work: (1) Self-Promotion, (2) Ingratiation, (3) Exemplification, (4) Intimidation, and (5) Supplication (Kacmar, Harris, & Nagy, 2007). Although most people use some of these seventeen manipulation tactics at work, they vary in toxicity, and moral acceptability.

There is compelling evidence to show that individuals high in the Dark Triad traits use Buss’ (1992) manipulation tactics selectively to solve adaptive problems with family members.
and friends. Amongst friends, those high on Machiavellianism use charm to build alliances, those high on Narcissism use reason to build social status, and those high on Psychopathy use seduction or charm to convince friends to help them find mates (e.g., Jonason et al. 2012). Research relating the Dark Triad to manipulation tactics at work is just beginning. Hard manipulation tactics are defined as tactics in which the user forces his or her will on another person by being pushy or aggressive, whereas soft manipulation tactics are defined as tactics that are designed to convince another person that it is in his or her best interest to engage in the advocated behaviour. Jonason, Slomski, and Partyka (2012) demonstrated that the arguably more toxic aspects of the Dark Triad were related to more use of hard tactics. Specifically, Psychopathy was related to the use of harder manipulation tactics at work, Narcissism was related to softer tactics, and Machiavellianism was related to both hard and soft manipulation tactics (Jonason, Slomski, & Partyka, 2012). There is presently no research that demonstrates that manipulation tactics are a potential mechanism for relating the Dark Personality traits and Job Success. This present research study will build on the finding that individuals high on the Dark Triad use a protean approach to interpersonal manipulation, which is characterized by being flexible and adaptable in one’s use of social influence (Jonason et al. 2012). Machiavellianism, in particular, is associated with high self-monitoring, low sincerity, and the use of emotional manipulation in many situations (e.g., Austin, Farrelly, Black, & Moore, 2007; Grieve, 2011). Therefore, in this dissertation, I aim to empirically support the proposition that people with high levels of the Dark Personality traits use a higher number of manipulation tactics at work, given their flexible approach to social influence in interpersonal situations (Jonason et al. 2012). In addition to the Dark Triad, both Low Agreeableness (Buss, 1992; Butkovic & Bratko, 2007) and Low Honesty-Humility (Hilbig & Zetler, 2009; Lee & Ashton, 2012) have
been associated with the use of manipulation in general, but less is known about their relationships to specific tactics. This dissertation will build on the current literature by examining a wider range of antisocial personality traits and manipulation tactics, thus filling the gaps in the current literature regarding how personality and social influence are related.

**The Dark Personality and Interpersonal Manipulation as a Mechanism for Job Success**

The central research question of this dissertation addresses the proposition that individuals with higher levels of the Dark Personality traits use more interpersonal manipulation tactics at work in order to obtain Job Success in the form of a high salary, high social status, and power over other people. The majority of people are motivated to succeed at work and progress in their jobs. As such, everyone tends to use some degree of influence at work. Perhaps the best example would be ingratiation, or the use of flattery to improve the target’s view of the individual (Kacmar, Harris, & Nagy, 2007). A meta-analysis of influence tactics and work outcomes indicated that individuals who exhibit ingratiation and reason at work have a greater chance of succeeding in their careers. In particular, these individuals tend to have more positive performance assessments, which may lead indirectly to extrinsic measures of Job Success, such as promotions and salary increases (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003). It is not surprising that influence behaviours are ubiquitous at work; however, individuals with higher levels of the Dark Personality traits use more interpersonal manipulation tactics. They use more intense, morally unacceptable, manipulation tactics. Therefore, the research questions addressed in this dissertation will focus on the relationship between the Dark Personality traits and the attainment of Job Success, and determine if the relationship is mediated by the use of interpersonal manipulation in the workplace. Specifically, this project will empirically test the research questions outlined above using a large sample of active members of the United States Army.
STUDY 1: MEASUREMENT DEVELOPMENT PILOT STUDY 1

Chapter 3

Research Objectives

The goal of Study 1 is to construct measures of the key variables to be used for addressing the substantive research questions in this dissertation. Specifically, in Study 1 I will develop a measure of the broad Dark Personality construct described above which includes aspects of Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, Narcissism, low Agreeableness and Low Honesty-Humility. I will also construct a measure of Desire for Job Success, which includes a Desire for Power, Money, and Social Status. Furthermore, I will construct a measure of Workplace Manipulation, which includes the seventeen individual manipulation tactics introduced above. Based on pilot work using a sample of expert raters who rated the severity/intensity of the manipulation tactics, I will also construct measures for Hard and for Soft Manipulation tactics. Finally, I will develop a measure of Job Success, using demographic information such as Army Rank and Pay Grade.
Chapter 4

Method

Participants and Procedure

The pilot sample of 191 American adult participants (151 males, 40 females; age range: 18-50, $M = 28.46, SD = 6.59$) was recruited online through Mechanical Turk, and completed the self-report questionnaires using SurveyMonkey. Qualifications for the study were that participants must be American, at least 21 years of age, and a current member of the United States Army. The sample consisted of 72% Caucasian and 18% African American participants, with the remaining participants being of Asian or South Asian descent. In addition, 57% of the sample was single, and 38% were married or cohabitating, with the remaining participants being widowed or divorced. The majority of the sample was Christian (56%), with the remaining participants being dispersed fairly evenly amongst other religious affiliations. Finally, 81% of the sample grew up in either a small or large city, and the remaining participants grew up in a rural area or on a farm. According to the Department of Defense 2013 Demographics report, approximately 20% of Military personnel are females and 80% are male, with 30% of Military personnel identifying as an ethnic minority, and just over 50% identifying themselves as married (2013 Demographics Profile of the Military Community, 2013). This sample largely coincides with the demographic breakdown of Military personnel presented in the demographics report, suggesting that this sample of Army members is representative of typical United States Military personnel.

In addition, a sample of graduate students in psychology provided expert ratings of the severity of the seventeen manipulation tactics described in the materials to follow. The student raters categorized the manipulation tactics as Hard (i.e., tactics where the user forces his or her
will on a co-worker by being pushy or aggressive) or Soft (i.e., tactics that are designed to convince a co-worker that it is in his or her best interest to engage in the advocated behaviour). The analyses to follow will attempt to empirically validate the Hard and Soft Manipulation tactics dichotomy that is suggested by the expert ratings and past research (e.g., Jonason, Slomski, & Partyka, 2012).

Materials

All the questionnaires to follow are included in Appendix B.

Aspirations Index – Financial Success items (AI-FS; Kasser & Ryan, 1993). The AI-FS is a 5-item measure of one’s desire for financial success or money. Participants rate items such as “You will have a job that pays well” on a 5-item scale according to how important financial success is to them as a personal aspiration (1 = Not at all Important, 5 = Very Important). The internal consistency of this scale was .69 in the pilot sample.

Job Success Demographics Questionnaire. Participants were asked questions related to Job Success in the United States Army; they were asked to identify their education, current salary and job title, and the number of years they have been in the Army. They also reported their starting Army Rank and Pay Grade, as well as their current Army Rank and Pay Grade. Finally, they provided information about their Military Occupational Specialty and the number of promotions and pay raises they have received.

Demographics Questionnaire. The demographics questionnaire asked participants to identify their age, marital status, gender, ethnic background, and where they grew up.

HEXACO Personality Inventory-Revised (HEXACO-PI-R; Ashton & Lee, 2009). The HEXACO-PI-R is a 60-item self-report measure of six domains of normal personality: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness
(10 items each). Participants rate items, such as “On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic” on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). This study will focus on Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness, which had internal consistencies of .59 and .67 in the pilot sample, respectively.

Impression Management Scale (IMS; Bolino & Turnley, 1999). The IMS is a 22-item measure of employee impression management behaviors based on the taxonomy proposed by Jones and Pittman. The scale measures five factors of employee impression management: Self-Promotion (4 items), Ingratiation (4 items), Exemplification (4 items), Intimidation (5 items), and Supplication (5 items). Participants rate items such as “How often do you make people aware of your accomplishments” on a 5-point scale (1 = Never Behave This Way, 5 = Often Behave This Way). In the pilot sample, the internal consistencies were as follows: Self-Promotion (α = .87), Ingratiation (α = .74), Exemplification (α = .64), Intimidation (α = .89), and Supplication (α = .92).

Index of Personal Reactions—Need for Power Subscale (IPR; Bennett, 1988). The IPR is a 49-item measure that consists of four subscales: (1) Need for Power, (2) Need for Influence, (3) Ability, and (4) Resistance to Subordination. Only the 10-item Need for Power subscale was used. Participants responded to items tapping their desire for power, such as “I think I would enjoy having authority over others” on a 5-point scale (1 = Not at all Characteristic of Me, 5 = Very Much Characteristic of Me). The internal consistency of this scale was .87 in the pilot sample.

MACH-IV (Christie & Geis, 1970). The MACH-IV consists of 20 items that are summed to measure Machiavellianism. Participants rate items such as “The best way to handle
people is to tell them what they want to hear” on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha was .80 in the pilot sample.

**Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979).** The NPI has 40 pairs of attitudes, such as “A. When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed” and “B. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.” Participants choose the attitude that best applies to them. Items are summed to obtain a measure of Narcissism. The internal consistency was .86 in the pilot sample.

**Need for Social Status items (NSS; Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Ames, 2006).** The NSS consists of 8 items from Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, and Ames (2006) that measure desire for personal social status. The items were adapted to be specific to the workplace. Participants rate items such as “It would please me to have a position of prestige and social standing” on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The internal consistency of this scale was .82 in the pilot sample.

**Self-report Psychopathy Scale-III-R (SRP-III-R; Forth, Brown, Hart, & Hare, 1996).** The SRP-III-R consists of 31 items that are summed to measure Psychopathy. Participants respond to items such as “I almost never feel guilty over something I’ve done” using a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). This scale has a Cronbach’s alpha of .90 in the pilot sample.

**Tactics of Manipulation Scale—Employee Revisal (TMS-ER; Buss, 1992).** The TMS-ER is a 35-item measure of six tactics used to influence one’s partner. The TMS was updated to include 42 items that tap twelve tactics of manipulation: Reason (3 items), Charm (2 items), Regression (3 items), Coercion (3 items), Silent Treatment (3 items), Debasement (3 items), Responsibility Invocation (2 items), Reciprocity (4 items), Monetary Reward (3 items),
Pleasure Induction (2 items), Social Comparison (4 items), and Hardball (10 items; Buss, 1992). The TMS-ER is a 42-item measure that uses gender-neutral language to examine the twelve tactics of influence used by employees to influence their co-workers. Participants rate items such as “I degrade him/her into doing it” on a 7-point scale (1 = Not at all Likely, 7 = Extremely Likely). In the pilot sample, the internal consistency estimates were as follows: Reason (\(\alpha = .85\)), Charm (\(\alpha = .76\)), Regression (\(\alpha = .85\)), Coercion (\(\alpha = .87\)), Silent Treatment (\(\alpha = .85\)), Debasement (\(\alpha = .83\)), Responsibility Invocation (\(\alpha = .69\)), Reciprocity (\(\alpha = .87\)), Monetary Reward (\(\alpha = .90\)), Pleasure Induction (\(\alpha = .83\)), Social Comparison (\(\alpha = .85\)), and Hardball (\(\alpha = .90\)).
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Results

Descriptive Statistics: Individual Variables

First, the individual variables were scored, and their distributional properties and internal consistencies were examined (Table 1, pg. 27). Overall, the range of scores was wide for the individual variables, indicating sufficient variability; notably, Army Rank Change had a few negative scores indicating a regression in Rank, and the variable was positively skewed indicating that most participants had advanced only a small number of Ranks in their time in the Army. The means and standard deviations of the individual variables largely coincide with the distributional properties presented in the literature. Examining the skewness of the individual variables indicates that all have fairly symmetrical, or normal, distributions. Similarly, most of the individual variables have kurtosis values that indicate approximately normal distributions, with the exception of Machiavellianism, which had a leptokurtic (or tall) distribution, and Intimidation and Supplication, which had platykurtic (or flat) distributions. Finally, the majority of the individual variables had good or excellent internal consistency estimates, indicating that the items hang well together to measure the constructs. Nonetheless, there was a range in the internal consistency estimates, with some few item variables showing moderate reliability (Low Honesty Humility, $\alpha = .59$; Exemplification $\alpha = .64$; Responsibility Invocation, $\alpha = .69$), and some variables showing very strong reliability (Supplication, $\alpha = .92$; Psychopathy, $\alpha = .90$; Hardball, $\alpha = .90$). Overall, the individual variables show good psychometric properties and will be used to construct the proposed index variables.
Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: The Dark Personality Index Variable

Maximum Likelihood was chosen as the model fitting procedure in this dissertation because it allows for tests of goodness of fit, statistical significance of factor loadings, and correlations between factors. Additionally, as examined above, the data had approximately normal distributions, thus upholding the assumption of multivariate normality, which is required for Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). The unrotated solutions are presented below; with one exception, no rotations were required.

The first Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, Narcissism, Low Agreeableness, and Low Honesty-Humility to determine the underlying factor structure. Examination of the scree plot of factor eigenvalues indicated that a 1-factor solution was optimal. The 1-factor solution accounted for 46.54% of the overall variance (Table 3, pg. 30). Examination of the extraction eigenvalues (Table 2, pg. 29) indicated that all the variables were well accounted for by the solution; Low Agreeableness had the lowest extracted communality, with 17% of its variance accounted for by the solution.

Examining the factor matrix (Table 4, pg. 31) indicated that all the variables consistently and significantly loaded the single factor. However, the 1-factor solution had a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of .66 (90% CI: .60-.71), which indicates poor model fit. Taken together, the results indicated that the Dark Personality index variable can be created by summing the items from Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, Narcissism, Low Agreeableness, and Low Honesty-Humility; however, the poor model fit indicates that the personality traits also have unique variance and should be examined for unique associations.

Given that each of the Dark Personality variables are measured using different response scales (i.e., the NPI responses are coded as 0 or 1, the MACH-IV responses are coded from 1 to
7, the SRPS-III-R responses are coded from 1 to 5, and the HEXACO responses are coded from 1 to 5), standardized Z-scores were computed for each of the items prior to summing them to form the Dark Personality index variable. Using standardized scores for the items will ensure that all items contributing to the Dark Personality are given equal weight. The assumption of homogeneity of variance required to use Z-scores was met for the Dark Personality; Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was non-significant when comparing each of the 5 individual personality variables. Therefore, the standardized Dark Personality index variable was created, and its descriptive properties are examined below.

**Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Desire for Job Success Index Variable**

A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on Desire for Power, Desire for Social Status, and Desire for Money to determine their underlying factor structure. Examining the scree plot of factor eigenvalues indicated that a 1-factor solution, which accounted for 50.95% of the total variance (Table 6, pg. 33), was optimal. The extracted communalities were all high, indicating that the single factor accounted for a significant proportion of each of the individual variables (Table 5, pg. 32).

Examining the factor matrix (Table 7, pg. 34) indicated that all the variables consistently and significantly loaded the underlying factor. Therefore, the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis confirmed that the items from Desire for Power, Desire for Social Status, and Desire for Money can be summed to create the index variable Desire for Job Success. Given that the items from the three contributing measures use different response scales, standardized Z-scores were computed for each of the items prior to summing them to form the Desire for Job Success index variable. Using standardized scores for the items will ensure that all items contributing to Desire for Job Success are given equal weight. The assumption of homogeneity of variance required to
use Z-scores was met for Desire for Job Success; Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was non-significant when comparing each of the 3 individual desires. The Desire for Job Success standardized index variable was computed, and its psychometric properties will be examined below.

**Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Total Manipulation Index Variable**

The next Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on Charm, Reason, Coercion, Silent Treatment, Debasement, Regression, Responsibility Invocation, Reciprocity, Monetary Reward, Pleasure Induction, Social Comparison, Hardball, Self-Promotion, Ingratiation, Exemplification, Intimidation, and Supplication to determine the underlying factor of the manipulation tactics. Examining the scree plot of factor eigenvalues supported the extraction of a 1-factor solution, which accounted for 37.23% of the total variance (Table 9, pg. 36). The extracted communalities for the 1-factor solution were adequate for many of the manipulation tactics, with the exception of Self-Promotion, Ingratiation, Exemplification, Responsibility Invocation, and Reason, which were not well explained by the single factor (Table 8, pg. 35). Thus, a Total Manipulation factor does not fit some of the softest manipulation tactics, which may belong on additional factors. This provides empirical support for the contention that the Manipulation tactics can be split based on their social severity, which I will follow up on shortly.

Examining the factor matrix of the 1-factor solution (Table 10, pg. 37) indicated that all variables significantly loaded the underlying factor, except for Reason, Ingratiation, Self-Promotion, and Exemplification, which showed factor loadings below .30. Notably, Reason had a negative factor loading, highlighting how different it is from the other manipulation tactics. The RMSEA for the 1-factor solution was .17 (90% CI: .16-.18), which indicates poor model fit.
Given the poor model fit for the 1-factor solution and its exclusion of some of the soft manipulation tactics, additional factors were examined. The scree plot of factor eigenvalues indicated that the second factor accounted for an additional 15% of the variance, suggesting the possible presence of 2 factors. Furthermore, the final eigenvalue drop occurred after the fourth factor was extracted, suggesting that there could be as many as 4 manipulation factors.

Based on the student severity ratings described above (pg. 13), I examined the 2-factor solution in an attempt to replicate the Hard and Soft Manipulation tactic categories that were created. However, the 2-factor solution did not replicate the categorization structure created by the student raters. Additionally, after computing the Hard and Soft Manipulation index variables, they were highly correlated with each other ($r = .69$). Regardless of these issues, examining the 2-factor solution resulted in a modest increase in model fit (RMSEA = .14, 90% CI = .12-.15). Similarly, examining the 3-factor solution and the 4-factor solution resulted in further increases in model fit: RMSEA = .10 (90% CI: .09 -.11) and RMSEA = .08 (90% CI: .06 -.09), respectively. The 4-factor solution’s RMSEA indicated acceptable model fit.

Given the acceptable model fit for the 4-factor solution, and the fact that the final drop on the scree plot occurred after extracting the fourth factor, this solution was also examined for the purposes of comparison to the 1-factor solution. To maximize interpretability of the factor loadings, Direct Oblimin rotation was used because the manipulation factors are expected to be correlated with one another. The 4-factor solution accounted for 62.94% of the total variance (Table 12, pg. 39). The extracted communalities were all above .30 (Table 11, pg. 38), indicating that all the manipulation tactics were well explained by the four manipulation factors. This represents an improvement over the 1-factor solution, which failed to explain the softest tactics. Examining the Pattern Matrix (Table 13, pg. 40) indicated that several of the most
antisocial manipulation tactics loaded the first factor, namely, Supplication, Regression, Debasement, Hardball, Silent Treatment, Social Comparison, Monetary Reward, and Intimidation, which also showed a cross loading on the fourth factor. Coercion and Responsibility Invocation loaded the second factor, which was uninterpretable. The third factor was loaded by Charm, Reason, Pleasure Induction, and Reciprocity, which also showed a cross loading on the first factor. Finally, Self-Promotion, Ingratiation, and Exemplification loaded the fourth factor. Generally speaking, the most egregious and anti-social manipulation tactics loaded the first factor, and the softest tactics loaded the third, and fourth factors. Finally, the factor correlation matrix confirmed that all four manipulation factors were moderately correlated with one another.

After examining the 1-factor, 2-factor, and 4-factor solutions, I made the decision to retain the 1-factor solution, which is indicative of a Total Manipulation index variable. Overall, the 1-factor solution accounted for the majority of the individual manipulation tactics. While, the multiple factor solutions had better model fit indices and explained more of the overall variance, they did not provide interpretable categorizations of the manipulation tactics, thus making it difficult to make and test meaningful hypotheses in the main study to follow. I argue that the best way to test the impact of the manipulation tactics in this dissertation is to examine the Total Manipulation factor and to also examine the tactics individually, as they do not appear to form coherent categories based on this pilot work. Therefore, a Total Manipulation variable was computed, and its descriptive properties will be examined below. Once again, standardized Z-scores were used for the items to compute the Total Manipulation index variable in order to ensure that all items had equal weight given that the two measures used different response scales. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was only partially met for Total Manipulation;
Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was non-significant for only 6 of the 17 individual manipulation variables, indicating that there were statistically significant differences in variance when comparing some of the manipulation tactics to one another. In addition to a Total Manipulation index variable, the individual manipulation tactics will be examined in the main analyses to follow because they appear to form unique associations, despite their common core.

**Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Job Success in the Army Index Variable**

Before running a Maximum Likelihood Factor Analyses on the Job Success items, two sets of possible change variables were created and compared. First, subtracting participants’ Starting Army Rank from their Current Army Rank created an Army Rank Change variable; similarly, subtracting participants’ Starting Army Pay Grade from their Current Army Pay Grade created an Army Pay Grade Change variable. Both of these change variables produced distributions that were positively skewed and leptokurtic with adequate variability (Table 1, pg. 28). While these change variables had adequate psychometric properties, they did not take into account the number of years it took the participants to move from their starting to current Army Rank and Pay Grade. Therefore, two additional change variables were created that control for the number of years in the Army. First, subtracting participants’ Starting Army Rank from their Current Army Rank and dividing this by the number of years in the Army created an Army Rank Change by Years variable. Similarly, subtracting participants’ starting Army Pay Grade from their Current Army Pay Grade and dividing this by the number of years in the Army created an Army Pay Grade Change by Years variable. These change by years variables produced distributions that had very limited variability and had significant violations of normality (Table 1, pg. 28). Consequently, only the Army Rank Change and the Army Pay Grade Change variables were retained for further study using Maximum Likelihood model fitting procedures.
A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on items measuring highest level of education, current salary, Current Army Rank, Current Army Pay Grade, and the change variables Army Rank Change and Army Pay Grade Change, to determine their underlying factor structure. Examining the scree plot of factor eigenvalues indicated that a 1-factor solution, which accounted for 43.14% of the total variance (Table 15, pg. 42), was optimal. The extracted communalities of most of the variables were high, with the exception of highest education (.16) and current salary (.18), which indicated that the single factor accounted for a significant proportion of most of the individual variables (Table 14, pg. 41).

Examining the factor matrix (Table 16, pg. 43) indicated that all the variables consistently and significantly loaded the underlying factor. Yet, the RMSEA for the 1-factor solution was .21 (90% CI: .17-.25), indicating poor model fit. The factor loadings present in the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis confirmed that the items measuring highest education, current salary, Current Army Rank and Pay Grade, and Change in Army Rank and Pay Grade can be summed to create the index variable Job Success in the Army. Yet, this index variable can still be improved due to poor overall model fit.

For the purposes of comparison, a second Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on a somewhat different subset of variables, namely, highest level of education, current salary, Current Army Rank, Current Army Pay Grade, and the other change variables Army Rank Change by Years and Army Pay Grade Change by Years. Based on an eigenvalue greater than 1 criterion, the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis extracted two factors. An examination of the scree plot indicated that a single factor could be extracted so the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was re-run extracting a single factor, which accounted for 33.22% of the total variance. Examining the single factor solution indicated that it was suboptimal when
compared to the solution described above using the Army Rank and Pay Grade change variables. In particular, the Army Rank and Army Pay Grade Change by Years items had lower communalities and lower factor loadings, the solution explained less of the overall variance in Job Success and the model fit was also poor (RMSEA = .22, 90% CI: .18 - .26). Furthermore, the Army Rank and Army Pay Grade Change by Years items violated the assumption of multivariate normality, which is required for Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.

Thus, the Job Success in the Army index variable was computed using the items measuring highest education, current salary, Current Army Rank and Pay Grade, and Change in Army Rank and Pay Grade. Standardized Z-scores were computed for each of the six items prior to summing them to form the Job Success in the Army index variable, whose psychometric properties will be examined below. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was only partially met for Job Success in the Army; Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was non-significant when comparing 2 of the 5 individual job success variables.

**Descriptive Statistics: Index Variables**

As a result of the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analyses conducted above, index variables were computed for the Dark Personality, Desire for Job Success, Total Manipulation, and Job Success in the Army. The distributional and psychometric properties of these index variables are presented in Table 17 (pg. 44). The Dark Personality (111 standardized items) was approximately normally distributed and had strong internal consistency in the pilot sample. Likewise, Desire for Job Success (22 standardized items) also had an approximately normal distribution of scores with good internal consistency. Furthermore, Total Manipulation (64 standardized items) was approximately normally distributed, with a slight positive skew and a strong internal consistency estimate. Finally, Job Success in the Army (6 standardized items)
was positively skewed and leptokurtic with acceptable internal consistency. While exploratory factor analysis provided support for creating these index variables, the poor model fit indices indicated the importance of conducting secondary analyses examining the individual variables in addition to the constructs. Therefore, the individual personality traits, job desires, and manipulation tactics will be examined individually to test for unique associations and to provide specificity in answering the research questions. Finally, given the results of Study 1, the index variable for Job Success in the Army bears further empirical scrutiny. As a result, a second pilot study was conducted to test a larger pool of potential Job Success items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>82.40</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>75.80</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Agreeableness</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.19</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Honesty-Humility</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplication</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Invocation</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debasement</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardball</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Treatment</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Induction</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Power</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Social Status</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Money</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change by Years</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>74.42</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Change by Years</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: The Dark Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Agreeableness</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Honesty-Humility</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 3

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: The Dark Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>55.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>16.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>13.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 4

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: The Dark Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Agreeableness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Honesty-Humility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1 factor extracted. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 5

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Desire for Job Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for Power</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Social Status</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Money</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.*
Table 6

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Desire for Job Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 7

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Desire for Job Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Power</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Social Status</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Money</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1 factor extracted. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 8

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Total Manipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplication</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Invocation</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debasement</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardball</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Treatment</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Induction</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Comparison</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
### Table 9

**Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Total Manipulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>40.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplication</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Invocation</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debasement</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardball</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Treatment</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Induction</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Comparison</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. 1 factor extracted. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.*
### Table 11

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Four Manipulation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplication</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Invocation</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debasement</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardball</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Treatment</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Induction</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Comparison</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 12

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Four Manipulation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>40.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplication</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Invocation</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debasement</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardball</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Treatment</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Induction</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Comparison</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Job Success in the Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Salary</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Rank</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Pay Grade</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 15

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Job Success in the Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>51.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>13.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.*
Table 16

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Job Success in the Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Army Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Army Pay Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Army Rank Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1 factor extracted. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 17

Pilot Study 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Index Personality, Manipulation, and Job Success Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Dark Personality*</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-95</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for Job Success*</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Manipulation*</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-81</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Success*</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Standardized Z-scores were used for each item to compute the index variable
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Discussion

Study 1 was partially successful in meeting its objective. Specifically, I used descriptive statistics and factor analysis to develop comprehensive measures of the Dark Personality, Desire for Job Success, and Total Manipulation. However, there was little empirical support for splitting the manipulation tactics into Hard and Soft categories based on severity ratings. Furthermore, an adequate operationalization of Job Success in the Army was not achieved and will require further developmental work in a subsequent study.

The Dark Personality

The literature provides a strong empirical link between the higher-order Dark Triad personality construct and allied, lower-order, normal personality traits like Low Agreeableness and Low Honesty-Humility. Individuals low in Agreeableness and low in Honesty-Humility are focused on obtaining personal wealth and status, and they tend to be suspicious, antagonistic, and disingenuous in interpersonal relations with other people. Conceptually, low levels of Agreeableness and low levels of Honesty-Humility facilitate the self-interested agenda of the person high on the Dark Triad. Therefore, Low Agreeableness and Low Honesty-Humility represent an integral part of this personality style. The results of Study 1 provide empirical support for this theoretical superordinate personality construct. A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis indicated that Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, Narcissism, Low Agreeableness, and Low Honesty-Humility loaded a single underlying construct, entitled the Dark Personality. Furthermore, the standardized Dark Personality items had strong internal consistency, indicating that they provided a reliable measure of the Dark Personality construct in the first pilot sample of United States Army members. The results of this pilot study support the proposed hierarchical
structure of the Dark Personality traits: they can be accounted for by the superordinate Dark Personality factor and the individual personality traits can also act independently. As a result, the Dark Personality construct will be retained for the main analyses to follow in Study 3, and the individual personality traits will also be examined to test for unique associations.

**Desire for Job Success**

For the purposes of this dissertation, Desire for Job Success was operationally defined based on what individuals high in the Dark Personality tend to desire in life, namely, obtaining high levels of power, status, and money relative to other people. While the literature demonstrates that the Dark Personality traits are individually related to desiring power, desiring status, and desiring money, less is known about whether these desires represent a single, coherent life aspiration for people with the Dark Personality. The results of Study 1 provide empirical support that desiring power, status, and money form a single life aspiration, namely, Desire for Job Success. A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis indicated that Desire for Power, Desire for Status, and Desire for Money loaded a single underlying factor. Furthermore, the individual items had strong internal consistency, indicating that they provide a reliable measure of Desire for Job Success amongst members of the US Army. Consequently, the Desire for Job Success construct will be used in the main analyses to follow, and the individual life aspirations will be examined in secondary analyses.

**Total Manipulation**

The literature on interpersonal influence has identified taxonomies of different manipulation tactics that are used in close relationships and in work relationships. While the individual manipulation tactics represent strategies of differing intensity, they all share the same goal, namely, gaining acquiescence from other people. Therefore, measurement development
work aimed to determine if the individual manipulation tactics shared a common core. A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis indicated that the seventeen manipulation tactics loaded a single underlying construct, entitled Total Manipulation. While splitting the manipulation tactics into four factors resulted in an increase to model fit, the manipulation categories were not particularly interpretable or meaningful. Furthermore, the manipulation tactics had very strong internal consistency, indicating that they are all representative of a single manipulation construct. Thus, the Total Manipulation construct will be retained for use in the main analyses. However, the individual manipulation tactics will also be examined to test for unique effects and to examine the softest tactics, which were not well explained by the index variable.

In support of a Total Manipulation construct, the Dark Triad has been described as a protean, or flexible, approach to interpersonal influence because the Dark Triad traits are associated with the adoption of all manipulation tactics across all influence targets (Jonason et al. 2012). Yet, within a work environment, the Dark Triad traits form unique relationships with individual manipulation tactics. In particular, Psychopathy is associated with adopting harder manipulation tactics, Narcissism is associated with adopting softer manipulation tactics, and Machiavellianism is associated with adopting both hard and soft tactics (Jonason, Slomski, & Partyka, 2012). In order to account for this specificity within the Dark Personality, my goal was to split the manipulation tactics into Hard and Soft categories based on student ratings. Unfortunately, Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis did not support the proposed two-factor structure and descriptive statistics indicated that a single manipulation factor was optimal. Therefore, only a Total Manipulation variable will be retained, and hypotheses about the severity of manipulation tactics will be tested by examining individual tactics in the analyses.
Job Success in the Army

Psychology research has long been interested in understanding the mechanisms that contribute to personal success in life. When studying individuals high on the Dark Personality, success is often defined in terms of job opportunities, such as obtaining a high salary, gaining status, and wielding power over other people. There is some preliminary evidence that the Dark Personality traits facilitate Job Success (e.g., Dutton, 2012), particularly in the Military (e.g., Paunonen, Lonnqvist, Verkasalo, Leikas, & Nissinen, 2006; Nissinen, 2001). Yet, while Job Success is well understood conceptually, there is no existing, objective, self-report measure of Job Success to tap this construct.

In Study 1, I attempted to create an objective self-report measure of Job Success using demographic items tapping highest education, as well as starting and current Army rank and salary. Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis confirmed that the items loaded a single factor with acceptable internal consistency. Yet, this measure of Job Success did not take into account the number of years it took participants to advance in their Army jobs to their present level of Job Success. In addition, an exclusively objective measure of Job Success may not be optimal, because participants’ Desire for Job Success is measured in subjective terms. These problems with the Job Success construct will be addressed below as a rationale for re-defining Job Success in the Army and doing additional measurement development work in a second pilot study.

There are a number of issues to consider when attempting to create an objective measure of Job Success in the Army. First and foremost, the number of years in the Army is not a straightforward indicator of Job Success. Army promotions are controlled by time in service (i.e., total accumulated Military service) and time in grade (i.e., amount of service in the current pay grade). These time requirements are the primary determinant of rank and pay grade
advancements in the lower strata of the Enlisted rank hierarchy, whereas other factors such as performance assessments hold more weight in determining advancement in the higher strata of the rank hierarchy. Given that Army Rank and Pay Grade were positively skewed and leptokurtic, this sample consists primarily of army members in the lower strata of the Army. Thus, regardless of performance, there are limits on how fast the army members in this sample can advance in the Army to achieve Job Success. These rules make it difficult to obtain a purely objective measure of Job Success that takes into account time in the Army in this sample.

In addition, Enlisted Army Ranks and Officer Army Ranks have separate rank hierarchies. Thus, it is not accurate to say that the rank Sergeant Major of the Army falls below the rank Warrant Officer, as they are each a part of separate hierarchies of advancement in the Army. Therefore, in the next pilot sample and the main sample to follow, I will only recruit Enlisted Army members, rather than combining samples of enlisted and officer Army personnel.

Finally, in Study 1, I attempted to create an objective measure of Job Success in the Army by computing rank and pay change variables rather than asking participants for their subjective impression of how much money, status, and power they have obtained in the Army. Note, however, that participants’ Desire for Job Success was measured in subjective terms by asking participants to rate their need for money, status, and power in their lives. In Study 2, I will modify the measure of Job Success in the Army, by asking participants how much money, status, and power they feel they have achieved in the Army compared to when they started. Thus, the assessment limitations of the number of years in the Army can be avoided by using a subjective measure of Job Success. Additional pilot work will be required to test a larger pool of potential Job Success items, including both objective items and subjective ratings.
STUDY 2: MEASUREMENT DEVELOPMENT PILOT STUDY 2
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Research Objectives

The objective of Study 2 is to construct a more comprehensive, reliable, and valid measure of Job Success in the Army by testing a larger pool of potential items. In Study 1, I created a novel objective measure of Job Success in the Army by looking at participants’ highest education, current salary, current Army Rank and Pay Grade, and changes in Army Rank and Pay Grade since entering the Army. Unfortunately, attempting to obtain a purely objective measure of Job Success is problematic, in part, because of Army rules about minimum time requirements for advancement. Therefore, I looked to the literature to determine the best way to conceptualize Job Success.

The industrial occupational psychology literature (e.g., Abele, Spurk, & Volmer, 2010; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005; Kirchmeyer, 1998) uses a two-dimensional conceptualization of Job Success, splitting the construct into Objective Job Success (i.e., real attainments such as salary level and promotions) and Subjective Job Success (i.e., perceived attainments such as career satisfaction). For a comprehensive understanding of the outcome variable in this dissertation, I will replicate the two-dimensional conceptualization of Job Success. The objective measure of Job Success created in Study 1 measures real attainments in the form of current salary, Army Rank, and Army Pay Grade. Study 2 will create a separate Subjective measure of Job Success. Rather than utilizing the prototypical career satisfaction measure (i.e., Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990), I decided to customize the subjective ratings to apply specifically to perceived Money, Power, and Status, because this is how Job Success is conceptualized in this dissertation. Consequently, the subjective Job Success
ratings will directly map onto the Desire for Job Success measure. While my conceptualization of Subjective Job Success is customized to this study, the overall two-dimensional structure of Job Success present in the literature will be replicated in this dissertation in order to obtain a comprehensive measure of the outcome variable.

Therefore, in Study 2, I will test the objective Job Success items from Study 1, and I will also include a pool of subjective items that measure participants’ perceived levels of status, power, and money in the Army. Participants’ will rate their perception of their current levels of status, power, and money, and they will rate their perceptions when they first entered the Army so that change variables can be computed. The analyses in Study 2 will include descriptive statistics and Factor Analyses to determine how best to measure Job Success in the Army.
Chapter 8

Method

Participants and Procedure

The second pilot sample of 100 American adult participants (75 males, 25 females; age range: 21-51, $M = 27.53, SD = 5.77$) was recruited online through Mechanical Turk, and completed the self-report questionnaires using Surveymonkey. Qualifications for the study were that participants must be American, at least 21 years of age, and a current Enlisted member of the United States Army. The sample consisted of 75% Caucasian and 17% African American participants, with the remaining participants being of Asian or South Asian descent. In addition, 52% of the sample was single, and 47% were married or cohabitating. The majority of the sample was Christian (50%) or had no religious affiliation (34%), with the remaining participants being dispersed fairly evenly amongst other religious affiliations. Finally, 80% of the sample grew up in either a small or large city, and the remaining participants grew up in a rural area or on a farm. According to the Department of Defense 2013 Demographics report, this sample largely coincides with the demographic breakdown of Military personnel, suggesting that this sample of Army members is representative of typical United States Military personnel (2013 Demographics Profile of the Military Community, 2013).

Materials

All the questionnaires to follow are included in Appendix B.

Job Success Demographics Questionnaire. Participants were asked questions related to Job Success in the United States Army: they were asked to identify their education, current salary and job title, and the number of years they have been in the Army. They also reported
their starting Army Rank and Pay Grade, as well as their current Army Rank and Pay Grade. Finally, participants provided information about their Military Occupational Specialty.

Demographics Questionnaire. The demographics questionnaire asked participants to identify their age, marital status, gender, ethnic background, and where they grew up.

Subjective Measure of Job Success in the Army. A 12-item questionnaire was created to measure participants’ perceived Job Success in the Army. Participants were asked to identify their Status in the Army at present and when they first entered the Army (4 items). Similarly, participants were asked to identify their level of Power (4 items) and their level of Money (4 items) in the Army at present and when they first entered the Army. Participants used a ladder to rate their perceived levels of Status, Power, and Money. The ladder was modeled after the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status (Adler & Stewart, 2007), which uses a pictorial format depicting a symbolic ladder and asks participants to identify the rung on which they feel they stand.
Chapter 9

Results

Descriptive Statistics: Individual Job Success in the Army Variables

First, the individual variables were scored, and their distributional properties and internal consistencies were examined (Table 18, pg. 61). The range of scores was good for most items, suggesting that there is sufficient variability in the Job Success variables (i.e., participants have changed positions since starting their Army jobs). Furthermore, the Army Rank and Army Pay Grade Change by Years variables had a restricted range of scores and high kurtosis values; dividing the change in Rank or Change in Pay Grade by the number of years in the Army eliminated much of the meaningful variability. The same restriction of range was noted in Study 1 due to the problems with using Years in the Army as an indicator of Job Success. In addition, the range of scores for the computed change variables contain negative values, indicating that some participants reported that their rank, pay grade, status, power, or money, has decreased since they entered the Army. These responses may represent careless responding, demotions, or the perception that one has regressed in the Army from where they started.

Examining the skewness of the individual variables suggests that they all have fairly symmetrical, or normal, distributions of scores. Similarly, most of the individual variables have kurtosis values that indicate normal distributions, with the exception of Army Rank Change, Army Rank Change by Years, and Army Pay Grade Change by Years, which had slightly leptokurtic (or tall) distributions. Given the restricted range of scores on the Army Rank and Army Pay Grade Change by Years variables, it makes sense that they would form a leptokurtic distribution with less variable scores.
Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Objective Job Success in the Army Items

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was chosen as the model fitting procedure due to the benefits outlined above (pg. 19). The data were sufficiently normally distributed to uphold the assumption of multivariate normality.

As in Study 1, two Army Rank and Pay Grade change variables were computed. The Army Rank Change by Years and the Army Pay Grade Change by Years variables produced distributions that had very little variability and had significant violations of normality (Table 18, pg. 62). Consequently, the Army Rank Change and the Army Pay Grade Change variables were preferred to the Army Rank Change by Years and the Army Pay Grade Change by Years variables. In replication of Study 1, a Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted using the Army Rank Change by Years and Army Pay Grade Change by Years variables; it returned a two-factor solution with weaker fit indices, and was judged to be suboptimal compared to the solutions described below. As discussed previously (pg. 49), there are drawbacks associated with accounting for Years in the Army as there are promotion limitations in regards to time in service and time in grade.

As in Study 1, a Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on items measuring highest level of education, current salary, Current Army Rank, Current Army Pay Grade, Army Rank Change, and Army Pay Grade Change, to determine their factor structure. Examining the scree plot of factor eigenvalues indicated that a 1-factor solution, which accounted for 51.06% of the total variance, was optimal. The RMSEA for the 1-factor solution was .23 (90% CI: .18 - .29), which indicated poor model fit. The extracted communalities were all high, with the exception of highest education (.16) and current salary (.23).
In Study 1, the extracted communalities for highest education and current salary were also low (see pg. 25), indicating that they are not well represented by the Objective Job Success factor. Therefore, the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted again using the Current Army Rank, Current Army Pay Grade, Army Rank Change, and Army Pay Grade Change variables only. Given that there are only 4 items in the factor analysis, a 1-factor solution is expected. The scree plot confirmed that a 1-factor solution was optimal, and it accounted for 68.70% of the overall variance (Table 20, pg. 63). The extracted communalities for the four remaining Objective Job Success variables were all high (Table 19, pg. 62).

Examining the factor matrix (Table 21, pg. 64) indicated that all the variables consistently and significantly loaded the underlying factor. The RMSEA for the 1-factor solution was .48 (90% CI: .37 - .60), indicating poor model fit. Therefore, the factor loadings present in the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis confirmed that the items measuring Current Army Rank and Pay Grade, and Change in Army Rank and Pay Grade can be summed to create the index variable Objective Job Success in the Army. In conclusion, the Objective Job Success items hung together in a very similar fashion across both pilot samples, indicating replication. However, the four-item Objective Job Success index variable is preferred to the six-item index variable that includes education and salary, which are variables shown in this study to be more peripherally related to the overall Job Success in the Army construct.

**Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Subjective Job Success in the Army Items**

Before running Maximum Likelihood Factor Analyses on the subjective items, six change variables were computed. Participants’ starting status in the Army was subtracted from their current status in the Army to create the variable Status in the Army Change; similarly, participants’ starting status in their rank was subtracted from their current status in their rank to
create the variable Status in Rank Change. A similar computational procedure was followed to create the following variables: Power in Army Change, Power in Rank Change, Money in Army Change, and Money in Rank Change.

A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on the six subjective change variables to determine their factor structure. Examining the scree plot of factor eigenvalues supports a 1-factor solution, which accounts for 72.96% of the overall variance (Table 23, pg. 66). The extracted communalities were all very high, which indicates that all the variables were well explained by the single factor (Table 22, pg. 65). Examining the factor matrix (Table 24, pg. 67) indicates that all the change variables significantly and consistently loaded the single factor. The RMSEA for the 1-factor solution was .14 (90% CI: .08 -.20), which indicates the solution falls just short of acceptable fit. Therefore, the factor loadings present in the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis confirmed that participants’ perceived change in status, change in power, and change in money, both in their rank and in the Army in general, are indicative of a single factor: Subjective Job Success in the Army.

A second Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on the six subjective change variables plus participants’ perception of their current status in the Army, current status in Rank, current power in the Army, current power in Rank, current money in the Army, and current money in Rank, to determine if they represent a better single factor solution for Subjective Job Success in the Army. Contrary to expectations, the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis returned a 2-factor solution that was suboptimal compared to the solution described above. For instance, the RMSEA for the 2-factor solution was .22 (90% CI: .20 -.25), indicating a loss in model fit. Therefore, only the six change variables will be used to create an index variable entitled Subjective Job Success in the Army.
Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Total Job Success in the Army Items

There is evidence for the presence of two separate Job Success variables: Objective and Subjective Job Success in the Army. Yet, I explored the possibility that they represent a single Job Success variable. A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on the four objective Job Success items (i.e., Current Army Rank, Current Army Pay Grade, Army Rank Change, Army Pay Grade Change) and the six subjective Job Success change variables (i.e., Status in Army Change, Status in Rank Change, Power in Army Change, Power in Rank Change, Money in Army Change and Money in Rank Change) to determine their factor structure. 

Examining the scree plot of factor eigenvalues supports a 1-factor solution, which accounts for 59.07% of the overall variance (Table 26, pg. 69). The extracted communalities were all high, which indicates that all variables are well explained by the single factor (Table 25, pg. 68). 

Examining the factor matrix (Table 27, pg. 70) indicates that all the items and variables significantly and consistently loaded the single factor. The RMSEA for the 1-factor solution was .24 (90% CI: .21 -.27), indicating that model fit was poor. This combined Job Success solution was judged to be suboptimal compared to the separate solutions for Objective and Subjective Job Success; combining the two forms of Job Success explained less of the overall variance, and the Objective and Subjective Job Success variables were moderately correlated ($r = .65$), indicating that they are related constructs but they are not necessarily synonymous. The psychometric properties of the Objective, Subjective, and Total Job Success in the Army variables will be examined below for further comparisons.
Descriptive Statistics: Objective, Subjective, and Total Job Success in the Army Index Variables

As a result of the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analyses conducted above, index variables were computed for Objective Job Success in the Army, Subjective Job Success in the Army, and Total Job Success in the Army. Given that the four objective items are measured using different response scales, standardized $Z$-scores were computed for each item prior to summing them to form the Objective Job Success in the Army index variable. The assumption of homogeneity of variance required to use $Z$-scores was only partially met for Objective Job Success in the Army; Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was non-significant when comparing only 2 of the 4 individual objective job success variables. For the purposes of consistency, standardized $Z$-scores were also used to compute the Subjective Job Success in the Army index variable, and the Total Job Success in the Army index variable. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was also only partially met for Subjective Job Success in the Army; Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was non-significant when comparing only 2 of the 6 individual subjective job success variables. The distributional and psychometric properties of these Job Success index scores are presented in Table 28 (pg. 72). All three index variables were approximately normally distributed and had strong internal consistency in the second pilot sample. Comparing the new Job Success index variables to the initial six-item Job Success in the Army variable from Study 1 indicates that there has been a significant improvement in distributional and psychometric properties. The Objective and Subjective Job Success in the Army variables will be examined in the main analyses to follow in Study 3. The Total Job Success in the Army index variable will also be retained in Study 3 for the purposes of
comparison to the separate Job Success variables and in an attempt to achieve parsimony in substantive interpretations regarding the outcome variable of this dissertation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Salary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Rank</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Pay Grade</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change by Years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change by Years</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Army Change</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Rank Change</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Army Change</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Rank Change</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Army Change</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Rank Change</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

**Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Objective Job Success in the Army Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Rank</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Pay Grade</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 20

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Objective Job Success in the Army Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>76.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 21

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Objective Job Success in the Army Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Pay Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1 factor extracted. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 22

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Subjective Job Success in the Army Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status in Army Change</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Rank Change</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Army Change</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Rank Change</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Army Change</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Rank Change</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.*
Table 23

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Subjective Job Success in the Army Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>77.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 24

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Subjective Job Success in the Army Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Army Change</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Rank Change</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Army Change</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Rank Change</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Army Change</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Rank Change</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. 1 factor extracted. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.*
Table 25

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Total Job Success in the Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Rank</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Pay Grade</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Army Change</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Rank Change</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Army Change</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Rank Change</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Army Change</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Rank Change</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.*
Table 26

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis: Total Job Success in the Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>63.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Rank</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Army Pay Grade</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Rank Change</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Pay Grade Change</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Army Change</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in Rank Change</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Army Change</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power in Rank Change</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Army Change</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money in Rank Change</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1 factor extracted. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis.
Table 2

Pilot Study 2: Descriptive Statistics for the Index Job Success in the Army Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective Job Success*</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Job Success*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Job Success*</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Standardized Z-scores were used for each item to compute the index variable
Chapter 10

Discussion

Following ambiguous results regarding how best to measure Job Success in the Army in Study 1, the purpose of Study 2 was to widen the conceptual and empirical scope of the Job Success construct in order to determine the optimal way to measure the outcome variable in this dissertation. The original Job Success item pool, which consisted of objective indicators of Job Success in the Army, was re-tested alongside a new pool of items, which consisted of subjective perceptions of changes in status, power, and money since entering the Army. A series of Maximum Likelihood Factor Analyses analyzing the objective items replicated the results of Study 1; yet, items measuring highest level of education and current salary in dollars, were not well explained by the Objective Job Success construct. In addition, a series of Maximum Likelihood Factor Analyses analyzing the subjective items provided strong support for a separate Subjective Job Success construct, consisting of personal perceptions of changes in one’s status, power, and money in the Army. Further analyses determined that Objective and Subjective Job Success in the Army can be represented as two distinct outcome variables of interest to be used to address the key research questions in this dissertation. Alternatively, empirical evidence indicates that Total Job Success in the Army can be examined as a cumulative outcome variable.

Objective Job Success in the Army

As discussed in Study 1, psychological research has a long-standing interest in understanding the predictors of personal success in various areas of life, including success in one’s job. Yet, while Job Success is well understood conceptually, there is no existing, objective, self-report measure of Job Success to tap this construct. Given the duplicitous nature of individuals high in the Dark Personality (e.g., Paulhus & Williams, 2002), and the self-deceptive
nature of Narcissists in particular (Stead, Plouffe, Kay, & Fekken, 2014), an attempt to obtain an objective measure of Job Success, which cannot be influenced by these personality traits, is important.

The Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis examining the six objective Job Success indicators returned a 1-factor solution that accounted for about half the total variance and explained all the variables except for highest education and current salary. These results were very similar to those from Study 1, indicating that the 1-factor objective Job Success construct is generalizable. However, the communality values for highest education and current salary were low across both the Study 1 and Study 2 solutions, indicating that they are more peripherally related to Objective Job Success in the Army. Consequently, these two items were removed; the Objective Job Success in the Army construct now consists of Current Army Rank, Current Army Pay Grade, and Change in Army Rank and Pay Grade since entering the Army. This four-item index was judged to be the optimal empirical measure of Objective Job Success in the Army.

Conceptually, it makes sense that highest education and current salary in dollars are more tangentially related to Objective Job Success in the Army, as opposed to acting as core components. While obtaining a postsecondary degree may allow a person to enlist in the Army and begin at a higher rank, examining the Army Promotion System for enlisted personnel (Powers, 2015) indicates that time in grade and time in service are the main determinants of rank advancement. Enlisted personnel can receive administrative points to expedite the advancement process, and a civilian education will give enlisted personnel up to 100 administrative points, yet this is unlikely to have any significant impact on promotion to a higher rank. Therefore, highest level of education is not a good indicator of advancement in the Army (i.e., Objective Job Success). Similarly, yearly salary is not a good indicator of Objective Job Success in the Army.
Examining the pay scale for enlisted personnel (Military Factory, 2016) indicated that the differences in annual salary amongst the lower enlisted ranks were minimal, although it must be pointed out that the current salary item only provided participants with salary options of $10,000 increments, thus eliminating the meaningful variability. Consequently, the item tapping Army Pay Grade were deemed to be a better empirical measure of Objective Job Success than annual salary.

The results of Study 1 and Study 2 provided consistent support for an Objective measure of Job Success in the Army; yet, the construct cohesiveness was improved by removing the more externally related items, highest education and current salary. In this dissertation I will use an Objective measure of Job Success in the Army that utilizes current Army Rank and Pay Grade, and changes in Army Rank and Pay Grade since entering the Army. It should be noted that an Objective measure of Job Success, while empirically supported in this dissertation, still has some practical limitations. As discussed in Study 1, the Objective measure of Job Success does not take into account the number of years the army members have been in the army. Like Study 1, this sample also consists of army members from the lower strata of the enlisted ranks, which means that their army rank and pay grade promotions are primarily determined by time in service and time in grade. These time requirements are consistent and they act to reduce the meaningful variability in our measures of Army Rank and Army Pay Grade Change. A further practical limitation is that it is impossible to differentiate between Army members in the same Rank or same Pay Grade level. In practice, being given specific assignments is indicative of an Army member being groomed for promotion. Our Objective measure of Job Success does not account for these signs of promotions within an Army level. Practically speaking, it would be difficult to
capture these indications of likely promotions in our measure, but it is a limitation to consider when conceptualizing Job Success in the Army.

**Subjective Job Success in the Army**

Measurement of the attainment of Job Success was enhanced by including subjective ratings of how much status, power, and money participants feel they have obtained in the Army. These items are parallel to the ratings already obtained on the subjective desire for status, power, and money and can be used for comparisons. Furthermore, individuals high in the Dark Personality are known to be deceitful and grandiose in their self-perceptions, which are personality traits that are likely to systematically influence subjective perceptions of Job Success in the Army. Comparisons of Objective and Subjective Job Success in the Army can provide meaningful interpretations given the personality traits being studied. Thus, an additional pool of subjective ratings of changes in status, power, and money were included in Study 2.

A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis was conducted on the six subjective change variables for status, power, and money in the Army. Results indicated that perceptions of change in status, power, and money, both in rank and in the army in general, loaded together to represent a single construct, namely, Subjective Job Success in the Army. Like the Objective Job Success construct, the Subjective Job Success 1-factor solution was clearly delineated and explained a high proportion of variance. Thus, Study 2 provided empirical support for the creation of a second Job Success construct.

The inclusion of a distinct Subjective Job Success construct is important in this dissertation given past research demonstrating that stable individual differences, like personality traits, are more strongly related to subjective job success (i.e., job satisfaction) than to objective job success (i.e., salary level and promotions; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005). Therefore,
the Dark Personality may relate more strongly to Army members’ subjective perceptions of their Job Success in the Army, as opposed to objective indicators like Rank and Pay Grade.

**Are Objective and Subjective Measures of Job Success in the Army Different?**

The results of Study 2 suggest that Objective and Subjective Job Success in the Army are better conceptualized as distinct, but related, constructs, as opposed to a single overarching construct. A final Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis combined the objective and subjective items to see if they form a single factor. The results supported the presence of a single factor, but the factor did not explain as much of the total variance when compared to two separate objective and subjective factors. Furthermore, the objective items had lower communalities and lower factor loadings, indicating that they were not as well explained as the subjective items by the single factor. In addition, the two Job Success variables had higher internal consistency estimates than the single Job Success variable. Furthermore, Objective Job Success and Subjective Job Success were moderately correlated, which supports the interpretation that they are related, but perhaps not synonymous, constructs. Finally, the two separate Job Success variables were more normally distributed. As outlined above, there is conceptual interest in examining Objective and Subjective Job Success separately, and the empirical evidence backs this distinction.

**Job Success Outcome Variable for Study 3**

As a result of the pilot work, Objective Job Success in the Army and Subjective Job Success in the Army will be examined as two separate outcome variables in the main analyses to follow in Study 3. However, should the distinction fail to provide meaningful differences in addressing the research questions, then Total Job Success in the Army will be used as the overarching outcome variable in this dissertation.
The measurement development work conducted in Study 1 and Study 2 confirmed that the Dark Personality construct, as well as the Desire for Job Success, Total Manipulation, Objective Job Success in the Army, Subjective Job Success in the Army, and Total Job Success in the Army are empirically supported by the data. Thus, in Study 3 I will utilize these index variables to address the research questions raised in the general introduction of this dissertation. I will also examine the unique associations of the individual personality traits, manipulation tactics, and job success variables in secondary analyses. This project follows a new line of research examining the potential adaptive features of Dark personality traits in the context of job advancement. It utilizes the highly structured United States Army as the workplace setting to examine Job Success trajectories in relation to personality traits. The central thesis of this dissertation is that individuals high in the Dark Personality use a higher number of interpersonal manipulation tactics in the United States Army in order to achieve Job Success, which is defined as the attainment of an Army Rank and Pay Grade position that affords power, status, and money.

Hypotheses

The first research question I ask in this dissertation is: do people with high levels of the Dark Personality desire power, social status, and money for themselves? The literature provides strong support for the hypothesis that Army members with higher levels of the Dark Personality will report a stronger Desire for Job Success. Specifically, these individuals will desire more power, more money, and more social status for themselves. The research suggests that
individuals higher in the Dark Personality may have the strongest desire for Power and Money, compared to Social Status. Analyses will examine how the Dark Personality relates to Desire for Job Success, as well as the individual desires for Power, Money, and Status.

**Hypothesis 1:** Higher scores on the Dark Personality will be positively related to Desire for Job Success in a sample of enlisted Army personnel.

I also ask, do individuals high on the Dark Personality use more interpersonal manipulation tactics at work when compared to individuals who are low in this personality style? It is hypothesized that army members who are high on the Dark Personality will use a higher number of manipulation tactics at work, including the soft (e.g., reason, ingratiating) and the egregious (e.g., hardball, silent treatment), due to their protean approach to social influence; thus, they will use more Total Manipulation at work. Analyses will examine how the Dark Personality traits relate to Total Manipulation, as well as to the individual manipulation tactics.

**Hypothesis 2:** Higher scores on the Dark Personality will be positively related to Total Manipulation at work in a sample of enlisted Army personnel.

I further ask does engaging in Total Manipulation facilitate or hinder Job Success in the Army? Given the variability in the egregiousness of the different manipulation tactics, it is hypothesized that the softer manipulation tactics will predict Job Success, but that use of a higher number of manipulation tactics, including the egregious, will not predict more Job Success in the Army. Thus, the overall directionality of Total Manipulation’s effect on Job Success in the Army may depend on which manipulation tactics are reported by the army members in this sample; in this dissertation, I will address the directionality of influence between Total Manipulation and Job Success in the Army in order to determine whether the positive association suggested by the literature will be empirically replicated. Analyses will examine how Total
Manipulation, as well as each of the individual manipulation tactics, relates to Job Success in the Army.

**Hypothesis 3**: Higher scores on Total Manipulation will be positively related to Job Success in the Army in a sample of enlisted army personnel.

Additionally, in this dissertation I ask, do people high on the Dark Personality traits actually obtain powerful, high paying positions within the US Army? It is tentatively hypothesized that army members who are higher on the Dark Personality may achieve higher levels of Job Success in the Army. Yet, the research is mixed, which suggests that there may not be a strong positive relationship present. In this dissertation, I will address the nature and directionality of influence of the Dark Personality style on the obtainment of Job Success in the Army.

**Hypothesis 4**: Higher scores on the Dark Personality will be positively related to Job Success in the Army in a sample of enlisted army personnel.

Finally, I will address the central research question of this dissertation: Do Army members high on the Dark Personality achieve Job Success in the Army by using more interpersonal manipulation tactics at work? It is hypothesized that individuals high on the Dark Personality traits are able to achieve Job Success in the Army at least partially because they use more manipulation on their coworkers.

**Hypothesis 5**: Total Manipulation will mediate the relationship between the Dark Personality and Job Success in the Army in a sample of enlisted army personnel.

In Study 3 of this dissertation, I will address each of these research question and hypotheses in turn using correlations, regressions, and mediation analysis on a large sample of enlisted members of the United States Army.
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Method

Participants and Procedure

The main sample of 468 American adult participants (333 males, 135 females; age range: 18 - 49, $M = 27.83, SD = 5.54$) was recruited online through Mechanical Turk, and completed self-report questionnaires using SurveyMonkey. Qualifications for the study were that participants must be American, at least 21 years of age, and a current Enlisted member of the United States Army. The sample consisted of 82% Caucasian and 11% African American participants, with the remaining participants being of Asian or South Asian descent. In addition, 58% of the sample was single, and 39% were married or cohabitating, with the remaining participants being widowed or divorced. The majority of the sample was Christian (59%) or Not Religious (32%), with the remaining participants being dispersed fairly evenly amongst other religious affiliations. Finally, 80% of the sample grew up in either a small or large city, and the remaining participants grew up in a rural area or on a farm. According to the Department of Defense 2013 Demographics report, this sample largely coincides with the demographic breakdown of Military personnel, suggesting that this sample of Army members is representative of typical United States Military personnel (2013 Demographics Profile of the Military Community, 2013).

Materials

Aspirations Index – Financial Success items (AI-FS; Kasser & Ryan, 1993). The AI-FS is a 5-item measure of one’s desire for financial success or money. Participants rate items such as “You will have a job that pays well” on a 5-item scale according to how important
financial success is to them as a personal aspiration (1 = Not at all Important, 5 = Very Important). The internal consistency of this scale was .69 in the main sample.

**Job Success Demographics Questionnaire.** Participants were asked questions related to Job Success in the United States Army; they were asked to identify their education, current salary and job title, and the number of years they have been in the Army. They also reported their starting Army rank and pay grade, as well as their current Army rank and pay grade. Finally, the provided information about their Military Occupational Specialty and the number of promotions and pay raises they have received.

**Demographics Questionnaire.** The demographics questionnaire asked participants to identify their age, marital status, gender, ethnic background, and where they grew up.

**HEXACO Personality Inventory-Revised (HEXACO-PI-R; Ashton & Lee, 2009).** The HEXACO-PI-R is a 60-item self-report measure of six domains of normal personality: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness (10 items each). Participants rate items, such as “On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic” on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). This study will focus on Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness, which both had internal consistencies of .74 in the main sample.

**Impression Management Scale (IMS; Bolino & Turnley, 1999).** The IMS is a 22-item measure of employee impression management behaviors based on the taxonomy proposed by Jones and Pittman. The scale measures five factors of employee impression management: Self-Promotion (4 items), Ingratiation (4 items), Exemplification (4 items), Intimidation (5 items), and Supplication (5 items). Participants rate items such as “How often do you make people aware of your accomplishments” on a 5-point scale (1 = Never Behave This Way, 5 = Often
In the main sample, the internal consistencies were as follows: Self-Promotion (α = .84), Ingratiation (α = .78), Exemplification (α = .67), Intimidation (α = .85), and Supplication (α = .90).

**Index of Personal Reactions—Need for Power and Need for Influence Subscales** (IPR; Bennett, 1988). The IPR is a 49-item measure that consists of four subscales: (1) Need for Power, (2) Need for Influence, (3) Ability, and (4) Resistance to Subordination. Only the 10-item Need for Power subscale was used. Participants responded to items tapping their desire for power, such as “I think I would enjoy having authority over others” on a 5-point scale (1 = Not at all Characteristic of Me, 5 = Very Much Characteristic of Me). The internal consistency of this scale was .87 in the main sample.

**MACH-IV** (Christie & Geis, 1970). The MACH-IV consists of 20 items that are summed to measure Machiavellianism. Participants rate items such as “The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear” on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha was .81 in the main sample.

**Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979).** The NPI has 40 pairs of attitudes, such as “A. When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed” and “B. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.” Participants choose the attitude that best applies to them. Items are summed to obtain a measure of Narcissism. The internal consistency was .86 in the main sample.

**Need for Social Status items** (NSS; Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Ames, 2006). The NSS consists of 8 items from Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, and Ames (2006) that measure desire for personal social status. The items were adapted to be specific to the workplace. Participants rate items such as “It would please me to have a position of prestige and social
standing” on a 7-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*). The internal consistency of this scale was .82 in the main sample.

**Self-report Psychopathy Scale-III-R (SRP-III-R; Forth, Brown, Hart, & Hare, 1996).** The SRP-III-R consists of 31 items that are summed to measure Psychopathy. Participants respond to items such as “I almost never feel guilty over something I’ve done” using a 5-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*). This scale has a Cronbach’s alpha of .88 in the main sample.

**Tactics of Manipulation Scale—Employee Revisal (TMS-ER; Buss, 1992).** The TMS-ER is a 35-item measure of six tactics used to influence one’s partner. The TMS was updated to include 42 items that tap twelve tactics of manipulation: Reason (3 items), Charm (2 items), Regression (3 items), Coercion (3 items), Silent Treatment (3 items), Debasingment (3 items), Responsibility Invocation (2 items), Reciprocity (4 items), Monetary Reward (3 items), Pleasure Induction (2 items), Social Comparison (4 items), and Hardball (10 items; Buss, 1992). The TMS-ER is a 42-item measure that uses gender-neutral language to examine the twelve tactics of influence used by employees to influence their co-workers. Participants rate items such as “I degrade him/her into doing it” on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all Likely*, 7 = *Extremely Likely*). In the main sample, the internal consistency estimates were as follows: Reason (α = .86), Charm (α = .78), Regression (α = .88), Coercion (α = .80), Silent Treatment (α = .88), Debasingment (α = .83), Responsibility Invocation (α = .74), Reciprocity (α = .89), Monetary Reward (α = .89), Pleasure Induction (α = .81), Social Comparison (α = .85), and Hardball (α = .88).
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Results

Descriptive Statistics

The data were screened for missing data and violations of assumptions prior to data analysis: Participants who failed to complete 10% or more of any scale were eliminated. For each of the individual variables, between 1 and 5 participants were eliminated from particular analyses due to missing data. On the standardized index variables, approximately the same number of individuals were removed, with the exception of Total Manipulation, which resulted in 13 participants being removed due to missing data in excess of the 10% cutoff. The distributional properties and internal consistencies of the individual variables and standardized index variables were examined (Table 29, pg. 96). The range of scores was wide, indicating that there was adequate variability present in all variables. Notably, Subjective Job Success had a minimum value of -11, indicating that some participants (i.e., 19 of 468) reported a subjective regression in their Job Success in the Army. The means and standard deviations of the preexisting individual variables largely coincide with the distributional properties presented in the literature. For instance, the levels of the Dark Triad traits were only marginally higher than the levels derived from a normal population (e.g., Stead, Fekken, Kay, & McDermott, 2012).

Examining the skewness of the individual variables indicates that they all have fairly symmetrical, or normal, distributions. Similarly, most of the individual variables have kurtosis values that indicate approximately normal distributions, with the exception of Machiavellianism, which had a leptokurtic (or tall) distribution. Finally, the majority of the variables had good or excellent internal consistency estimates, indicating that the items hang well together to measure the constructs. Conversely, Low Agreeableness, Low Honesty-Humility, Exemplification,
Responsibility Invocation, and Need for Money had acceptable internal consistencies. Overall, the variables show good psychometric properties and will be used to analyze the hypotheses of this study.

**Validating the Measure of Job Success in the Army**

As in Study 2, two separate measures of Job Success in the Army were computed; namely, Objective Job Success and Subjective Job Success. As discussed above, these two Job Success variables demonstrated good psychometric properties (Table 29, pg. 96) and were initially used in the main analyses to follow. However, examining the pattern of results when addressing the key research questions indicated that there were no meaningful or interpretable differences between Objective and Subjective Job Success in the Army. Thus, the decision was made to use the Total Job Success in the Army as the outcome variable in this dissertation; the single variable will increase the power of this construct in the analyses to follow. Standardized Z-scores were computed for the individual Objective and Subjective items prior to summing the items, in order to give all items equal weight given that they were measured using different response scales. The Total Job Success in the Army variable also demonstrated good psychometric properties (Table 29, pg. 96).

To establish construct validity for Total Job Success in the Army, previously documented correlations were examined. In replication of previous work, Total Job Success in the Army was positively correlated with Current Salary ($r = .30, p < .01$), Highest Education ($r = .18, p < .01$), and Conscientiousness ($r = .37, p < .01$). Therefore, there is preliminary evidence that Total Job Success in the Army is measuring what it purports to measure. Thus, the Total Job Success in the Army index variable was retained for the analyses to follow.
Correlations

In replication of past research, the Dark Triad variables in the main sample displayed positive intercorrelations of medium to large effect size (Table 30, pg. 98). In addition, the Dark Triad variables displayed positive correlations of medium to large effect size with both Low Agreeableness and Low Honesty-Humility.

Examining the seventeen individual manipulation tactics indicated that the majority of the tactics were positively correlated with one another. For instance, Self-Promotion, Exemplification, Reciprocity, Pleasure Induction, and Social Comparison were positively correlated to all the other manipulation tactics. Yet, there appear to be two notable exceptions: Reason and Ingratiation were two tactics that were not positively linked to all the other manipulation tactics. Reason was positively correlated with some of the other tactics, namely, Self-Promotion, Ingratiation, Exemplification, Responsibility Invocation, Reciprocity, Pleasure Induction, Social Comparison, and Charm. However, Reason was negatively correlated to a number of the more egregious manipulation tactics, namely, Intimidation, Supplication, Coercion, Regression, Debasement, Silent Treatment, and Hardball. Ingratiation demonstrated the same correlational pattern as Reason; it was positively correlated to many of the tactics but formed negative correlations with the same seven egregious manipulation tactics. Therefore, Reason and Ingratiation appear to be more soft forms of manipulation in that they were not correlated with the use of more socially abhorrent forms of manipulation. These results are in line with the Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis results from Study 1 (Table 10, pg. 39), which indicated that Reason and Ingratiation were not explained by the Total Manipulation factor; Ingratiation had a low factor loading and Reason had a negative factor loading.
Looking at the relationships between the Dark Personality traits and the manipulation tactics supports the contention that Reason and Ingratiation, as well as Exemplification, are different from the other manipulation tactics. Psychopathy is negatively correlated with Reason, and the remaining Dark Personality traits, as well as the Dark Personality index variable, are not correlated with Reason. Similarly, all the Dark Personality traits, and the index variable, were not correlated with Ingratiation. Finally, with the exception of Narcissism, none of the Dark Personality traits, or the index variable, was correlated with Exemplification or Ingratiation. Conversely, the Dark Personality traits formed positive correlations with the majority of the remaining manipulation tactics. In fact, the Dark Personality was positively correlated with Total Manipulation with a medium to large effect size.

Looking at the Desire for Job Success in the Army variables indicated that Need for Power, Need for Social Status, and Need for Money displayed positive intercorrelations of medium to large effect size. Examining the relationships between the Dark Personality variables and the Desire for Job Success variables indicated that the Dark Personality was positively correlated to Desire for Job Success with a medium effect size. Of the individual Dark Personality variables, Narcissism and Low Honesty-Humility appeared to be driving the positive correlation with Desire for Job Success. Contrary to tentative expectations, the Dark Personality was negatively correlated with Total Job Success in the Army with a small effect size. Of the individual Dark Personality variables, Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Low Honesty-Humility appear to be driving the negative correlations with Total Job Success in the Army.

Finally, the correlations between the manipulation tactics and Total Job Success in the Army were examined. Total Manipulation was negatively correlated with Total Job Success in the Army, with a small effect size. Examining the individual manipulation tactics indicated that
a few tactics were unrelated to Total Job Success in the Army, namely, Self-Promotion, Ingratiation, Exemplification, and Charm. Reason and Responsibility Invocation were positively correlated with Total Job Success in the Army. Finally, the remaining manipulation tactics were negatively correlated with Total Job Success in the Army.

Linear Regressions

The Dark Personality and Desire for Job Success

To address the hypothesis that higher levels of the Dark Personality will predict a higher Desire for Job Success in the Army, a simple linear regression was conducted. The regression indicated that an Army member’s score on the Dark Personality predicted a higher Desire for Job Success in the Army, $F(1, 461) = 56.67, p = .00, \beta = .12$. The Dark Personality accounted for 11% of the variability in Desire for Job Success in the Army. The five individual personality traits that make up the Dark Personality were also entered as separate predictors of Desire for Job Success in the Army in a multiple linear regression. The regression indicated that Narcissism [$F(1, 453) = 51.05, p = .00, \beta = 1.05]$ and Low Honesty-Humility [$F(1, 453) = 51.05, p = .00, \beta = .35$] predicted higher Desire for Job Success in the Army, while Psychopathy [$F(1, 453) = 51.05, p = .00, \beta = -.18$] predicted lower Desire for Job Success, and Machiavellianism and Low Agreeableness were unrelated to Desire for Job Success.

Examining the individual desires subsumed under Desire for Job Success in the Army indicated that an Army member’s score on the Dark Personality predicted higher Desire for Power [$F(1, 463) = 123.30, p = .00, \beta = .10$], and a higher Desire for Money [$F(1, 462) = 44.81, p = .00, \beta = .03$], but it was not related to Desire for Social Status [$F(1, 463) = 1.21, p = .27, \beta = .01$].
The Dark Personality and Manipulation

To address the hypothesis that higher levels of the Dark Personality will predict high levels of Total Manipulation, a simple regression was conducted. The regression indicated that an Army member’s score on the Dark Personality predicted engaging in Manipulation at work, $F(1, 454) = 130.34, p = .00, \beta = .41$. The Dark Personality accounted for 22% of the variance in Total Manipulation. The five individual personality traits that make up the Dark Personality were also entered as separate predictors of Total Manipulation in a multiple linear regression. The regression indicated that Psychopathy $[F(1, 450) = 27.17, p = .00, \beta = .57]$, Narcissism $[F(1, 450) = 27.17, p = .00, \beta = .59]$ and Low Honesty-Humility $[F(1, 450) = 27.17, p = .00, \beta = .63]$ predicted more Total Manipulation at work, and Machiavellianism and Low Agreeableness were unrelated to Total Manipulation.

Given the variability present in the different manipulation tactics, several simple linear regressions were conducted to determine which specific manipulation tactics Army members high on the Dark Personality reported using at work. The Dark Personality predicted using 15 of the 17 manipulation tactics: Self-Promotion $[F(1, 465) = 38.53, p = .00, \beta = .03]$, Exemplification $[F(1, 465) = 6.07, p = .01, \beta = .01]$, Intimidation $[F(1, 465) = 113.12, p = .00, \beta = .05]$, Supplication $[F(1, 465) = 58.74, p = .00, \beta = .04]$, Coercion $[F(1, 456) = 71.15, p = .00, \beta = .05]$, Responsibility Invocation $[F(1, 465) = 12.32, p = .00, \beta = .01]$, Regression $[F(1, 465) = 37.86, p = .00, \beta = .03]$, Reciprocity $[F(1, 464) = 53.19, p = .00, \beta = .05]$, Debasement $[F(1, 463) = 60.96, p = .00, \beta = .04]$, Hardball $[F(1, 461) = 93.37, p = .00, \beta = .13]$, Charm $[F(1, 464) = 68.62, p = .00, \beta = .03]$, Silent Treatment $[F(1, 464) = 51.20, p = .00, \beta = .04]$, Pleasure Induction $[F(1, 464) = 31.80, p = .00, \beta = .02]$, Social Comparison $[F(1, 464) = 90.77, p = .00, \beta = .03]$. The regression indicated that Psychopathy, Narcissism, and Low Honesty-Humility predicted more Total Manipulation at work.
= .07], and Monetary Reward \( [F(1, 465) = 61.25, p = .00, \beta = .04] \). Yet, the Dark Personality did not predict using Reason or Ingratiation at work.

**Manipulation and Total Job Success in the Army**

To address the hypothesis that higher levels of Total Manipulation will predict higher Job Success in the Army, a simple linear regression was conducted. Contrary to expectations, the regression indicated that an Army member’s score on Total Manipulation predicted lower Total Job Success in the Army, \( F(1, 449) = 23.11, p = .00, \beta = -.05 \). Total Manipulation accounted for 5% of the variability in Total Job Success in the Army.

Given the conceptual variability present in the different manipulation tactics, seventeen simple linear regressions were conducted to determine which specific tactics were related to Total Job Success in the Army. Only Reason \( [F(1, 459) = 6.31, p = .01, \beta = .18] \) and Responsibility Invocation \( [F(1, 460) = 6.14, p = .01, \beta = .29] \) predicted higher levels of Total Job Success in the Army. The following tactics predicted lower levels of Total Job Success in the Army: Supplication \( [F(1, 460) = 32.58, p = .00, \beta = -.52] \), Coercion \( [F(1, 451) = 6.52, p = .01, \beta = -.18] \), Regression \( [F(1, 460) = 23.58, p = .00, \beta = -.41] \), Reciprocity \( [F(1, 459) = 16.61, p = .00, \beta = -.24] \), Debasement \( [F(1, 458) = 40.23, p = .00, \beta = -.54] \), Hardball \( [F(1, 456) = 325.31, p = .00, \beta = -.19] \), Silent Treatment \( [F(1, 459) = 41.86, p = .00, \beta = -.51] \), Pleasure Induction \( [F(1, 459) = 5.82, p = .02, \beta = -.26] \), Social Comparison \( [F(1, 459) = 18.24, p = .00, \beta = -.25] \), and Monetary Reward \( [F(1, 460) = 25.40, p = .00, \beta = -.39] \). Finally, using Self-Promotion, Ingratiation, Exemplification, and Charm were unrelated to Total Job Success in the Army.

Therefore, with notable exceptions such as Reason and Responsibility Invocation, most of the manipulation tactics predicted lower levels of Total Job Success in the Army. These findings add to the current literature on manipulation and job success, which has only demonstrated that using
Reason and Ingratiation are related to achieving more Job Success (e.g., Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003).

**The Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army**

To address the hypothesis that higher levels of the Dark Personality will predict Total Job Success in the Army, a simple linear regression was conducted. The regression indicated that an Army member’s score on the Dark Personality predicted lower Total Job Success in the Army, $F(1, 460) = 9.11, p = .01, \beta = -.03$. The Dark Personality accounted for only 2% of the variability in Total Job Success in the Army. The five individual personality traits that make up the Dark Personality were also entered as separate predictors of Total Job Success in the Army in a multiple linear regression. The regression indicated that only Psychopathy was a significant predictor of lower Total Job Success in the Army, $F(1, 451) = 3.70, p = .00, \beta = -.09$. Overall, the Dark Personality had a minimal linear effect on Total Job Success in the Army.

**Curvilinear Regression**

**The Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army**

Due to the mixed research findings regarding the effects of the Dark Personality traits on Job Success, and the low magnitude of the linear relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army in this dissertation, I questioned whether a linear relationship could adequately explain the covariance in these two variables. After examining the scatterplot of the two variables, I decided to conduct post hoc analyses to test for the presence of a curvilinear relationship. A curvilinear regression analysis was employed to fit the relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army with an appropriate model. Adding a quadratic and a cubic component to the model each produced an increase in fit. The linear, quadratic and cubic regression lines are depicted on the scatterplot in Figure 1 (pg. 154).
The quadratic model \([F(2, 458) = 7.21, p = .001, R^2 = .03]\) provided the most parsimonious curvilinear explanation of the relationship. The quadratic regression model indicated that possessing very low levels of the Dark Personality, or possessing very high levels of the Dark Personality, was related to achieving more Total Job Success in the Army, while possessing intermediate levels of the Dark Personality traits was related to achieving less Total Job Success in the Army. The Dark Personality accounted for 6% of the variability in Total Job Success in the Army. Furthermore, this increase in \(R^2\) from the linear to the quadratic model was significant, \(F(4, 445) = 6.93, p = .00\).

The cubic model \([F(3, 457) = 6.74, p = .000, R^2 = .04]\) provided an alternative and more complex explanation of the relationship. The cubic regression model indicated that Total Job Success in the Army increases as a person’s level of the Dark Personality increases from extremely low to low-moderate; then Total Job Success in the Army decreases as a person’s level of the Dark Personality reaches intermediate levels. Finally, a person’s Total Job Success in the Army increases significantly as their levels of the Dark Personality increases to high levels.

While statistically significant, the cubic regression’s oscillating pattern was contrary to expectations regarding the impact of personality on outcome variables and the solution was difficult to interpret; thus, the quadratic regression model was preferable because it provided the most parsimonious and interpretable curvilinear explanation of the relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army. Furthermore, the quadratic relationship was preferable to the linear relationship due to the significant increase in the variance explained.
Curvilinear Mediation Analysis

The Dark Personality, Total Manipulation, and Total Job Success in the Army

To examine the hypothesis that Total Manipulation mediates the effect of the Dark Personality on Total Job Success in the Army, a series of regressions was conducted in order to statistically test a mediation effect. Similar to the curvilinear regressions presented above, both a quadratic and cubic model were tested. The decision was made to present and interpret the quadratic models because the cubic models were too complex conceptually and the cubic models also had the weakest effects when compared to the linear and quadratic solutions. The curvilinear mediation analysis (Figure 2, pg. 157) tested the relationships between the Dark Personality and the Dark Personality Squared, through Total Manipulation and Total Manipulation Squared, to Total Job Success in the Army.

First, the linear relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Manipulation was significant \[ F(1, 453) = 130.34, p = .000, R^2 = .22 \], indicating that individuals with higher scores on the Dark Personality engaged in more Total Manipulation at work. Adding a quadratic component (Figure 3, pg. 156) to the model resulted in a significant relationship \[ F(1, 453) = 4.14, p = .04, R^2 = .01 \]. The quadratic regression model indicated the presence of a decelerating curve in which individuals engaged in more Total Manipulation at work as their level of the Dark Personality increased to intermediate levels, at which point the amount of Total Manipulation at work plateaued. Furthermore, the linear relationship between the Dark Personality Squared and Total Manipulation Squared was significant, \[ F(1, 453) = 7.21, p = .01, R^2 = .02 \]. Finally, the relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Manipulation Squared was not significant.

Next, the relationships between Manipulation and Total Job Success were tested. The linear relationship between Total Manipulation and Total Job Success in the Army (Figure 4, pg.
was significant, whereas the quadratic relationship between Total Manipulation and Total Job Success in the Army was not significant. These results indicate that as a person engages in more Total Manipulation at work their level of Total Job Success in the Army decreases in a linear fashion. When comparing these results, it appears that the quadratic relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Manipulation is driving the previously documented curvilinear relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army.

Finally, the relationships between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army, controlling for the effects of Total Manipulation were examined to test for the presence of mediation. The linear relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army was no longer significant, and the quadratic relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army was only marginally significant. These results suggest the presence of mediation.

Overall, the results of the curvilinear mediation analysis (Figure 2, pg. 157) indicated that the Dark Personality, in isolation, did not have a large effect on Total Job Success in the Army; yet, being high on the Dark Personality and using more Manipulation tactics at work predicted attaining less Job Success in the Army. Specifically, engaging in more manipulation tactics at work impedes an Army member’s job success. When looking at the initial quadratic relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army (i.e., U shaped), it makes sense that people low in the Dark Personality achieve more job success in the Army because they engage in fewer manipulation tactics at work. Given the quadratic relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Manipulation (i.e., decelerating curve), it makes sense that people with intermediate levels of the Dark Personality do not achieve as much job success as people with low levels of the Dark Personality because they are engaging in more manipulation tactics at
work. It also follows that Army members with high levels of Dark Personality should not be achieving any less job success than Army members with intermediate levels of the Dark Personality because they are not using any additional manipulation tactics at work (i.e., the decelerating curve of manipulation tactics plateaus at intermediate levels of the Dark Personality, Figure 3). Overall, being less anti-social at work is the most successful strategy for achieving job success in the Army; however, an alternative niche strategy is to commit fully to being anti-social and manipulative at work.
Table 29

Main Study: Descriptive Statistics for the Individual and Index Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>76.09</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Agreeableness</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Honesty-Humility</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplication</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility Invocation</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debasement</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardball</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24.27</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Treatment</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Induction</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>Note. * Standardized Z-scores were used for each item to compute the index variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Comparison</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Power</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Social Status</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Money</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dark Personality*</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>-116</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for Job Success*</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Manipulation*</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Job Success*</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Job Success*</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Job Success*</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 30</td>
<td>Main Study: Correlation Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Psychopathy</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Machiavellianism</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Narcissism</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low Agreeableness</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Low Hon-Humility</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-Promotion</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ingratiation</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exemplification</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intimidation</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supplication</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Coercion</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsib Invoc</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Regression</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Reciprocity</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Debasement</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Hardball</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Charm</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Reason</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Silent Treatment</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Pleasure Induction</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Social Comparison</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Monetary Reward</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Need for Power</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Need for Money</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Dark Personality</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Desire for Job Suc</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Total Manipulation</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tot Job Success</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: *p < .05, **p < .01
Table 30

Main Study: Correlation Table (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Psychopathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Machiavellianism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Narcissism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low Agreeableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Low Hon-Humility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ingratiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exemplification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intimidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Responsib Invoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Regression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reciprocity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Debasement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Hardball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Charm</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Reason</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Silent Treatment</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pleasure Induction</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Social Comparison</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Monetary Reward</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Need for Power</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Need for Soc Stat</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Need for Money</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Dark Personality</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Desire for Job Suc</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Total Manipulation</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Tot Job Success</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01
Chapter 14
Discussion

Summary of Results

This dissertation empirically addressed several research questions regarding the impact of the Dark Personality and Manipulation on Job Success in the United States Army. In support of Hypothesis 1, the Dark Personality was related to desiring job success in the Army. The Dark Personality predicted a stronger desire for Job Success in the Army. In particular, army members higher on the Dark Personality desired more Power, and to a lesser degree more Money, but they did not desire more Social Status in the Army. Examining the individual personality traits indicated that being high on Narcissism and being low on Honesty-Humility predicted a stronger Desire for Job Success. Contrary to prediction, being high on Psychopathy predicted less Desire for Job Success in the Army.

In support of the Hypothesis 2, the Dark Personality also predicted engaging in more manipulation at work. Army members higher on the Dark Personality used more manipulation tactics at work. The Dark Personality predicted using all of the manipulation tactics, with the exception of Reason and Ingratiation, which are soft forms of influence that have been previously shown to relate to job success. Therefore, the Dark Personality predicted engaging in more Total Manipulation at work, including the more anti-social and egregious manipulation tactics like Hardball or Silent Treatment.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 aimed to empirically elucidate the directionality of both the Dark Personality and Total Manipulation’s influence on Total Job Success in the Army. Contrary to Hypothesis 3, results indicated that using more Total Manipulation at work predicted lower levels of Total Job Success in the Army. Examining the individual manipulation tactics
indicated that most had a negative impact on Job Success in the Army. Yet, there were some notable exceptions to this pattern; using Reason and Responsibility Invocation at work predicted attaining more Job Success in the Army. Furthermore, some other forms of soft manipulation, namely, Self-Promotion, Ingratiation, Exemplification, and Charm were unrelated to Job Success in the Army. Collectively, these results support the hypothesis that more soft manipulation tactics predicted Job Success, but that use of a higher number of manipulation tactics, including the egregious, predicted less Job Success in the Army. Overall, using Manipulation at work had a negative impact on attaining Job Success in the Army.

When examining Hypothesis 4, the linear results indicated that the Dark Personality predicted lower Job Success in the Army and this negative impact was driven by Psychopathy. When looking at the linear relationships, the Dark Personality had a minimal negative effect on Total Job Success in the Army. However, testing for a curvilinear relationship indicated that the relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army was better explained by a quadratic (i.e., U shaped) model, which indicated that possessing low levels of the Dark Personality or high levels of the Dark Personality was associated with more Total Job Success in the Army, while possessing intermediate or average levels of the Dark Personality was associated with lower Total Job Success in the Army. In other words, individuals who are low in the Dark Personality achieve Job Success in the Army (i.e., team players) but there are also some individuals high in the Dark Personality who manage to achieve similar Job Success in the Army (i.e., self-interested leaders). These results represent partial support for Hypothesis 4, yet they also indicate that the relationship is more complex than originally proposed.

Finally, Hypothesis 5 addressed the cumulative impact of the Dark Personality and use of Total Manipulation at work on the attainment of Total Job Success in the Army using a
Results indicated that being high on the Dark Personality and using more Manipulation tactics at work, together, predicted attaining less Job Success in the Army. The relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army was no longer significant when including Total Manipulation, indicating the presence of mediation. Specifically, engaging in more manipulation tactics at work impeded an Army member’s attainment of job success. The initial quadratic relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army (i.e., U shaped) indicated that people low in the Dark Personality achieved more job success in the Army because they engaged in fewer manipulation tactics at work. The quadratic relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Manipulation (i.e., decelerating curve) indicated that people with intermediate levels of the Dark Personality did not achieve as much job success as people with low levels of the Dark Personality because they engaged in more manipulation tactics at work. However, Army members with high levels of the Dark Personality achieved more job success than Army members with intermediate levels, even though they were using similar levels of manipulation tactics at work. Thus, there is a niche in the Army for anti-social and manipulative individuals to get ahead, despite an overall pattern of success for individuals who are not anti-social.

In sum, army members scoring high on the Dark Personality want to attain more power and money in the Army and they use a more diverse set of manipulation tactics on their coworkers. Yet, having intermediate levels of the Dark Personality and using a larger number of manipulation tactics at work undermines army members’ ability to actually attain a powerful, well-paying position in the Army. Thus, army members with intermediate levels of the Dark Personality want to obtain more powerful and high paying jobs, yet their strategy of manipulating their coworkers to move up the job ladder does not work in the Army; they do not
tend to hold higher ranking, higher paying positions than army members scoring lower in the Dark Personality and Total Manipulation. One caveat to this pattern was the fact that Army members scoring highest on the Dark Personality were able to achieve job success, despite using manipulation tactics at work. Potential explanations for this finding will be examined below.

The Curvilinear Mediation Model in Relation to the Literature

The mediational model indicated that the Dark Personality, in isolation, had a minimal negative curvilinear impact on whether an individual will attain Job Success in the Army. A previous meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behaviour indicated that Psychopathy and Machiavellianism in particular, were negatively related to work performance with small effect sizes, while the Dark Triad construct was unrelated to work performance (O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012). In discussing these results, the authors suggested that the Dark Triad is better able to predict dark behaviours, rather than positive behaviours. In this dissertation project, I displayed a similar pattern of results: The Dark Personality strongly predicted using manipulation tactics (i.e., dark behaviour), but it had a weaker predictive effect on Job Success (i.e., positive outcome).

Furthermore, the mediational model indicated that having intermediate levels of the Dark Personality traits, and using more manipulation tactics at work, together, make it less likely that an army member will attain Job Success in the Army. Past research indicates that one of the key determinants of Job Success is one’s use of social skills in the workplace; specifically, being rewarding to deal with in social interactions is positively associated with employability and Job Success (Hogan, Chamorro-Premuzic, & Kaiser, 2013). Thus, engaging in more manipulation tactics at work, particularly the more egregious forms of manipulation, would likely make a person less rewarding to work with. This may provide an explanation for why Army members
with intermediate levels of the Dark Personality who engaged in more workplace manipulation were less likely to achieve Job Success; perhaps their manipulative interpersonal style made them less rewarding to work with and thus prevented them from advancing in the Army.

Being a manipulative coworker who is not rewarding to work with may be particularly harmful in the Army where teamwork is especially valued; trained army members are expected to sacrifice their own preferences for the good of the team. The more egregious manipulation tactics and the Dark Personality style focus on obtaining the individual’s own preferences at the expense of the team, which may not be tolerated in the Army. When comparing the Dark Personality to Total Manipulation at work, it appears that engaging in more Manipulation tactics at work is more harmful in regards to personal Job Success. This is illustrated by the quadratic (i.e., U shaped) relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army; the highest Job Success was obtained by individuals who are low in the Dark Personality traits, and thus more likely to be team players. However, the other side of the quadratic model indicated that there are some individuals high on the Dark Personality who obtain similar success, suggesting that a more self-interested interpersonal style may be successful for some Army members. Thus, being high in the Dark Personality can be adaptive. However, using a higher number of manipulation tactics at work is detrimental to achieving Job Success in the Army.

Unexpected Findings

There were a number of unexpected findings in this dissertation project, particularly in relation to two of the Dark Triad traits, namely, Psychopathy and Machiavellianism. Although the Dark Personality construct predicted a stronger Desire for Job Success, when the individual traits were examined, Psychopathy predicted a lower Desire for Job Success, which was contrary
to predictions. The Dark Triad literature indicates that Psychopathy is related to self-enhancement, and to desiring power and control (e.g., Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Thus, it was predicted that Psychopathy would be related to desiring Power, and desiring Money, even if simply as a means to attain power and control, in one’s job. Yet, research also indicates that Psychopathy is related to low levels of self-deceptive enhancement and low levels of impression management (e.g., Stead, Plouffe, Kay, & Fekken, 2014) meaning that individuals who are high on Psychopathy do not care what other people think of them. Therefore, individuals high on Psychopathy may not desire social status because they do not consider the impression they make on other people to be important. Surprisingly, the results of this research project suggest that Psychopaths do not desire Job Success in the form of Power, Money, and Social Status; perhaps their disregard for impression management is a contributing factor. Psychopathy was also negatively related to attaining Job Success in the Army. This finding is logical: Army members who are high on Psychopathy do not want Job Success so they do not achieve it. Furthermore, Psychopaths are impulsive and high in thrill seeking, meaning that they often live in the moment, which can be a detriment to achieving long-term outcomes that require sustained effort, such as job success.

Additionally, Machiavellianism was not a significant predictor of Desire for Job Success, Total Manipulation, or Total Job Success in the Army, which is contrary to past research and to this study’s hypotheses. Despite the fact that Machiavellianism showed the same pattern of first order correlations to these variables as Psychopathy and Narcissism, it was not a significant predictor in any of the regressions. Particularly surprising was the finding that Machiavellianism was the only Dark Triad trait that did not predict using more manipulation tactics at work. This finding is in contrast to past research, which has demonstrated that Machiavellianism is
associated with using a larger range of manipulation tactics at work, including hard tactics (e.g., threats) and soft tactics (e.g., offering compliments; Jonason, Słomski, & Partyka, 2012, Austin, Farrelly, Black, & Moore, 2007). However, it should be noted that the present study and previous studies used different measures of the Dark Triad traits, which may account for the differences in findings. Furthermore, Machiavellianism’s distribution was leptokurtic, which may have reduced the variability of scores, and thus the significance of the findings.

Finally, the curvilinear mediation analysis contained unexpected job success findings for Army members with high levels of the Dark Personality. The mediation analysis did not indicate why Army members with high levels of the Dark Personality were achieving more job success than Army members with intermediate levels of the Dark Personality, given that the two groups were engaging in relatively equal amounts of manipulation at work, which was found to be detrimental to achieving job success in the Army. Perhaps there is something other than workplace manipulation that people high in the Dark Personality are doing that is accounting for their job success in the Army. As cited in the introduction, the literature suggests that individuals with high levels of the Dark Personality traits are more likely to break the cooperative interpersonal rules of the workplace, which emphasize the collective good, and choose rather to extract resources for themselves (e.g., O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012; Glenn, Kurzban & Raine, 2011). Furthermore, the literature suggests that it is only some elements of the Dark Personality traits that relate to job success. For instance, the bright side of Narcissism (i.e., egotism and high self-esteem) is related to leadership attainment in the Military, rather than the dark side of Narcissism (i.e., manipulation and impression management; Paunonen, Lonnqvist, Verkasalo, & Nissinen, 2006). Perhaps the Army members with high levels of the Dark Personality inhibited some aspects of their personality, like using excessive
manipulation at work, and utilized other aspects of their personality well, such as their high self-confidence and decisiveness. Alternatively, perhaps Army members in this sample with high levels of the Dark Personality traits were attaining job success because they had not yet been caught. The literature suggests that the Dark Personality traits are related to short-term success in several domains, but that this success often diminishes or reverses over time (e.g., Jonason, Valentine, Li, & Harbeson, 2011). The main sample was composed of fairly young Enlisted Army personnel who represented the lower strata of the Rank hierarchy, suggesting that the Dark Personality strategy for attaining job success may be working in the short-term, but it may backfire over the long-term.

**Limitations**

The primary limitation of this dissertation is the use of a cross-sectional research design to test a mediational model. All measurements were taken at the same time and there was no experimental manipulation, which makes it difficult to establish the causal ordering of the relationships. Therefore, use of a cross-sectional design to test a mediation model is associated with threats to internal validity; it can be difficult to determine whether the observed effects are caused by the predictor variables in the study, as opposed to confounding factors. To make a causal inference the cause must proceed the effect, the cause and effect must be related (i.e., covariance), and there should be no plausible alternative explanation for the covariance. Given that the predictor variables in this study consist of personality traits, which develop early and are stable over time, it is reasonable to assume that personality proceeds Job Success temporally. There was also evidence of covariance between the Dark Personality and Job Success in this dissertation, as evidenced by their correlation. Although there is some evidence that the assumptions required for causal inferences are upheld, causal inferences should be cautioned
given that I used a cross-sectional design. Causal inferences would better be supported by a longitudinal research design, where personality information would be collected as army members enlisted and would be related to future job success, thus allowing for better control of confounding factors such as work environment or maturation, which might simultaneously influence both personality and job success.

The reporting methods used in this dissertation are associated with potential limitations. For instance, self-report can lead to overestimating relationships among variables because individuals tend to look for consistency in their own behaviour in order to establish a coherent view of themselves. Furthermore, a lack of insight into one’s own thoughts and behavior may lead to stereotypic responding which may yield artificial relationships. Finally, Job Success in the Army was measured using self-report of one’s starting and current Army Rank, Pay Grade, power, and status. Thus, the self-report questions used to generate the Job Success variables are subject to memory bias because participants may have inaccurately recalled their starting positions, and the questions may be subject to social desirability, in the form of self-deceptive enhancement.

Additionally, relying exclusively on self-report can lead to mono-method bias, which is associated with threats to construct validity; it can be difficult to determine if the self-report measures are truly measuring what they purport to measure. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff (2012) reviewed questionnaire design methods that control for sources of method bias, including separation of predictor and criterion variables, eliminating common scale properties, using unambiguous items, reducing social desirability in item wording, and balancing positive and negative items. The questionnaires used in this study conformed to several of these procedural remedies for method bias. For instance, the questionnaires were randomly ordered to
prevent the measures of the predictor and criterion variables falling in close proximity to one another across participants. The questionnaires used a wide range of response scales and anchor points, thus reducing response bias due to common scale properties. Furthermore, most of the questionnaire items have been empirically developed and rigorously tested. Consequently, the items are unambiguously worded and the questionnaires include both positively and negatively worded items through the use of reverse coding scoring procedures.

Moreover, the recruitment methods used in this dissertation are associated with potential limitations. Given that the participants for the pilot studies and the main study were all recruited through Mechanical Turk, there may have been participant overlap amongst the samples used in this dissertation. Thus may have resulted in dependencies in the empirical results obtained from the “same” participants. Using a single recruitment method introduces mono-operation bias, which is associated with threats to construct validity; it can be difficult to determine if the measure of the predictor variable derived from a single method is representative of the full breadth of the construct, as opposed to a peculiar version of the construct. The resolution to this issue in future research would be to assess the key variables using multiple methods, for example, to use a structured interview to assess the Dark Triad, as it may be less subject to impression management or lack of insight.

The recruitment method also has limitations associated with sample demographics and careless responding. The studies were completed online through Mechanical Turk on a voluntary basis with a small cash reward (i.e., $2) for participation. The samples that were recruited using this method consisted of younger army members in lower ranks and pay grades, which may be due, in part, to the low cash reward offered for participation. Army members at the highest ranks in the Army may be less likely to use Mechanical Turk, and they may be less likely
to participate in this research for such a small cash reward. Thus, the results of this dissertation are limited in that the sample consists of young army members who have not advanced very far in the army. Future research should look at job progression over a longer time period, including the highest strata of the army. Furthermore, with low incentives for accurate and thoughtful responding, there are likely some participants who answered some items in a rushed, dishonest, or simply careless fashion. This begs the question of whether the small cash reward induced sufficient motivation for thoughtful responding in participants. It should be noted that careless responders were identified and removed via listwise deletion prior to analyses. Careless responders were identified by repetitive response patterns (e.g., choosing the same response option across an entire questionnaire) and by large proportions of missing data (e.g., responses missing for multiple questionnaires). A total sample of 491 participants was downloaded from Surveymonkey, and 23 participants were removed for careless responding, leaving a sample of 468 participants for data analysis. In addition, variables were not computed for participants who had 10% or more missing data on the relevant questionnaire or questionnaires, meaning that some analyses used a sample of fewer than 468 participants. Overall, the low proportion of missing data indicates that Mechanical Turk provided a relatively reliable and valid sample of participants and may even suggest that it is things such as search for novelty, relief from boredom, or opportunity to contribute to knowledge, that motivates Mechanical Turk respondents, rather than money.

Furthermore, Mechanical Turk participants have to be computer literate, have access to a computer, and be English speaking, which are characteristics that enhance data quality while also limiting generalizability of findings. In addition to online recruitment, there are other factors that call into question the generalizability of the results. This dissertation project limited recruitment
to members of the United States Army due to the Army’s highly structured advancement system, which uses rank and pay hierarchies to measure Job Success. However, it is unclear whether the present findings would generalize to other workplace contexts. There is evidence that working in the United States Military is associated with significant work stress and depression, which act to limit personnel’s work performance (e.g., Pflanz & Ogle, 2006). The stress and emotional strain that is present in a Military workplace may not be present to the same degree in other more traditional workplaces. Similarly, different workplace environments may impact how anti-social personality traits and manipulation affects job success; in a labile environment with constant employee turnover, an anti-social individual may find it easier or harder to manipulate co-workers when compared to a static environment with familiar co-workers. Thus, the reported relationships between personality, manipulation, and job success may differ if this research were to be replicated in different contexts.

Finally, the low magnitude of some of the statistically significant results begs the question of whether the reported relationships have practical significance or meaning. For instance, the Dark Personality predicted attaining less Job Success in the Army, but the magnitude of this relationship was small. Similarly, the curvilinear mediation analysis of the Dark Personality, Total Manipulation, and Job Success in the Army consisted of significant, yet weak, curvilinear and linear relationships. Thus, the statistical significance of some of the relationships may be an artifact of large sample size as opposed to the presence of robust phenomena. Furthermore, the curvilinear relationships tested a quadratic and cubic model, but the analyses could have also tested more complex models (e.g., a quartic model) for significance. However, even if statistically significant, these more complex models would likely have been difficult to interpret in a meaningful way; thus, the decision was made to test only the quadratic
and cubic models, and to present the significant quadratic results as they had strongest and most parsimonious curvilinear results.

**Future Research**

Subsequent research should continue to examine the relationship between the Dark Personality traits, using manipulation tactics at work, and attaining Job Success. Given the complexity of the curvilinear mediation results, replication is needed to validate the interpretations made in this dissertation. Similar analyses using independent samples will enable cross-validation, replication, and extension of the results. For instance, this research examined army members working in “regular” occupations that parallel the civilian world, such as accountants, plumbers, and so on. Thus, replication is needed with an Army sample composed of active soldiers who may have substantively different levels of the Dark Personality, and whose use of manipulation may differ because the team is paramount in their work. Similarly, replication is needed using a sample of army members from the highest ranks of the Army, where performance has more impact on rank and pay grade progression than time requirements, allowing more variability in key job success indicators and allowing for a more direct influence of personality and manipulation on job success. Furthermore, replication using different workplaces and different recruitment methods would enable researchers to determine if the results are generalizable. Specifically, a comparison of static and labile work environments would enable researchers to determine if workplace environment affects whether an anti-social manipulative strategy is beneficial or harmful to the individual’s job progression. For instance, when co-workers are in the workplace long enough, do they determine whether someone is a manipulator and change their willingness to support the manipulator’s work goals, thus undermining the manipulator’s job success?
Furthermore, a longitudinal research design would be superior to a cross-sectional design. A longitudinal research design would enable researchers to follow participants from the time they begin a new job until a specified endpoint, while monitoring their manipulation tactics and job progression over time. Measuring the predictor variables and the mediation and outcome variables at different time points would strengthen the research design and enable researchers to make casual hypotheses and causal interpretations of the mediation findings. For instance, a longitudinal design would make it easier to measure, and control for, confounding factors that are introduced over time, which would strengthen casual interpretations. Furthermore, memory bias would be reduced, as participants would not have to recall their starting positions, but would rather report current information at specified time points. In addition, a long time period would allow for comparisons of the impact of personality and manipulation on job success at different strata of the Army hierarchy. For instance, a longitudinal analysis could address the question of whether use of manipulation strategies, and their impact on job success, changes over time. Collectively, a longitudinal design would allow more a much more nuanced analysis of the research questions raised in this dissertation.

Additionally, future research designs would not be confined to using self-report methods; observational measurement and third-party reports could supplement participants’ self-report data, making the methodology more rigorous, and making the potential findings stronger, clearer, and more robust. For instance, workplace records in the form of salary and promotion documentation, performance reviews, and Human Resources complaints could be used to supplement self-reports of Job Success at work. Furthermore, in addition to measuring the number of manipulation tactics used at work, future studies can measure the versatility or range of the tactics used, and the competency with which the tactics were used using third party
reports, which would refine the analyses regarding the impact of personality on manipulation, and manipulation on career success. However, it should be noted that these more rigorous research designs would likely have smaller sample sizes, which would reduce power, which is necessary to conduct complex multivariate analyses like curvilinear mediation analysis. Collectively, future research projects should focus on replicating and extending the results of this dissertation using more rigorous research methods in various workplace contexts.
Chapter 15

Summary and Conclusions

In this dissertation I asked whether possessing anti-social personality traits (i.e., the Dark Personality) and employing anti-social behaviours at work (i.e., Manipulation tactics) is personally adaptive to the individual in regards to achieving Job Success (i.e., attaining a high paying, high status, powerful position). Given past research that purports that Psychopathy can be evolutionarily adaptive to the individual, I predicted that possessing the Dark Personality and using manipulation tactics at work would predict the attainment of job success in these antisocial individuals. Yet, results indicated that anti-social individuals generally did not advance further than their peers in the United States Army; similarly, using a larger number of manipulation tactics on their co-workers appeared to prevent anti-social individuals from advancing in the Army.

While these findings were contrary to expectations, they do display a more optimistic view of workplace dynamics in the Army than that which was predicted. It appears that looking out for number one is not a successful strategy for attaining Job Success in the Army. Future research might test the assumption that being an employee who is non-manipulative, humble, agreeable, and socially responsible, and who influences his or her coworkers using tactics such as reason and ingratiation, is more likely to achieve job success than the corporate scoundrel depicted in the opening paragraphs of this thesis.

The popular media has created numerous iconic characters that display Dark Personality traits and behaviours and occupy elevated positions in their occupational hierarchies. For instance, the character James Bond is a top-level assassin, and the character Dr. Gregory House is a sought-after physician who is considered a medical genius in his field; both these characters
represent the pinnacle of their occupations. These depictions suggest that the Dark Personality may lead to positive work outcomes, such as job success. However, the results of this dissertation indicate that for most people, possessing anti-social traits and engaging in manipulative behaviour, does not facilitate job success. Yet, there do appear to be a few of these anti-social individuals who get ahead despite their socially egregious behaviour. Perhaps, the media is focusing in on these niche characters who attain success in unconventional ways. Yet overall, most employees are no James Bond or Dr. House, and attempting to be manipulative and self-interested does not tend to pay off in the end.
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Letter of Information, Consent Form, Debriefing Form

Letter of Information

The Dark Personality and Job Success: Use of Interpersonal Manipulation in the Workplace

This research is being conducted by Rebecca Stead, under the supervision of Dr. Cynthia Fekken of the Queen’s University Department of Psychology.

This research investigates several personality traits and how they relate to the use of different interpersonal strategies at work. This research will attempt to determine which personality styles and which interpersonal strategies relate to job advancement and the attainment of a high salary and interpersonal power. You will be asked to complete a series of on-line questionnaires that should take less than 60 minutes. You will receive $2 for your participation.

Although this research deals with potentially personal information, there are no known risks in participating in this study. There is a possibility that you may feel uncomfortable with the kind of information we ask of you. You are free to stop participating at any time without penalty by simply exiting the browser before the end of the study. It would be greatly appreciated if you would answer all questions as honestly as possible. However, you should not feel obliged to answer any questions that you find objectionable or that make you feel uncomfortable.

You will not be asked to provide any identifying information, which will enable us to keep your responses anonymous. All information gathered in this research is kept confidential and is used only for research purposes. Only the research supervisor and the students in the supervisor’s laboratory, who may access this data for future use, will see your responses. The data will be stored in a secure area in a locked office. Any publications or presentations at scientific conferences based on this research will be of general findings only, and will not reveal identifying information.

If you have questions about this research, here are several sources you may contact:

a) Myself, Rebecca Stead (email: 0rs1@queensu.ca)
b) My supervisor, Dr. Cynthia Fekken (email: fekkenc@queensu.ca)
c) The Chair of the Queen’s University General Research Ethics Board (phone: 613-533-6000, ext. 74025; email: chair.GREB@queensu.ca).

Sincerely,
Rebecca Stead
Consent Form

I have volunteered to participate in the study titled, The Dark Personality and Job Success: Use of Interpersonal Manipulation in the Workplace

I consent to the above information and understand what is required for participation in the study. I understand that I will be seated at a personal computer and will complete a number of questionnaires. I understand that there is a possibility that I may feel uncomfortable with the kind of information asked. I understand that my participation in the study is completely voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without penalty. I also understand that my confidentiality will be protected throughout the study, and that the information I provide will be available only to researchers with scholarly interests in personality traits and interpersonal strategies in the workplace.

Should I have further questions I understand that I can contact any of the following individuals:
- a) The Principal Investigator, Rebecca Stead (email: 0rs1@queensu.ca)
- b) The Research Supervisor, Dr. Cynthia Fekken (email fekkenc@queensu.ca)
- c) The Chair of the Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (phone: 613-533-6000, ext. 74025; email: chair.GREB@queensu.ca).

If you do not wish to participate in this study, then please exit the survey browser now.

If you agree to participate in this study, please enter your Mechanical Turk nickname below to begin:


Debriefing Form

The Dark Personality and Job Success: Use of Interpersonal Manipulation in the Workplace

The popular media has long created iconic characters that are defined by their dark personality traits, such as the psychopathic serial killer or the manipulative, narcissistic CEO. These cold, manipulative, “evil” characters draw a lot of fan attention in a variety of films and television programs. Personality research has introduced a construct that typifies the characteristics of these dark individuals, which we term the Dark Personality style. This study aims to demonstrate a relationship between the Dark Personality traits and the attainment of job success and show that the relationship is explained by the use of interpersonal manipulation in the workplace. This research will contribute to a sparse literature that relates socially negative aspects of personality, namely, subclinical socially malevolent Dark Personality traits and manipulation tactics to workplace success. This study fits with previous arguments that there may be adaptive aspects of the Dark Personality and interpersonal influence; it aims to decipher whether the Dark Personality style facilitates the attainment of positive work outcomes, such as money, power, and status. The knowledge gained will be useful for personnel procedures related to hiring and promoting employees in organizational settings.

We appreciate you taking the time and effort to share your experiences with us for this study. If the recounting of your experiences has left you feeling distressed and you would like to speak to someone in confidence about your thoughts or feelings, or you would like more information, you are strongly encouraged to contact your local health practitioner (e.g., your physician).

Alternatively, please contact any of the following National resources available to you:
National Hopeline Network………………………………………………………………………………………………1-800-784-2433
National Suicide Prevention Lifeline………………………………………………………………………………………………1-800-273-8255

If you have any further questions about this research please contact Rebecca Stead (email: 0rs1@queensu.ca), Dr. Cynthia Fekken (email: fekkenc@queensu.ca). Thank you for helping us with this project—your time is much appreciated. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you should contact the Director Chair of the Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (phone: 613-533-6000, ext. 74025; email: chair.GREB@queensu.ca).

If you are interested in this area of research, you may wish to read the following references:


Appendix B

Questionnaires

Demographics Questionnaire

What is your sex?
1. Male
2. Female

What is your age?

Of which of the following ethnic groups are you a member?
1. Caucasian
2. African American
3. Asian
4. South Asian
5. Middle Eastern

Please indicate your marital status:
1. Single
2. Married or Cohabitating
3. Widowed
4. Divorced

With regard to religion, with which religious group do you identify?
1. Christian
2. Jewish
3. Muslim
4. Hindu
5. Buddhist
6. Sikh
7. Other
8. None

In what kind of a place did you grow up?
1. Large city (500,000+)
2. Small city
3. Rural area
4. Farm
Job Success Demographics Questionnaire (used in Study 1)

Are you currently a member of the United States Army?
1. Yes
2. No

Which component of the United States Army are you currently a member of?
1. Active Army
2. Army Reserve
3. Army National Guard

What is the highest level of education you have achieved?
1. Less than 7th grade
2. Junior high / Middle school (9th grade)
3. Partial high school (10th or 11th grade)
4. High school graduate
5. Partial college (at least one year)
6. College education
7. Graduate degree

What is your current job title?

_____________

What is your current salary per year?
1. Under $20 000
2. $ 20 000 - $ 29 999
3. $ 30 000 - $ 39 999
4. $ 40 000 - $ 49 999
5. $ 50 000 - $ 59 999
6. $ 60 000 - $ 69 999
7. $ 70 000 - $ 79 999
8. $ 80 000 - $ 89 999
9. $ 90 000 - $ 99 999
10. $ 100 000 - $109 999
11. $ 110 000 - $ 119 999
12. $ 120 000 - $ 129 999
13. $ 130 000 - $ 139 999
14. $ 140 000 - $ 149 999
15. $ 150 000
16. Above $ 150 000 (please specify _______)

Approximately how many years have you been a member of the United States Army?

__________
When you first enlisted in the United States Army, which Army ranking did you start at?

1. Private (PVT)
2. Private 2 (PV2)
3. Private First Class (PFC)
4. Specialist (SPC)
5. Corporal (CPL)
6. Sergeant (SGT)
7. Staff Sergeant (SSG)
8. Sergeant First Class (SFC)
9. Master Sergeant (MSG)
10. First Sergeant (1SG)
11. Sergeant Major (SGM)
12. Command Sergeant Major (CSM)
13. Sergeant Major of the Army (SMA)
14. Warrant Office (WO1)
15. Chief Warrant Officer 2 (CW2)
16. Chief Warrant Officer 3 (CW3)
17. Chief Warrant Officer 4 (CW4)
18. Chief Warrant Officer 5 (CW5)
19. Second Lieutenant (2LT)
20. First Lieutenant (1LT)
21. Captain (CPT)
22. Major (MAJ)
23. Lieutenant Colonel (LTC)
24. Colonel (COL)
25. Brigadier General (BG)
26. Major General (MG)
27. Lieutenant General (LTG)
28. General (GEN)

When you first enlisted in the United States Army, which Army pay grade did you start at?

1. E-1
2. E-2
3. E-3
4. E-4
5. E-5
6. E-6
7. E-7
8. E-8
9. E-9
10. E-9 Special
11. W-1
12. W-2
13. W-3
14. W-4
15. W-5
16. O-1
17. O-2
18. O-3
19. O-4
20. O-5
21. O-6
22. O-7
23. O-8
24. O-9
25. O-10

Which United States Army ranking do you currently hold?
1. Private (PVT)
2. Private 2 (PV2)
3. Private First Class (PFC)
4. Specialist (SPC)
5. Corporal (CPL)
6. Sergeant (SGT)
7. Staff Sergeant (SSG)
8. Sergeant First Class (SFC)
9. Master Sergeant (MSG)
10. First Sergeant (1SG)
11. Sergeant Major (SGM)
12. Command Sergeant Major (CSM)
13. Sergeant Major of the Army (SMA)
14. Warrant Office (WO1)
15. Chief Warrant Officer 2 (CW2)
16. Chief Warrant Officer 3 (CW3)
17. Chief Warrant Officer 4 (CW4)
18. Chief Warrant Officer 5 (CW5)
19. Second Lieutenant (2LT)
20. First Lieutenant (1LT)
21. Captain (CPT)
22. Major (MAJ)
23. Lieutenant Colonel (LTC)
24. Colonel (COL)
25. Brigadier General (BG)
26. Major General (MG)
27. Lieutenant General (LTG)
28. General (GEN)

Which United States Army pay grade are you currently at?
1. E-1
2. E-2
3. E-3
4. E-4
Within the United States Army, which field of Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) have you chosen?

1. Administrative Support
2. Intelligence and Combat Support
3. Arts and Media
4. Legal and Law Enforcement
5. Combat
6. Mechanics
7. Computers and Technology
8. Medical and Emergency
9. Construction and Engineering
10. Transportation and Aviation
11. Other (please specify ___________)

Since your first entered the United States Army, how many promotions have you received?

_______

Since you entered the United States Army, how many pay raises have you received that were associated with a promotion or with exceptionally good performance?

_______
Job Success Demographics Questionnaire (used in Study 2 and Study 3)

Are you currently an Enlisted member of the United States Army?
   1. Yes
   2. No

Which component of the United States Army are you currently a member of?
   1. Active Army
   2. Army Reserve
   3. Army National Guard

What is the highest level of education you have achieved?
   1. Less than 7th grade
   2. Junior high / Middle school (9th grade)
   3. Partial high school (10th or 11th grade)
   4. High school graduate
   5. Partial college (at least one year)
   6. College education
   7. Graduate degree

What is your current job title?

_____________

What is your current salary per year?
   1. Under $20 000
   2. $ 20 000 - $ 29 999
   3. $ 30 000 - $ 39 999
   4. $ 40 000 - $ 49 999
   5. $ 50 000 - $ 59 999
   6. $ 60 000 - $ 69 999
   7. $ 70 000 - $ 79 999
   8. $ 80 000 - $ 89 999
   9. $ 90 000 - $ 99 999
   10. $ 100 000 - $109 999
   11. $ 110 000 - $119 999
   12. $ 120 000 - $129 999
   13. $ 130 000 - $139 999
   14. $ 140 000 - $149 999
   15. $ 150 000
   16. Above $ 150 000 (please specify _______)

Approximately how many years have you been a member of the United States Army?

___________
When you first enlisted in the United States Army, which Army ranking did you **start at**?

1. Private (PVT)
2. Private 2 (PV2)
3. Private First Class (PFC)
4. Specialist (SPC)
5. Corporal (CPL)
6. Sergeant (SGT)
7. Staff Sergeant (SSG)
8. Sergeant First Class (SFC)
9. Master Sergeant (MSG)
10. First Sergeant (1SG)
11. Sergeant Major (SGM)
12. Command Sergeant Major (CSM)
13. Sergeant Major of the Army (SMA)

When you first enlisted in the United States Army, which Army pay grade did you **start at**?

1. E-1
2. E-2
3. E-3
4. E-4
5. E-5
6. E-6
7. E-7
8. E-8
9. E-9
10. E-9 Special

Which United States Army ranking do you **currently** hold?

1. Private (PVT)
2. Private 2 (PV2)
3. Private First Class (PFC)
4. Specialist (SPC)
5. Corporal (CPL)
6. Sergeant (SGT)
7. Staff Sergeant (SSG)
8. Sergeant First Class (SFC)
9. Master Sergeant (MSG)
10. First Sergeant (1SG)
11. Sergeant Major (SGM)
12. Command Sergeant Major (CSM)
13. Sergeant Major of the Army (SMA)

Which United States Army pay grade are you **currently** at?

1. E-1
2. E-2
3. E-3
Within the United States Army, which field of Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) have you chosen?

12. Administrative Support
13. Intelligence and Combat Support
14. Arts and Media
15. Legal and Law Enforcement
16. Combat
17. Mechanics
18. Computers and Technology
19. Medical and Emergency
20. Construction and Engineering
21. Transportation and Aviation
22. Other (please specify ____________)
Subjective Measure of Job Success in the Army

For questions 1-4, please refer to the ladder below and rate your level of **Status** in the United States Army using the following definition.

**STATUS** = holding an honored, prestigious, and important position in the United States Army

1. Comparing yourself to ALL enlisted soldiers in the US Army, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stood when you FIRST ENTERED The Army.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

2. Comparing yourself to ALL enlisted soldiers in the US ARMY, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stand TODAY.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

3. Comparing yourself to enlisted soldiers IN YOUR ARMY RANK, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stood when you FIRST ENTERED the Army.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

4. Comparing yourself to enlisted soldiers IN YOUR ARMY RANK, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stand TODAY.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung
For questions 5-8, please refer to the ladder below and rate your level of Power in the United States Army using the following definition.

POWER = holding a position that provides a high degree of power over other members of the United States Army

5. Comparing yourself to ALL enlisted soldiers in the US Army, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stood when you FIRST ENTERED The Army.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

6. Comparing yourself to ALL enlisted soldiers in the US ARMY, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stand TODAY.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

7. Comparing yourself to enlisted soldiers IN YOUR ARMY RANK, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stood when you FIRST ENTERED the Army.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

8. Comparing yourself to enlisted soldiers IN YOUR ARMY RANK, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stand TODAY.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung
For questions 9-12, please refer to the ladder below and rate your level of Money in the United States Army using the following definition.

**MONEY** = holding a position that offers a high salary in the United States Army

9. Comparing yourself to ALL enlisted soldiers in the US Army, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stood when you FIRST ENTERED The Army.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

10. Comparing yourself to ALL enlisted soldiers in the US ARMY, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stand TODAY.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

11. Comparing yourself to enlisted soldiers IN YOUR ARMY RANK, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stood when you FIRST ENTERED the Army.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung

12. Comparing yourself to enlisted soldiers IN YOUR ARMY RANK, please choose the rung (1-10) where you think you stand TODAY.
   Rung 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Rung
HEXACO Self-Report Battery

Below is a series of statements about you. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement, using the following scale.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Please answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

1. I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
2. I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
3. I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.
4. I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
5. I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
6. I wouldn’t use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought I would succeed.
7. I’m interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
8. I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.
9. People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
10. I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
11. I sometimes can’t help worrying about little things.
12. If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
13. I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.
14. When working on something, I don’t pay much attention to small details.
15. People sometimes tell me that I’m too stubborn.
16. I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.
17. When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
18. Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
19. I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
20. I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
21. People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
22. On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
23. I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
24. I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.
25. If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
26. When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
27. My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is “forgive and forget.”
28. I feel that I am an unpopular person.
29. When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
30. If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person’s worst jokes.
31. I’ve never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
32. I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.
33. I tend to be lenient in judging other people.
34. In social situations, I’m usually the one who makes the first move.
35. I worry a lot less than most people do.
36. I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.
37. People have often told me that I have a good imagination.
38. I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.
39. I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.
40. The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.
41. I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
42. I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.
43. I like people who have unconventional views.
44. I make a lot of mistakes because I don’t think before I act.
45. Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.
46. Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.
47. I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.
48. I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.
49. I don’t think of myself as the artistic or creative type.
50. People often call me a perfectionist.
51. Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.
52. I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.
53. Even in an emergency I wouldn’t feel like panicking.
54. I wouldn’t pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.
55. I find it boring to discuss philosophy.
56. I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.
57. When people tell me that I’m wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.
58. When I’m in a group of people, I’m often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.
59. I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.
60. I’d be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.
Self-report Psychopathy Scale-III-R

Listed below is a series of statements. Please select the response option that indicates the extent to which you disagree or agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ 1. I enjoy driving at high speed.
_____ 2. I think I could “beat” a lie detector.
_____ 3. I like to change jobs fairly often.
_____ 4. I am usually very careful about what I say to people.
_____ 5. I have often done something dangerous just for the thrill of it.
_____ 6. I get a kick out of “conning” someone.
_____ 7. I get in trouble for the same things time after time.
_____ 8. I am very good at most things I try to do.
_____ 10. Rules are made to be broken.
_____ 11. Not hurting other’s feelings is important to me.
_____ 12. I would be good at a dangerous job because I like making fast decisions.
_____ 13. I have sometimes broken an appointment because something more interesting came along.
_____ 15. I almost never feel guilty over something I’ve done.
_____ 16. It’s sometimes fun to see how far you can push someone before they catch on.
_____ 17. People can usually tell if I am lying.
_____ 18. Conning people gives me the “shakes” (i.e., I become nervous and jittery).
_____ 19. When I do something wrong, I feel guilty even though nobody else knows it.
_____ 20. I enjoy drinking and doing wild things.
_____ 21. I am the most important person in this world and nobody else matters.
_____ 22. I have had (or tried to have) sexual relations with someone against their will.
_____ 23. I have avoided paying for things, such as movies, bus or subway rides, and food.
_____ 24. I have cheated on school tests.
_____ 25. I have been arrested.
_____ 26. I have handed in a school essay that I copied from someone else.
_____ 27. I have shoplifted.
_____ 28. I have been involved in gang activity.
_____ 29. I have stolen (or tried to steal) a motor vehicle, such as a car or motorcycle.
_____ 30. I have broken into a building or vehicle (or tried to break in) to steal something
or just to look around.

31. I have attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting him or her.

MACH-IV

Listed below are a number of statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree Somewhat</td>
<td>Agree Slightly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree Slightly</td>
<td>Disagree Somewhat</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
2. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
3. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.
4. Most people are basically good and kind.
5. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance.
6. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.
7. There is no excuse for lying to someone else.
8. Generally speaking, men don’t work hard unless they’re forced to do so.
9. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.
10. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.
11. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.
12. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.
13. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that the criminals are stupid enough to get caught.
14. Most men are brave.
15. It is wise to flatter important people.
16. It is possible to be good in all respects.
17. Barnum was wrong when he said that there’s a sucker born every minute.
18. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.
19. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.
20. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.
Narcissistic Personality Inventory

In each of the following pairs of attitudes, choose the one that you MOST AGREE with. Mark your answer by selecting EITHER A or B for each question. Only select ONE ANSWER for each attitude pair, and please DO NOT skip any items.

1. A. I have a natural talent for influencing people.
   B. I am not good at influencing people.

2. A. Modesty doesn’t become me.
   B. I am essentially a modest person.

3. A. I would do almost anything on a dare.
   B. I tend to be a fairly cautious person.

4. A. When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed
   B. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.

5. A. The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me.
   B. If I ruled the world it would be a better place.

6. A. I can usually talk my way out of anything.
   B. I try to accept the consequences of my behavior.

7. A. I prefer to blend in with the crowd.
   B. I like to be the center of attention.

8. A. I will be a success.
   B. I am not too concerned about success.

9. A. I am no better or no worse than most people.
   B. I think I am a special person.

10. A. I am not sure if I would make a good leader.
    B. I see myself as a good leader.

11. A. I am assertive.
    B. I wish I were more assertive.

12. A. I like having authority over other people.
    B. I don’t mind following orders.

13. A. I find it easy to manipulate people.
    B. I don’t like it when I find myself manipulating people.

14. A. I insist upon getting the respect that is due to me.
    B. I usually get the respect that I deserve.

15. A. I don’t particularly like to show off my body.
    B. I like to show off my body.

16. A. I can read people like a book.
    B. People are sometimes hard to understand.

17. A. If I feel competent I am willing to take responsibility for making decisions.
    B. I like to take responsibility for making decisions.

18. A. I just want to be reasonably happy.
    B. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.

19. A. My body is nothing special.
    B. I like to look at my body.

20. A. I try not to be a show off.
    B. I will usually show off if I get the chance.
21. A. I always know what I am doing.  
   B. Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing.  
22. A. I sometimes depend on people to get things done.  
   B. I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.  
23. A. Sometimes I tell good stories.  
   B. Everybody likes to hear my stories.  
24. A. I expect a great deal from other people.  
   B. I like to do things for other people.  
25. A. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.  
   B. I take my satisfactions as they come.  
26. A. Compliments embarrass me.  
   B. I like to be complimented.  
27. A. I have a strong will to power.  
   B. Power for its own sake doesn’t interest me.  
28. A. I don’t care about new fads and fashions.  
   B. I like to start new fads and fashions.  
29. A. Sometimes I tell good stories.  
   B. Everybody likes to hear my stories.  
30. A. I really like to be the center of attention.  
   B. It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention.  
31. A. I can live my life in any way I want to.  
   B. People can’t always live their lives in terms of what they want.  
32. A. Being an authority doesn’t mean that much to me.  
   B. People always seem to recognize my authority.  
33. A. I would prefer to be a leader.  
   B. It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not.  
34. A. I am going to be a great person.  
   B. I hope that I am going to be successful.  
35. A. People sometimes believe what I tell them.  
   B. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to.  
36. A. I am a born leader.  
   B. Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop.  
37. A. I wish someone would someday write my biography.  
   B. I don’t like people to pry into my life for any reason.  
38. A. I get upset when people don’t notice how I look when I go out in public.  
   B. I don’t mind blending in with the crowd when I go out in public.  
39. A. I am more capable than other people.  
   B. There is a lot that I can learn from other people.  
40. A. I am much like everybody else.  
   B. I am an extraordinary person.
Impression Management Scale

Respond to the following statements by thinking about "how often you behave this way" at work on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (I never behave this way) to 5 (I always behave this way).

1 = I never behave this way
2 = I rarely behave this way
3 = I sometimes behave this way
4 = I often behave this way
5 = I always behave this way

Self-Promotion
1. Talk proudly about your experience or education.
2. Make people aware of your talents or qualifications.
3. Let others know that you are valuable to the organization.
4. Make people aware of your accomplishments.

Ingratiation
1. Compliment your colleagues so they will see you as likable.
2. Take an interest in your colleagues’ personal lives to show them that you are friendly.
3. Praise your colleagues for their accomplishments so they will consider you a nice person.
4. Do personal favors for your colleagues to show them that you are friendly.

Exemplification
1. Stay at work late so people will know you are hard working.
2. Try to appear busy, even at times when things are slower.
3. Arrive at work early to look dedicated.
4. Come to the office at night or on weekends to show that you are dedicated.

Intimidation
1. Be intimidating with coworkers when it will help you get your job done.
2. Let others know you can make things difficult for them if they push you too far.
3. Deal forcefully with colleagues when they hamper your ability to get your job done.
4. Deal strongly or aggressively with coworkers who interfere in your business.
5. Use intimidation to get colleagues to behave appropriately.

Supplication
1. Act like you know less than you do so people will help you out.
2. Try to gain assistance or sympathy from people by appearing needy in some areas.
3. Pretend not to understand something to gain someone’s help.
4. Act like you need assistance so people will help you out.
5. Pretend to know less than you do so you can avoid an unpleasant assignment.
Tactics of Manipulation Scale – Employee Revision

Instructions: When you want your co-worker or boss to do something for you, what are you likely to do? Look at each of the items listed below and rate how likely you are to do each when you are trying to get your co-worker or boss to do something. None of them will apply to all situations in which you want your co-worker or boss to do something, so rate how likely you are, in general, to do what is described. Indicate if you are extremely likely to do it, somewhat likely to do it, or not at all likely to do it. Give intermediate ratings for intermediate likelihoods of performing the behaviors.

1 = Not at all likely
2 = ...
3 = ...
4 = Somewhat likely
5 = ...
6 = ...
7 = Extremely likely

1. I demand that he/she do it.
2. I criticize him/her for not doing it.
3. I yell at him/her so he’ll/she’ll do it.
4. I get him/her to make a commitment to doing it.
5. I give him/her a deadline to do it.
6. I pout until he/she does it.
7. I sulk until he/she does it
8. I whine until he/she does it
9. I tell him/her I’ll do him/her a favour if he’ll/she’ll do it.
10. I do something in exchange so that he/she will do it.
11. I promise him/her that next time I will do what he/she wants.
12. I give up something so he’ll/she’ll do it.
13. I lower myself so he’ll/she’ll do it.
14. I allow myself to be debased so he’ll/she’ll do it.
15. I look sickly so he’ll/she’ll do it.
16. I will hit him/her so he/she will do it.
17. I tell him/her I’ll get him/her fired if he/she doesn’t do it
18. I imply the possibility of physical harm if he/she doesn’t do it.
19. I lie so that he/she will do it.
20. I degrade him/her into doing it.
21. I use deception to get him/her to do it.
22. I do something violent so he/she will do it.
23. I ask him/her to do it.
24. I withhold money until he/she does it.
25. I threaten to cut off his/her money if he/she doesn’t do it.
26. I compliment him/her so he’ll/she’ll do it.
27. I act charming so he’ll/she’ll do it.
28. I explain why I want him/her to do it.
29. I give him/her reasons for doing it.
30. I point out all the good things that will come from doing it.
31. I ignore him/her until he/she agrees to do it.
32. I am silent until he/she agrees to do it.
33. I don’t respond to him/her until he/she does it.
34. I tell him/her that he/she will enjoy it.
35. I show him/her how much fun it is.
36. I compare him/her to someone who would do it.
37. I tell him/her that other employees would do it.
38. I tell him/her that everyone is doing it.
39. I tell him/her that he/she will look stupid if he/she doesn’t do it.
40. I promise to buy him/her something if he/she does it.
41. I give him/her a small gift or card before asking him/her to do it.
42. I offer him/her money so he/she will do it.
Index of Personal Reactions – Need for Power Subscale

Please read each statement below and choose the response that best describes how characteristic the statement is of you.

1 = Not at all characteristic of me
2 = Not characteristic of me
3 = Somewhat characteristic of me
4 = Characteristic of me
5 = Very much characteristic of me

1. I think I would enjoy having authority over others.
2. I dislike having to tell others what to do.
3. I am not interested in obtaining a position of power and influence.
4. I do not particularly like having power over others.
5. Power for its own sake doesn’t interest me.
6. I would enjoy being a powerful executive or politician.
7. It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not.
8. I want to be the one who makes the decisions.
9. I expect to have a good deal of power someday.
10. I enjoy planning things and deciding what tasks each person should do.
Need for Social Status

Please rate the extent to which you agree with each of the following items on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neutral
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

1. I want my co-workers to respect me and hold me in high esteem.
2. I am not concerned with my status among my co-workers. (reverse scored)
3. Being a highly valued member of my work group is important to me.
4. I would like to cultivate the admiration of my co-workers.
5. I enjoy having influence over other people’s decision making.
6. It would please me to have a position of prestige and social standing.
7. I don’t care whether others view me with respect and hold me in esteem. (reverse scored)
8. I care about how positively others view me.
Aspirations Index – Financial Success Items

Please rate how important each of the following life aspirations are to you? (1 = not at all important, 5 = very important)

1 = Not at all important
2 = Not important
3 = Neutral
4 = Important
5 = Very important

1. You will buy things just because you want them.
2. You will be financially successful.
3. You will be your own boss.
4. You will have a job with high social status.
5. You will have a job that pays well.
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Figure 1. Scatterplot of the Linear and Curvilinear Relationships between the Dark Personality and Total Job Success in the Army.

Figure 2. Curvilinear Mediation Analysis examining the Relationships between the Dark Personality, Total Manipulation, and Total Job Success in the Army. Standardized $\beta$ coefficients reported. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Figure 3. Scatterplot of the Curvilinear Relationship between the Dark Personality and Total Manipulation.

Figure 4. Scatterplot of the Linear Relationship between Total Manipulation and Total Job Success in the Army.