THE DARK TETRAD EMPOWERED:

THE DARK TETRAD AND POWER MOTIVATIONS WITHIN

THE NORMAL PERSONALITY SPACE

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of

Western Carolina University in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology.

By

James H. R. Houston

Director: Dr. David McCord

Professor of Psychology

Department of Psychology

Committee Members: Dr. Matt Meier, Psychology

Dr. Erin Myers, Psychology February
2018

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

THE DARK TETRAD EMPOWERED: THE DARK TETRAD AND POWER

MOTIVATIONS WITHIN THE NORMAL PERSONALITY SPACE

James Howard Ray Houston, M.A. General/Experimental Psychology

Western Carolina University (April 2019)

Director: Dr. David M. McCord

Within personality psychology there has been a surge in research regarding the Dark Tetrad of

personality (Buckels, Jones, & Paulhus, 2014). This research has focused on the way these

constructs are related to diverse variables of interest. The present research builds on the prior

studies by expanding the exploration into the common features that comprise the four constructs.

The hypotheses were that each construct would correlate with facets of Honesty/Humility,

Emotionality, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, along with four aspects of power

motivations, and that narcissism would be connected to Extraversion. Also, it was hypothesized

that facets of these domains, as well as power motivations. would be predictive of levels of the

dark constructs. These hypotheses were tested against a sample of 300 subjects from Western

Carolina University. Results showed predictive significance on the hypothesized models

explaining variance within each of the four constructs of Sadism (R^2 = 0.27), Machiavellianism

(R^2 = 0.31), Psychopathy (R^2 = 0.40), and Narcissism (R^2 = 0.66).

INTRODUCTION

A currently popular topic of research in personality psychology is the "Dark Tetrad," a set of four constructs that reflect negative forms of interpersonal interaction (*see* Smith, Hill, Wallace, Recendes, & Judge, 2017). Briefly, the meta-construct of the Dark Tetrad includes Machiavellianism, psychopathy, narcissism, and sadism. Much of the recent literature has examined the connections between the Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al., 2013) and various aspects of personality and interpersonal behaviors. Within the context of the current study, I will be examining these constructs at the facet level of normal personality using the HEXACO (Lee & Ashton, 2004) framework which has already shown several significant relationships, at the domain level, with the Dark Tetrad. From that point I examined the way in which power motivations (Bennett, 1988) interacted with the Dark Tetrad and normal aspects of personality. Power motives are simply defined as being either need related or belief related. As each of the four aspects of power motivations describe a desire to be able to influence or control the actions of another or a belief in one's own ability to lead or believing in oneself strongly enough to refuse to suborn yourself to another, it can be shown how the Dark Tetrad is likely to behave in social situations. Finally, I will be using multiple regression analysis to determine the amount of variance accounted for within the Dark Tetrad when using facets of the HEXACO and the subscales of the Index of Personal Reactions (IPR; Bennett, 1988) as predictors.

HEXACO Model of Personality

The HEXACO model of personality (Lee & Ashton, 2004) is a theory of personality made up of six domains with each domain containing four subscales, or facets (see Table 1).

These domains are labeled: Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience. Though similar to the Five Factor Model (FFM; Costa & McCrae, 1992), the HEXACO model is unique in the inclusion of the sixth factor, Honesty/Humility. This factor has been linked to several trait constructs that were not completely explained by the FFM (see Lee, Ogunfowora, & Ashton, 2005). Of interest within the context of the current study, the Dark Triad (Paulhus & Williams, 2002) was found to be related to Honesty/Humility (Lee & Ashton, 2005). Later the Dark Triad construct was reformulated to include everyday sadism which formed the meta-construct, the Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al., 2013). The HEXACO also differs from the FFM in the inclusion of anger as an aspect of agreeableness rather than negative affect, and the removal of intellectual ability from the openness to experience domain. Another key difference between the HEXACO and the FFM is the moving of Sentimentality from FFM agreeableness to HEXACO Emotionality.

Overall, the HEXACO structure provides several key insights, at the domain level, that provide greater detail on various dark personality features. In addition to links between the Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, and Agreeableness domains of the HEXACO and the Dark Tetrad (Book, Visser, Blais et al., 2016). The original meta-construct of the Dark Triad has also been shown to possess correlations to the cluster of personality variables known as Social Dominance Orientation (Jones & Figueredo, 2013) through the shared core of low Honesty/Humility. This connection has led some to hypothesize that low Honesty/Humility is the common factor of all dark personality clusters.

The Dark Tetrad

The Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al., 2013) is a series of distinct, but correlated, constructs consisting of subclinical psychopathy, subclinical narcissism, everyday sadism, and Machiavellianism. Each of these constructs, both together and separately, have been linked to countless emotional, behavioral, and personality aspects providing a large body of research into the ways in which individuals who express one of these trait clusters might interact with the world around them.

Subclinical psychopathy, much like the clinical counterpart, contains a two-factor structure of Fearless Dominance and Impulsivity with one subscale of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996), cold-heartedness, that does not load appreciably on either factor, (Marcus, Fulton, & Edens, 2013). There are two forms of psychopathy, primary and secondary, and each is characterized by specific traits and behaviors. Primary psychopathy is related to a lower Behavior Inhibition System (BIS) as well as fearlessness, poor passive avoidance, and average levels of positive and negative emotionality (Lykken, 1995). Secondary psychopathy, however, is characterized as being related to a higher Behavior Activation System (BAS), high levels of positive and negative emotionality, impulsiveness, and sensation seeking, but average levels of fearlessness and passive avoidance (Lykken, 1995).

Subclinical narcissism has been found to consist of both grandiose and vulnerable forms. Grandiose narcissism is primarily related to an inflated sense of self, while Vulnerable narcissism is chiefly related to hypervigilance regarding ego-threat (Derry, Ohan, & Bayliss, 2017). Each of these two types of narcissism contains both interpersonal and intrapersonal

processes (Derry et al., 2017). Of the various individual differences that have been linked to narcissism in general, of greatest note is the link between narcissism and self-esteem (ZeiglerHill, 2006). Zeigler-Hill (2006) found that, of the forms of self-esteem that have been identified, narcissism was closely related to discrepant self-esteem. This offers support to Brown and Bosson (2001), who theorized that this form of self-esteem was the reason that narcissists are characterized as delicate and erratic. It should be noted however, that only Vulnerable narcissism is considered to be especially fragile, though both forms of narcissism are volatile in regard to ego threats (see Jones & Paulhus, 2010).

Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970) has been characterized as being a two-part construct consisting of tactics and views. The Tactics domain of the construct is comprised primarily of a willingness to manipulate others for one's own gain, while Views has been primarily conceptualized as a cynical outlook (Christie & Geis, 1970). Though these two domains within Machiavellianism are considered to primarily consist of cynicism and manipulation, there is evidence linking the construct to several other aspects of personality and behavior that provide a much more detailed picture of the shape of the construct. Reported correlates of Machiavellianism include: spite (r=.36; Marcus, Zeigler-Hill, Mercer, & Norris, 2014), contempt (r=.66; Schriber, Chung, Sorensen, & Robins, 2016), and hostility (r=.39; Jones & Neria, 2015). Machiavellianism has also been linked to resistance to subordination in men (r=.27) and ability in women (r=.20) through the Index of Personal Reactions (IPR; Bennett, 1988). When viewed together, the links between Machiavellianism and these other personality aspects give the impression of an individual who is decidedly selfish and amoral.

These four constructs, when viewed together, have been found to have a common core at the domain level of low Honesty/Humility, low Emotionality, low Conscientiousness, and low

Agreeableness, with low Honesty/Humility being the most pertinent (Book, Visser, & Volk, 2015). Of note, is the similarity of the correlations between everyday sadism, subclinical psychopathy, and Machiavellianism with the HEXACO domains Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, and Agreeableness.

Power Motivation

Recently, research has begun examining the way in which social values interact with the predecessor of the Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al., 2013), the Dark Triad (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Jonason, Strosser, Kroll, Duineveld, and Baruffi (2015) found that the Dark Triad was linked to individual interests and self-enhancement values. Other researchers found that, the Dark Triad accounted for nearly 20% of the variance within the values achievement and power (Kajonius, Perrson, & Jonason, 2014). The problem with these studies is the method of measurement regarding the values constructs. In Jonason et al. (2014) a multitude of methods of assessment were used which made consistent results problematic. The problem within Jonason et al., was that the correlations and beta weights fluctuated a great deal this made interpretation of their results more equivocal. The difficulty within Kajonius et al. (2014) is the use of vignettes to provide measures of the various social values constructs. These vignette scores require centering and risk a multitude of problems (i.e., vignette equivalency or response consistency; see Vriend, 2010).

For the purposes of this study, a more formalized method of assessing power motivations will be used. The Index of Personal Reactions (IPR; Bennett, 1988) is a 39-item scale that is divided into four subscales measuring need for power (nPower), need to influence (nInfluence), Ability, and Resistance to Subordination. Due to the similarities between power and influence,

Bennett (1988) differentiated between nInfluence and nPower by operationalizing nInfluence as being "the interpersonal effect one individual has on another," while nPower is defined as "having the role related privileges or responsibilities that permit an individual to apply sanctions, coerce, or force others to behave in intended ways" (Bennett, 1988). This distinction, though small, has a profound impact upon the way in which power-related motivations have been studied. By differentiating in this way, Bennett outlined a way to study an individual's desire for a form of control over another's actions.

By viewing nInfluence as the effect one person has on another and nPower as the ability to force others to conform to one's desires, a template has been laid upon which the Dark Tetrad can be superimposed to provide clearer insights into the desire for control over others as well as personality constructs that possess, at the very least, the appearance of a connection to these motivations. This connection is tenuous at best, though one can hypothesize links between ability and narcissism, rSubordination and psychopathy, or sadism and nPower, but empirical links between any of the Dark Tetrad and desire for a form of control over others has focused on examining these motivations in regard to Machiavellianism, as reported above.

The current study

The purpose of the current research is to determine how much of the Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al, 2013) is comprised of specific facets of the HEXACO model and motivations toward specific types of power. Based on prior research, I predicted that the Dark Tetrad constructs would share the common core of low Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness (Book et al., 2016). I also predicted that, in line with the findings of Bennett (1988), Machiavellianism will correlate highly with multiple aspects of the

6

IPR, specifically, rSubordination, nPower, and Ability. I predicted that nInfluence will provide the strongest correlation with Machiavellianism. Narcissism will have the strongest link to Ability, psychopathy will correlate highly with rSubordination, and everyday sadism will most closely correlate to nPower.

Due to the correlations with the HEXACO model at the domain level (Book et al., 2015), I predict significant negative correlations with all subscales of the Honesty/Humility domain, negative correlations with the four facets of Emotionality, and negative correlations with Forgiveness, Gentleness, and Patience from the Agreeableness domain. Considering the negative relationship with Conscientiousness, I predicted that there will be a significant negative link between Organization and Diligence. Based on the findings of Book et al. (2015) regarding narcissism and its correlation to the Extraversion domain, I predicted that narcissism will possess strong positive correlations with Social Self-Esteem, Social Boldness, and Sociability.

I predicted that all four subscales of the IPR will exhibit negative correlations with the Modesty subscale of Honesty/Humility. I also predicted that the Ability subscale of the IPR will possess strong positive correlations with all facets of the Extraversion domain. In regard to Agreeableness, I predicted that there will be negative correlations with nPower, nInfluence, and rSubordination with the largest negative correlation being between rSubordination and the Flexibility facet.

METHOD

Participants.

Participants (N = 300) were recruited from a small southeastern university and received course credit for completing the study. The average age was 18.77 years with a standard deviation of 1.82. There were 122 males, 177 females, and 1 transgender participant. Ethnicity endorsements were as follows: 243 (81%) White; 27 (9%) Black, 15 (5%) Latinx, 2 (0.6%) Native American/Alaskan Native, 2 (0.6%) Asian American, 2 (0.6%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 11 (3.6%) who preferred not to say.

Measures

Subjects were given the HEXACO-100-PI, a 100-item inventory designed to assess normal personality features within the theoretical framework of the HEXACO model. An example of an item from the HEXACO-100-PI is "*I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery*". Subjects next completed the Short Dark Triad (SD3; Jones & Paulhus, 2014) a 27-item measure with 9 items assessing each of the three constructs. A sample item of the SD3 is "*It's not wise to tell your secrets*". To measure sadistic impulses, subjects were given the Short Sadistic Impulse Scale (SSIS; O'Meara, Davies, & Hammond, 2011). The SSIS is a 10-item measure with items such as "*I enjoy seeing people hurt*". In order to measure power motivations subjects were given the Index of Personal Reactions (IPR; Bennet, 1988). The IPR (Bennet, 1988) is a 39-item measure designed to assess an individual's desire for control. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for each scale are reported in Appendix A.

RESULTS

Table I. Correlations of the Dark Tetrad, normal personality, and power motivations

	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Psychopathy	Sadism
Sincerity	-.33*	-.17*	-.19*	-.16
Fairness	-.40*	-.20*	-.49*	-.36*
Greed Avoidance	-.34*	-.30*	-.33*	-.18*
Modesty	-.06	-.40*	.10	-.04
Dependence	-.18*	.04	-.07	-.09
Fearfulness	.06	-.11	-.26*	-.24*
Anxiety	.09	-.11	-.16	-.13
Sentimentality	-.04	-.16*	-.12	-.07
Social Self-esteem	-.05	.49*	-.03	-.12
Social Boldness	.06	.62*	.22	.20*
Sociability	-.06	.53*	.01	-.07
Forgivingness	-.28*	.02	-.14	-.04
Gentleness	-.21*	.07	-.20*	-.19*
Patience	-.12	-.33*	-.27*	-.29*
Organization	-.07	-.13	-.25*	-.20*
Diligence	.24*	.18*	.21*	.17*
nInfluence	.26*	.35*	-.12	-.09
nPower	.27*	.65*	.33*	.26*
rSubordination	.20*	.12	.05	.08
Ability	.32*	.69*	.35*	.30*

. $* = p$-value $< .001$

9

Data analysis was a two-step process, in the first step correlations were performed on each of the Dark Tetrad constructs (Buckels et al., 2013) and the predicted facets of Sincerity, Fairness, Greed Avoidance, Modesty, Dependence, Anxiety, Fearfulness, Sentimentality, Sociability, Social Boldness, Social Self-esteem, Gentleness, Patience, Flexibility, Organization, and Diligence. Key findings regarding the Dark Tetrad can be found in Table 1. In order to lessen the risk of Type I error, a correlation was deemed to be significant if the p-value was less than .001. Overall, the results of the current study indicate that individuals high in the Dark Tetrad constructs express tendencies toward insincerity, unfairness, greed, impatience, and diligence. Of particular note however, are the relationships that were predicted but did not manifest in the current study. Machiavellianism was predicted to closely correlate with nInfluence, more than other power motivations, but the form of power motivation that showed the closest correlation was, in fact, Ability ($r = 0.32, p < .001$), though the relationships between this construct and all of the aspects of power motivations were significant. The significance of these relationships can be seen through the relationship of Machiavellianism and the aggregate score of power motivations ($r = 0.37, p < .001$). This particular relationship indicates that individuals who are high in Machiavellian tendencies also tend to be high in a desire for control over others, a belief in their own ability to lead, and a level of resistance to being subordinate to another individual or authority.

It was also hypothesized that psychopathy would be positively correlated with rSubordination. However the actual correlation between psychopathy and rSubordination was no more than chance ($r = 0.05, p = .43$). A desire to dominate others, expressed by a need for power, did manifest within psychopathy ($r = 0.33, p < .001$).

The predictions involving narcissism were mostly accurate, with the exception of dependence ($r = 0.04$, $p = .51$), flexibility ($r = -0.06$, $p = .29$), gentleness ($r = 0.07$, $p = .26$), and forgivingness ($r = 0.02$, $p = .74$). These null findings serve to help isolate the driving facets within each factor of the HEXACO model that provides narcissism with a link to that particular factor. Specifically, all three of the other facets of the emotionality domain provide the links between this domain and narcissism, while the agreeableness facet, patience, ties the agreeableness domain to the construct in question.

Everyday sadism proved as elusive as Machiavellianism and psychopathy in regard to many of the correlations predicted. Though sadism was predicted to be correlated with modesty ($r = -0.04$, $p = .01$), sentimentality ($r = -0.07$, $p = .21$), and dependence ($r = -0.09$, $p = .14$) these relationships did not exist. Other predicted correlations did, in fact, occur however. Results indicated that sadism was moderately and negatively correlated with fairness ($r = -0.36$, $p < .001$). This relationship is interesting due to the links found in this study between fairness and the other Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al., 2013) constructs. All four of the constructs share moderate relationships with fairness (Machiavellianism: $r = -0.40$, $p < .001$; psychopathy: $r = -0.49$, $p < .001$; narcissism: $r = -0.20$, $p < .001$). The only other facets which share a significant relationship with all four constructs are greed avoidance, patience, and diligence., though these relationships were not predictive of all of the constructs.

The facets of Emotionality that have proven to be significantly related to the Dark Tetrad (Buckels, et al., 2013) are different in regard to Machiavellianism and the other three constructs. Within emotionality, Machiavellianism was only significantly correlated to dependence ($r = 0.18$, $p < .001$), while narcissism was connected to anxiety ($r = -0.11$, $p = .05$), sentimentality (r

= -0.16, $p < .001$), and fearfulness ($r = -0.11$, $p = .05$), as was psychopathy (anxiety: $r = -0.16$, $p = .01$; sentimentality: $r = -0.12$, $p = .04$; and fearfulness: $r = -0.26$, $p < .001$). Sadism also shares two of the connections with the Emotionality domain as with narcissism and psychopathy, but only correlates to the facets, anxiety ($r = -0.13$, $p = .02$) and fearfulness ($r = -0.24$, $p < .001$).

The facets of Conscientiousness that were predicted to relate to the Dark Tetrad (Buckels, et al., 2013), Organization and Diligence, exhibited mixed results as well. Machiavellianism proved to be connected to Diligence ($r = 0.24$, $p < .001$) but was unrelated to Organization ($r = 0.07$, $p = .22$). Narcissism also correlated with diligence, ($r = 0.24$, $p < .001$). Psychopathy was related to both Organization ($r = -0.25$, $p < .001$) and Diligence ($r = 0.21$, $p < .001$). The relationship between psychopathy and organization, though predicted, highlights the connection between psychopathy and diligence. Sadism also was significantly correlated with organization ($r = -0.20$, $p < .001$) and diligence ($r = 0.17$, $p < .001$).

The various forms of desire toward power over others correlated with the Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al., 2013) in expected ways. Machiavellianism connected with all four subscales of the IPR (Bennett, 1988) in ways that, while not surprising, were not specifically predicted. Though the subscale, nInfluence, was predicted to have the strongest correlation with Machiavellianism, it actually shared the strongest correlation with Ability ($r = 0.32$, $p < .001$) rather than nInfluence ($r = 0.26$, $p < .001$). Machiavellianism also correlated weakly with nPower ($r = 0.27$, $p < .001$) and rSubordination ($r = 0.20$, $p < .001$) which was predicted. Narcissism shared a strong correlation with Ability ($r = 0.69$, $p < .001$) as predicted, but also showed a strong relationship with nPower ($r = 0.65$, $p < .001$). Narcissism was also moderately connected to nInfluence ($r = 0.35$, $p < .001$) but only weakly correlated with rSubordination ($r = 0.12$, $p = .05$). Psychopathy did not relate as predicted with rSubordination ($r = 0.05$, $p = .43$).

Sadism showed the predicted correlation with nPower ($r = 0.26$, $p < .001$).

	nPower	NInfluence	Ability	rSubordination
Modesty	-0.27*	-0.22	-0.29*	0.04
Sociability	0.36*	0.31*	0.42*	0.06
Social Boldness	0.49*	0.21	0.51*	0.01
Social self-esteem	0.27*	0.23*	0.41*	0.09
Liveliness	0.04	0.01	0.01	-0.01
Gentleness	-0.04	0.15	0.06	0.05
Flexibility	-0.18	-0.09	-0.17	-0.15
Forgivingness	-0.05	-0.02	0.03	-0.11
Patience	-0.32*	0.02	-0.28*	-0.04

Table 2. Correlations between power motivations and facets of personality. * = p-value < .01

The various aspects of power motivations were related to normal personality primarily as predicted (see Table 2). The negative correlation with modesty, $r = -0.27$, $p < .001$, when viewed in conjunction with the high positive correlations found between nPower and three of the subscales of the Extraversion domain, indicates the motivation is likely found most often in individuals who are outgoing, believe in themselves, and in general enjoy to talk.   The relationship between this motivation and patience, though predicted, is intriguing when viewed in the context of the other significant relationships, specifically that individuals high in nPower are more likely to be socially adept, due to the correlations with Modesty ($r = -0.27$, $p < .01$), Sociability ($r = 0.36$, $p < .01$), Social Boldness ($r = 0.49$, $p < .01$), and Social Self-esteem ($r = 0.27$, $p < .01$).

The need to influence others carried a weak, but significant, relationship with sociability and social self-esteem, though none of the other predicted relationships emerged within the

13

current study. The two relationships that did occur indicate that individuals high in the need to be able to influence others are prone to believing that they possess likable qualities and are generally more comfortable around other people. This finding makes sense at a conceptual level, as those who tend to want to be able to exert influence in the lives of others are more likely to desire to be around others which would likely not be possible did they not believe themselves very likable.

Table 3. Final regression model for Machiavellianism.

Machiavellianism	B	t	p-value
Sincerity	-0.15	-2.80	.005
Fairness	-0.24	-4.42	< .001
Greed Avoidance	-0.17	-3.26	.001
Dependence	-0.14	-2.79	.005
Gentleness	-0.15	-2.88	.004
nInfluence	0.23	4.65	< .001
Adjusted R^2	0.31		
$F(6, 284)$	22.43	$p < .001$	

In the next step of analysis, each of the hypothesized predictors were centered and the constructs were regressed onto the predicted facets and motivations believed to underly them. In order to lessen the risk of Type I error, a more stringent p value was used. In order to be considered a significant predictor, the facet in question had to be significant at less than the .01 level. Each model was then refined to include only those predictors significant.

Machiavellianism was first regressed onto sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, modesty, fearfulness, anxiety, dependence, sentimentality, gentleness, patience, organization, diligence, and nInfluence. When the model was run, anxiety proved to be the least significant and therefore was excluded. The model was run again and patience proved to be not significant and was excluded from further analysis. The remaining significant predictors were: sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, dependence, gentleness, and nInfluence (see Table 3). The final model was significant, $F(6, 284) = 22.43$, $p < .001$, with an adjusted $R^2 = 0.31$. This indicates that the final model explains approximately 31% of the total variance within the Machiavellianism construct.

Table 4. Final regression model for psychopathy.

Psychopathy	B	t	p-value
Fairness	-0.37	-7.68	< .001
Greed Avoidance	-0.21	-4.20	< .001
Fearfulness	-0.17	-3.55	< .001
Anxiety	-0.14	-2.99	.003
Patience	-0.16	-3.48	< .001
Organization	-0.20	-4.32	< .001
Adjusted R^2	0.40		
$F(6, 286)$	33.32	$p < .001$	

Next, psychopathy was regressed onto the facets: sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, modesty, fearfulness, dependence, anxiety, sentimentality, gentleness, patience, organization,

diligence, and the power motivation of rSubordination. Using the same significance criteria and procedure as before, the final model again contained only six predictors: fairness, greed avoidance, fearfulness, anxiety, patience, and organization (see Table 4). This model was significant, $F(6, 286) = 33.32$, $p < .001$ with an adjusted $R^2 = 0.40$ indicating 40% of the variance in psychopathy was captured by these facets.

Table 5. Final regression model for narcissism.

Narcissism	B	t	p-value
Greed Avoidance	-0.21	-5.85	$< .001$
Sociability	-0.14	3.33	$< .001$
Social Self-esteem	-0.29	6.77	$< .001$
Social Boldness	-0.12	3.02	.002
Ability	-0.37	8.67	$< .001$
Adjusted R^2	0.66		
$F(5, 283)$	111.1	$p < .001$	

Narcissism was regressed onto the predictors: sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, modesty, fearfulness, anxiety, dependence, social boldness, sociability, social self-esteem, sentimentality, organization, diligence, and the ability aspect of power motivations. The model was refined until only five predictors were left: greed avoidance, social boldness, sociability, social self-esteem, and ability (see Table 5). This refined model proved significant ($F(5, 283) =$

111.1, $p < .001$). The adjusted R^2 was also interesting, ($R^2 = 0.66$) showing that this model explained 66% of the variance within narcissism.

Table 6. Final regression model for everyday sadism.

Sadism	B	$t(288)$	p-value
Fairness	-0.24	-4.50	$< .001$
Fearfulness	-0.18	-3.55	$< .001$
Gentleness	-0.15	-2.90	.004
Patience	-0.19	-3.54	$< .001$
Organization	-0.18	-3.54	$< .001$
nPower	0.15	2.81	.005
Adjusted R^2	0.27		
$F(6, 288)$	19.5	$p < .001$	

Finally, everyday sadism was regressed onto sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, modesty, fearfulness, dependence, anxiety, sentimentality, gentleness, patience, organization, diligence, and nPower. The model was then refined until only the facets of fairness, fearfulness, gentleness, patience, organization, nPower remained (see Table 6). Sadism was then regressed onto these facets and the model was found to be significant ($F(6, 288) = 19.5, p < .001$). The adjusted R^2 value ($R^2 = 0.27$) indicates that 27% of the scores on sadism can be explained through the individual's levels on these particular facets and motivations.

17

DISCUSSION

The goal of the present study was to further clarify where the Dark Tetrad (Buckels, et al., 2013) constructs were similar and different within the nomological network of the HEXACO model of personality (Lee & Ashton, 2001). The expected results were that low scores on sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, modesty, fearfulness, anxiety, sentimentality, dependence, organization and diligence would occur in all four constructs, while narcissism would have positive correlations with sociability, social boldness, and social self-esteem from the domain extraversion. The particular facets that indicated a significant relationship to each of the Dark Tetrad constructs might be explanatory of the results of Book, Visser, & Volk (2015). Their results showed that, using canonical correlation analyses, the Honesty/Humility domain of the HEXACO model (Lee & Ashton, 2004) proved to explain greater variance within the Dark Triad (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). The results of that study were replicated and expanded to include everyday sadism (Book, et al., 2016). Considering the results of their analyses, the reason that Honesty/Humility proves to explain the most variance within the Dark Tetrad (Buckels, et al., 2013) is likely due to the connections formed by the facets of fairness and greed avoidance. The domains of Emotionality, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness have also been shown to be intricately linked to the Dark Tetrad (Buckels, et al., 2013) within the context of the studies conducted by Book, et al. (2015).The results of this study assist in informing the literature of the Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al., 2013) by delineating the facets and motivations that serve to form part of the Dark Tetrad.

19

Machiavellianism

An inability to forgive tended to occur within Machiavellian individuals within the current sample, though this facet was not a significant predictor. The lack of predictive ability of forgivingness could be due to the hypothetical connection between the facet of forgivingness and the construct of spitefulness. Machiavellian individuals tend to be spiteful in many cases though these individuals are capable of restraining vengeance in favor of future goals, particularly if those goals may be harmed by the act of revenge. The relationship between Machiavellianism and patience has also proven elusive. While a significant correlate, patience has not shown itself to be a significant predictor of Machiavellianism. Individuals who score low on patience often tend to lose their tempers quickly, this would likely make it difficult for a Machiavellian individual to continue to gain and exert influence over the individual who made them angry originally. Of particular note within the current study, is that dependence was negatively predictive of Machiavellianism, but did not possess any significant predictive ability with the other Dark Tetrad constructs. Though there are multiple reasons this could be, including a random anomaly that may have only occurred within the current sample, one such reason is that individuals who are high in Machiavellianism are somewhat capable of surviving independently of other individuals, while those who are high in the other constructs, are not dependent on others though not wholly independent of other people either. Another such difference occurs in the facet of sincerity. Sincerity, though significantly negatively correlated with all of the Dark Tetrad constructs, is uniquely predictive of Machiavellianism. This indicates that, while all four of the constructs tend toward flattery and manipulation, it is uniquely indicative of Machiavellianism. Anxiety was also found to be uniquely negatively predictive of psychopathy, though Narcissism ($r = -0.11$, $p = .05$) and Sadism ($r = -0.13$, $p = .02$) were weakly negatively

correlated. Also, though it did not predict Machiavellianism or any other construct, Machiavellian individuals seem to tend toward being more unforgiving than the other three constructs ($r = -0.28$, $p < .001$).

Psychopathy

The link between sincerity and psychopathy is explainable as individuals who display psychopathic tendencies may engage in deception when they feel like it or need to but they do not always deceive when they have the opportunity. The correlation between psychopathy and sentimentality is also puzzling. Though it was predicted that sentimentality and psychopathy would be negatively related , sentimentality was also hypothesized to be a predictor of psychopathy which failed to manifest within the current study. The failure of sentimentality to predict psychopathy may be due to the conceptual definition of sentimentality within the HEXACO framework (Lee & Ashton, 2001). Within the HEXACO model, sentimentality is defined as a tendency to feel strong emotional bonds with others. Due to this definition, individuals who are high in psychopathy should be low in sentimentality as well. The fact that sentimentality and psychopathy are negatively correlated, but only weakly, is something that needs to be explored in greater detail.

Sadism

Sadism shares much of the same facet-level connections with psychopathy, though the inclusion of low gentleness in sadism however, is intriguing. Together, these facets can further inform the discussion on what, precisely, combines to form everyday sadism. Several types of sadistic tendencies have been identified though, to date, very little has been done to clarify the structural components of everyday sadism.

Narcissism

The current study shows that narcissism is primarily informed by interpersonal social content. Narcissistic individuals tend toward greed and displays of wealth and status, though they are also socially outgoing, highly confident, and tend to enjoy social interaction. These findings are entirely in line with the theoretical conception of grandiose narcissism. Another interesting correlation between is between sentimentality and narcissism. Narcissistic individuals seem to have more shallow, superficial bonds than Machiavellians, sadists, or psychopaths. This could be due to the fact that people who are narcissistic tend to be more outgoing than individuals high in one of the other constructs, though it should be noted that sadism shares a significant correlation with social boldness within the current study.

Power Motivations

That Ability carried similar relationships as those found in regard to nPower was expected conceptually, though the fact that these relationships are primarily higher in regard to ability is puzzling. Of the predictions made in regard to connections of the two aspects of power motivations the only one that is not stronger in ability is the link to patience. This provides a glimpse into the inner workings of individuals who perceive that they have the ability to effect their goals. Specifically, though they are slightly more likely to perceive themselves as superior to others and are generally more outgoing and social than individuals who are high in only nPower, these individuals are slightly less likely to lose their temper as easily as an individual high in the need for power. The relationship between these two aspects of power motivations and the facet of patience is likely a result of frustration. Individuals who are high in nPower are possibly more likely to view events where they do not get the outcome that they desire as more

frustrating than individuals high in ability and, therefore, are more likely to become irritable as a result of this.

The lack of any significant correlation between rSubordination and the facets predicted indicates that the construct, defined as a general resistance to being dominated by authority, has very little to do with agreeableness, extraversion, or honesty/humility. Further study of this motivational aspect is required to fully define the aspects of personality that inform the construct.

General Discussion

The only significant predictors across all four models were fairness and greed avoidance, though these facets did not occur in all four models. Fairness was a significant predictor for Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and sadism, while greed avoidance was a significant predictor for Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism. Due to the lack of a single facet that occurs in all four constructs or even another facet that occurs in three of the four constructs, it can be hypothesized that, at the core, the Dark Tetrad (Buckels et al., 2013) constructs are possibly held together by a willingness to lie, cheat, and steal in order to gain what they desire as well as an enjoyment of displaying wealth and privilege. These results entirely support the theoretical basis of each of the Dark Tetrad constructs in that each construct has been linked to the cold-hearted octant (Southard, Noser, Pollock, Mercer, & Zeigler-Hill, 2015) of the Interpersonal Circumplex (IPC; Freedman, Leary, Ossorio, & Goffey, 1951) is described as being highly agentic and low in communion.

Another thing of interest are the significant connections between the Dark Tetrad constructs and the aspects of power motivations. Though only specific regression models were run, the number of significant correlations between the Dark Tetrad constructs and power

motivations indicate that the Dark Tetrad constructs have a general desire to advance socially. In this study, individuals high in narcissism also tended toward being immodest, defined as believing themselves as superior and entitled to privileges, than individuals who were higher in one of the other three constructs. This relationship however did not prove to be predictive in the regression model and warrants further, more detailed, exploration. Equally as interesting as the unique relationships explored here, are the common relationships that occur within the HEXACO facets and the Dark Tetrad. Fairness proved to predict Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and sadism while greed avoidance predicted Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy. Fearfulness was negatively predictive of both psychopathy and sadism. Diligence, though correlated across all four constructs, proved to predict only Machiavellianism. Gentleness was found to negatively predict Machiavellianism and Sadism but was correlated with psychopathy as well. Patience predicted both psychopathy and sadism indicating individuals who are high in these two aspects of the Dark Tetrad are more volatile. The relationships between psychopathy, sadism and organization indicates these individuals are likely sloppy or tend to be less orderly about their surroundings.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The current study was limited in various ways, in particular the sample in question was predominantly white and approximately 18 years old. Age within the current sample is a problem as individuals who are around the age of eighteen have greater room within their personalities for alterations to occur. Geographic limitations imposed by using students from a rural university pose an issue through a less diverse sample. These limitations can be addressed by including individuals from other universities or through the use of Amazon's Mechanical Turk (mTurk).

Overall, the findings of the current study provide multiple avenues of exploration in order to more fully map out the various traits that form the individual constructs of the Dark Tetrad. One such avenue is the deeper examination of the relationships between the Dark Tetrad constructs and the facets of fairness and greed avoidance. That these two facets occur in more constructs than any of the other predicted correlations gives evidence at further defining the core aspect of the Dark Tetrad. Further research into the facets that occur in two of the Dark Tetrad constructs simultaneously also could aid in teasing apart the various threads binding these constructs together. Another line of inquiry are the unique connections between any single construct of the Dark Tetrad and specific facets of personality. In order to better understand these individuals, we need to look more closely at what makes each construct similar and what makes each construct unique.

REFERENCES

Bennett, J. B. (1988). Power and influence as distinct personality traits: Development and validation of a psychometric measure. *Journal Of Research In Personality*, *22*(3), 361-394. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(88)90036-0

Book, A., Visser, B. A., & Volk, A. A. (2015). Unpacking 'evil': Claiming the core of the Dark Triad. *Personality And Individual Differences*, *73*29-38. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.09.016

Book, A., Visser, B. A., Blais, J., Hosker-Field, A., Methot-Jones, T., Gauthier, N. Y., ... & D'Agata, M. T. (2016). Unpacking more "evil": What is at the core of the dark tetrad?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *90*, 269-272.

Brown, R. P., & Bosson, J. K. (2001). Narcissus meets Sisyphus: Self-love, self-loathing, and the never-ending pursuit of self-worth. *Psychological Inquiry*, *12*(4), 210-213.

Buckels, E. E., Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). Behavioral confirmation of everyday sadism. *Psychological Science*, *24*(11), 2201-2209. doi:10.1177/0956797613490749

Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (2013). *Studies in machiavellianism*. Academic Press.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality And Individual Differences*, *13*(6), 653-665. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(92)90236-I

Derry, K. L., Ohan, J. L., & Bayliss, D. M. (2017). Toward Understanding and Measuring Grandiose and Vulnerable Narcissism Within Trait Personality Models. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*.

DeYoung, C. G., Weisberg, Y. J., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2013). Unifying the aspects of the Big Five, the interpersonal circumplex, and trait affiliation. *Journal of personality*, *81*(5), 465-475.

Jonason, P. K., Strosser, G. L., Kroll, C. H., Duineveld, J. J., & Baruffi, S. A. (2015). Valuing myself over others: The Dark Triad traits and moral and social values. *Personality And Individual Differences*, *81*102-106. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.045

Jones, D. N., & Figueredo, A. J. (2013). The core of darkness: Uncovering the heart of the Dark Triad. *European Journal Of Personality*, *27*(6), 521-531. doi:10.1002/per.1893

Jones, D. N., & Neria, A. L. (2015). The Dark Triad and dispositional aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *86*, 360-364.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2010). Different provocations trigger aggression in narcissists and psychopaths. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *1*(1), 12-18.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Introducing the short dark triad (SD3) a brief measure of dark personality traits. *Assessment*, *21*(1), 28-41.

Kajonius, P. J., Persson, B. N., & Jonason, P. K. (2015). Hedonism, Achievement, and Power: Universal values that characterize the Dark Triad. *Personality And Individual Differences*, *77*173-178. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.12.055

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*(2), 329-358. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism in the Five-Factor Model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality And Individual Differences*, *38*(7), 1571-1582. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.016

27

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2016). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment*, 1073191116659134.

Lee, K., Ogunfowora, B., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Personality Traits Beyond the Big Five: Are They Within the HEXACO Space?. *Journal Of Personality*, *73*(5), 1437-1463. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00354.x

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and Preliminary Validation of a SelfReport Measure of Psychopathic Personality Traits in Noncriminal Population. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, *66*(3), 488.

Lykken, D. T. (1995). *The antisocial personalities*. Psychology Press.

Marcus, D. K., Fulton, J. J., & Edens, J. F. (2013). The two-factor model of psychopathic personality: Evidence from the Psychopathic Personality Inventory. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, And Treatment*, *4*(1), 67-76. doi:10.1037/a0025282

Marcus, D. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Mercer, S. H., & Norris, A. L. (2014). The psychology of spite and the measurement of spitefulness. *Psychological Assessment*, *26*(2), 563.

Markey, P. M., & Markey, C. N. (2009). A brief assessment of the interpersonal circumplex: The IPIP-IPC. *Assessment*, *16*(4), 352-361.

O'Meara, A., Davies, J., & Hammond, S. (2011). The psychometric properties and utility of the Short Sadistic Impulse Scale (SSIS). *Psychological assessment*, *23*(2), 523.

Patrick, C. J., Fowles, D. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. *Development And Psychopathology*, *21*(3), 913-938. doi:10.1017/S0954579409000492

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism,

    Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal Of Research In Personality*, *36*(6), 556-563.

    doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6

Schriber, R. A., Chung, J. M., Sorensen, K. S., & Robins, R. W. (2017). Dispositional contempt:

    A first look at the contemptuous person. *Journal of personality and social psychology*,

    113(2), 280.

Smith, M. B., Hill, A. D., Wallace, J. C., Recendes, T., & Judge, T. A. (2018). Upsides to Dark

    and Downsides to Bright Personality: A Multidomain Review and Future Research

    Agenda. *Journal of Management*, *44*(1), 191-217.Vriend, S., van der Klaauw, B., &

    Lindeboom, M. Testing the Vignettes Method.

APPENDIX A

Cronbach's alphas for all measures.

	Cronbach's α
Machiavellianism	0.73
Psychopathy	0.71
Narcissism	0.74
Sadism	0.89
Honesty/Humility	0.69
Sincerity	0.56
Fairness	0.31
Greed Avoidance	0.80
Modesty	0.18
Emotionality	0.72
Dependence	0.67
Fearfulness	0.71
Anxiety	0.28
Sentimentality	0.46
Extraversion	0.81
Sociability	0.73
Social Boldness	0.56
Social Self-esteem	0.69
Agreeableness	0.65
Gentleness	0.45
Forgivingness	0.42
Patience	0.53
Conscientiousness	0.65
Organization	0.51
Diligence	0.54
Power Motivations	0.90
Need for Power	0.84
Need to Influence	0.81
Ability	0.83
Resistance to Subordination	0.73