The Dark Triad and its Impacts on Workplace Behavior and Satisfaction

Benjamin Nelson

Department of Management
Faculty Mentor: Dr. Anna C. Lennard, PhD
Second Reader: Dr. Evan Davis, PhD

Abstract

The dark triad (Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy) is understood to have negative impacts on the workplace. However, the extent of these impacts has eluded researchers as it is unclear what effects the presence of these personality traits has on variables such as behavior, satisfaction, and more. To discover the magnitude that the dark triad has on the workplace, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWBs), and job satisfaction, were measured in relation to the frequency of the presence of peers that display any of the three dark triad traits. Through a survey distributed to college students in Greek Life organizations, it was clear that organizations that possess a higher quantity of individuals with dark triad characteristics, also possess a higher quantity of individuals who partake in CWBs and are less satisfied with their membership in the organization. These results indicate that individuals should take into consideration the personalities of coworkers when selecting where to work.

Introduction

When members of society seek employment, the primary factors that ultimately determine where they apply can vary considerably. While some job-seekers may prioritize salary, others may focus on location. Regardless of their preferences, the importance of who they will be working with is often overlooked as students are told from a young age that they must learn to get along with their peers. While this may be a good piece of general advice, it fails to acknowledge the impact that coworkers may have on the individual. In recent years, this relationship has been under the spotlight for organizational science researchers who are seeking to better understand the impact that coworker's personalities have on an individual (LeBrenton et al., 2018). The impact of coworker personality has been shown to affect a wide variety of important job attitudes and behaviors, such as coworker incivility and its negative relationship with job performance (Rhee et al., 2017).

To narrow down this extensive relationship, researchers have focused on studying the dark triad, which consists of Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy (LeBrenton et al., 2018). These traits (when exhibited by a coworker) have been highlighted as potential key impactors of an individual's job attitudes and behavior simply because of their definitions and how they explain various relationships. In other words, each of the three traits are defined by an individual and the nature of their interactions with others. Therefore, it is logical to study these personality traits in the workplace to observe if the foundations of these traits hold up, or if the structure of corporations breaks them down. In conjunction with these personality traits, previous studies have selected various combinations of the previously listed variables and observed the impacts that these traits may have on workplace behavior. With this study, the impact that a coworker's personality has on an individual's job satisfaction and behavior in the workplace was measured.

Theoretical Development

While the culmination of Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy create the dark triad, the traits should be individually defined and treated independently. The individual

evaluations of each characteristic can also give researchers additional insight into how the variations of negative coworker's personalities can impact an individual. Machiavellianism is "a tendency to distrust others, a willingness to engage in amoral manipulation, a desire to accumulate status for oneself, and a desire to maintain interpersonal control" (Dahling et al., 2009). Narcissism is defined by the individuals sense of grandiosity, entitlement, and superiority (Raskin & Hall, 1979). Psychopathy is summed up by thrill-seeking behaviors, low empathy, and anxiety (Harpur et al., 1985). Understanding the similarities and differences between these traits provides researchers with the opportunity to understand how they impact one another, as well as how they impact important work outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWBs).

Job satisfaction is more difficult to define as every individual is pleased by different characteristics of the workplace. While Person A might be satisfied because of the abundance of windows in the workplace, Person B might be displeased for the same reason. Person A might also value their salary over the environment, while Person B's attitude is impacted largely by the job title. OCBs encompass behaviors that are not vital to the individual's task performance but that facilitate a better functioning of the organization (covering for an employee, helping teach a new hire a useful skill, etc.). CWBs can best be defined as voluntary behaviors that negatively impact the interests of the organization (theft of material or time, negative statements towards others, etc.) (O'Boyle 2010). These distinct behaviors are important to understanding the impacts of a coworker's personality because they enable an individual's internal personality to be externally observed. That is because these behaviors are voluntary and represent an extension of the individual's personality.

Previous studies have observed the relationships between Machiavellianism and important work outcomes such as OCBs, CWBs, and satisfaction. One study found that it is difficult to predict a relationship between Machiavellianism and OCBs because the term OCB is too broad. They found that Machiavellianism had a stronger negative association with OCBs targeted towards the organization than OCBs targeted towards an individual (Becker & O'Hare, 2007). This would align with the definition of Machiavellianism as individuals with this trait seek to manipulate others (or organizations) for self-gain. Another study found that increases in Machiavellianism were associated with increases in CWBs (although future studies found that this may be due to mediators between the two variables) (O'Boyle et al., 2012) (Castille et al., 2017). This aligns with the previously stated relationship with Machiavellianism and OCBs, as it is probably unlikely to find an individual who participates in both behaviors. Another study found that Machiavellianism had a negative relationship with satisfaction (although it may have been impacted by competitiveness). This may be due to improper motives in the workplace. (Jonason et al., 2015). I therefore predict the following:

Hypothesis 1a: Machiavellianism will negatively relate to OCBs.

Hypothesis 1b: Machiavellianism will positively relate to CWBs.

Hypothesis 1c: Machiavellianism will negatively relate to satisfaction.

In previous studies, the relationships between narcissism and important work outcomes such as OCBs, CWBs, and satisfaction have been observed. Little work has been done on studying the relationship between narcissism and OCBs, however a study on this trait found that a high involvement management climate moderated the association with OCBs (Webster & Smith, 2019). This may be due to the definition of this trait and the individual's motive to succeed. Another study found that increases in narcissism were associated with increases in CWBs (although future studies found that this may be due to mediators between the two variables (Cohen 2016; O'Boyle et al., 2012). This aligns with the previously stated relationship with narcissism and OCBs, as it is probably unlikely to find an individual who participates in both behaviors. Another study found that narcissism had a positive relationship with satisfaction (although it may have been impacted by perceptions of job prestige and autonomy). This may be due to motives in the workplace that enable the individual to seek opportunities for advancement. (Jonason et al., 2015). I therefore predict the following:

Hypothesis 2a: Narcissism will negatively relate to OCBs.

Hypothesis 2b: Narcissism will positively relate to CWBs.

Hypothesis 2c: Narcissism will positively relate to satisfaction.

Previous studies have observed the relationships between psychopathy and important work outcomes such as OCBs, CWBs, and satisfaction. Little work has been done on studying the relationship between psychopathy and OCBs, however, a study on this trait and the impact that it may have on corporate social responsibility and organizational commitment to employees found a negative association (Boddy et al., 2010). Another study found that increases in psychopathy were associated with increases in CWBs (although it proceeds to state that other studies could not verify this finding) (O'Boyle et al., 2012). Another study found that psychopathy had a negative relationship with satisfaction (although it may have been impacted by competitiveness). This may be due to improper motives in the workplace. (Jonason et al., 2015). I therefore predict the following:

Hypothesis 3a: Psychopathy will negatively relate to OCBs.

Hypothesis 3b: Psychopathy will positively relate to CWBs.

Hypothesis 3c: Psychopathy will negatively relate to satisfaction.

Methods

To measure these relationships, a survey was created that asked subject's a multitude of questions. In the following paragraphs, an explanation of how each variable was studied will be described.

Machiavellianism: The most commonly used measure of this trait is the Mach-IV inventory. However, recent studies have questioned its validity and thus alternative measures have been created (Hunter et al., 1982). The leader of these alternatives is the Machiavellian

Personality Scale (MPS) which measures four factors (amoral manipulation, desire for control, desire for status, and distrust for others) using a Likert scale (Dahling et al., 2009). The Likert scale includes five points ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". While the standard MPS is 16 questions long, the survey used for this study condensed it to 8 questions that still covered each of the four factors. Examples of questions used in this survey include: 1) I enjoy being able to control the situation 2) Accumulating wealth is an important goal for me 3) Other people are always planning ways to take advantage of the situation at my expense (Dahling et al., 2009).

Narcissism: The most commonly used measure of this trait is Narcissistic Personality Inventory. However, recent evidence has questioned its extensiveness (Pincus et al. 2009). Thus, the Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI) was created. This scale measures seven factors (contingent self-esteem, exploitative, self-sacrificing self-enhancement, hiding the self, grandiose fantasy, devaluing, and entitlement rage) using a Likert scale. The Likert scale includes five points ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". While the standard PNI is 52 questions long, the survey used for this study condensed it to 14 questions that still covered each of the seven factors. Examples of questions used in this survey include: 1) When others don't notice me, I start to feel worthless 2) I can usually talk my way out of everything 3) I often fantasize about having a huge impact on the world around me (Raskin & Hall, 1979).

Psychopathy: The most commonly used measure of this trait is the Self-Report Psychopathy scale (SRP), which is currently updated to the SRP-III version. This recent version has been found to be very reliable (especially compared to other scales) (Paulhus & Jones, 2015). The SRP-III is 64 questions long and measures four factors (interpersonal manipulation, callous affect, erratic lifestyle, and criminal tendencies) using a Likert scale (Williams et al., 2007). The Likert scale includes five points ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". The survey used for this study has condensed it to 8 questions that still cover each of the four factors. Examples of questions used in this survey include: 1) I think I could "beat" a lie detector 2) Most people are wimps 3) I rarely follow the rules (Paulhus and Jones, 2015).

Dark Triad: The dark triad was measured by combining the previous three variables (Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy) in order to give each respondent a comprehensive score.

OCBs and CWBs: OCBs were measured by utilizing questions created by Fox et al., (2012), while CWBs were measured by utilizing questions created by Spector (2006). The questions utilize a Likert scale. The Likert scale includes five points ranging from "Never" to "Very Often". Examples of questions used in this survey include: 1) Helped a coworker who had too much to do (OCB) 2) Straightened up or cleaned a common workspace, above and beyond what would formally be required of you (OCB) (Fox et al., 2012) 3) Purposely wasted your employer's materials/suppliers (CWB) 4) Made fun of someone's personal life (CWB). The survey used for this study asked ten questions for OCBs and ten questions for CWBs (Spector 2006).

Job Satisfaction: This factor was measured using the Cornell Job Descriptive Index. This dissects job satisfaction into three areas: satisfaction with organization, satisfaction with

supervision, and satisfaction with coworkers. For each area, subjects were given a variety of characteristics and were instructed to responds with "Yes" or "No" based on whether or not the descriptor describes the particular aspect of his job (Smith 1974). Examples of questions used in this survey include: 1) Are the members boring 2) Is the organization satisfying 3) Are the elections based on ability (Smith 1974). This variable was then broken down into the three previously mentioned sub-categories (organization, supervision, and coworkers) in order to provide better insight in regards to what aspect of satisfaction is driving the individual's happiness (or lack thereof).

After the survey was created, subjects were recruited by contacting Greek Life presidents. Fraternity and Sorority presidents were asked to distribute the survey to members. After receiving responses, organizations were established at three levels. These levels were:

Level 1: All of Greek Life
Level 2: All Fraternities or All Sororities
Level 3: Each Individual Chapter

The results were then analyzed using SPSS.

Results

Using SPSS, scale variables were created for Machiavellianism, narcissism, psychopathy, OCBs, CWBs, and job satisfaction. Reliabilities were run on each of these scales to ensure that they had a minimum alpha score of 0.7. The correlations were then run between the scale variables at each of the previously described levels. On statistically significant correlations, regressions were then conducted.

Hypotheses 1a-1c:

Machiavellianism was found to have no correlation with OCBs at the first or second levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities). However, within the sorority Chi Omega, a positive correlation was found (see Tables 8-14, 36).

Machiavellianism was found to have a correlation with CWBs only at the first level (Greek Life). At the second and third levels, there was no correlation found between Machiavellianism and CWBs (see Tables 8-14, 15).

Machiavellianism was found to have no correlation with Satisfaction at any of the three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter) (see Tables 8-14). However, a breakdown of the Satisfaction variable into its three components (organization, supervision, and coworkers) revealed a correlation between Machiavellianism and Satisfaction with People at the second and third levels. At the second level, the correlation was between All Sororities (see Tables 8-14, 23). At the third level, the correlation was between Alpha Omicron Pi (see Tables 8-14, 32).

Hypotheses 2a-2c:

Narcissism was found to have no correlation with OCBs at any of the three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter) (see Tables 8-14).

Narcissism was found to have a correlation with CWBs at all three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter). At the third level, the correlation was found within the sorority Zeta Tau Alpha. At the second level, the correlation was found within All Sororities. In Greek Life, a correlation was also found (see Tables 8-14, 16, 24, 42).

Narcissism was found to have no correlation with Satisfaction at any of the three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter) (see Tables 8-14). However, a breakdown of the Satisfaction variable into its three components (organization, supervision, and coworkers) revealed a correlation between Narcissism and Satisfaction with People at the first level (Greek Life) (see Tables 8-14, 17).

Hypotheses 3a-3c:

Psychopathy was found to have no correlation with OCBs at any of the three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter) (see Tables 8-14).

Psychopathy was found to have a correlation with CWBs at all three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter). At the third level, the correlation was found within the fraternity of Sigma Chi. At the second level, the correlation was found within All Sororities and All Fraternities. In Greek Life, a correlation was also found (see Tables 8-14, 18, 25, 30, 39).

Psychopathy was found to have no correlation with Satisfaction at any of the three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter) (see Tables 8-14). However, a breakdown of the Satisfaction variable into its three components (organization, supervision, and coworkers) revealed a correlation between Psychopathy and Satisfaction with Supervision at the second level (All Sororities) (see Tables 8-14, 26).

Other:

Unrelated to any of the hypotheses, a correlation was found between CWBs and Satisfaction at all three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter). At the third level, the correlation was found within the sorority of Chi Omega and Alpha Omicron Pi. At the second level, the correlation was found within All Sororities. In Greek Life, a correlation was also found (see Tables 8-14, 19, 27, 37). This relationship can be simplified by breaking down Satisfaction into the three individual components. When analyzing the sub-categories, a correlation was found between CWBs and Organizational Satisfaction at all three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter), as well as between CWBs and Satisfaction with People at the first level, and CWBs and Satisfaction with Supervision at the third level. The correlation between CWBs and Organizational Satisfaction was found within Greek Life, All Sororities, Alpha Omicron Pi, Chi Omega, and Sigma Chi (see

Tables 8-14, 21, 29, 34, 38, 41). The correlation between CWBs and Satisfaction with People was only found within Greek Life (see Tables 8-14, 22). The correlation between CWBs and Satisfaction with Supervision was only found within Alpha Omicron Pi (see Tables 8-14, 35).

Also unrelated to any of the hypotheses, a correlation was found between the Dark Triad and CWBs at all three levels (Greek Life, All Fraternities or All Sororities, Each Individual Chapter). At the third level, the correlation was found within Alpha Omicron Pi, Sigma Chi, and Zeta Tau Alpha. At the second level, the correlation was found within All Fraternities and All Sororities. In Greek Life, a correlation was also found (see Tables 8-14, 20, 28, 31, 33, 40, 43).

Discussion

The only level that displayed a relationship between a dark triad trait and OCBs was the third level, specifically the sorority Chi Omega, which showed a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and OCBs. This was contrary to my prediction in hypothesis 1a, which stated that Machiavellianism would negatively relate to OCBs. There are several reasons that could explain this relationship. However, it is important to note that with a sample size of 5 individuals, a future study with more participants is necessary. If this future study also revealed a positive relationship between OCBs and Machiavellianism, I would predict that it is due to the organization's culture. On the Oklahoma State campus, Chi Omega is known for receiving the highest grades in Greek Life. Therefore, the organization values personal success as it reflects organizational success. By pushing this standard, members of the sorority are forced to prioritize their interests over others and thus develop dark triad characteristics. In regards to hypotheses 2a and 3a, there was not enough evidence to support a positive nor negative relationship.

There was a consistent positive relationship found between CWBs and each of the three dark triad traits. This was predicted by hypotheses 1b, 2b, and 3b which stated that the three traits would positively relate to CWBs. This relationship was emphasized as there was also a consistent positive relationship found between the Dark Triad (when measured collectively) and CWBs. This may be because individuals who possess these traits tend to value themselves over the organizations. Therefore, they are likely to partake in activities that support their own interests at the expense of the organization.

There was also not enough evidence to support a positive nor negative relationship between any of the dark triad traits (Machiavellianism, narcissism and psychopathy) and satisfaction. Therefore, hypotheses 1c, 2c, and 3c need to be explored in future studies to understand what type of relationship exists. However, there was a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and satisfaction with people within All Sororities and within Alpha Omicron Pi. There was also a negative relationship between narcissism and satisfaction with organization in Greek Life. There was also a negative relationship between psychopathy and satisfaction with supervision in All Sororities. To explain the positive relationship between Machiavellianism and a sub-category of satisfaction in contrast to the negative relationship between narcissism and psychopathy and a sub-category of satisfaction, it is important to refer back to the definitions of these three traits. Machiavellians seek to manipulate others, while narcissists and psychopaths simply prioritize themselves over others. This key difference means that Machiavellians are much better at managing the emotions of others and building relationships that can be later taken

advantage of. Thus, others in the organization should not rate satisfaction with people lower because they feel that the Machiavellian is friendly towards them.

The final association that should be discussed from the previously presented data, is the consistent negative relationship between satisfaction and CWBs. This relationship was found at all three levels as an increase in CWBs was matched with a decrease in satisfaction. This can be explained in a variety of ways, but would need to be studied more in-depth to verify which explanation is correct. It is also important to note that this relationship still existed when the satisfaction variable was broken down into its three sub-categories. The relationship held up between CWBs and each of the three sub-categories because of the harmful impacts that CWBs can have. Regardless of what/who the behavior is targeted at, the organization, the supervisors, and the people, are all impacted. For example, if someone takes food from the fridge, each of the three categories are affected in one way or another. The satisfaction with people decreases because trust decreases. The satisfaction with supervisors decreases because they could not prevent the food from being stolen and the act happened under their leadership. The satisfaction with the organization decreased because the proper procedures were not in place to prevent the act from happening. In this example, it is evident that regardless of what/who the CWB is targeted at, satisfaction at all three levels should be expected to decrease (as was observed in this study).

With the previously stated relationships, the importance of evaluating the personalities of coworkers is exemplified. By understanding the effects that a coworker may have on other individuals, it becomes crucial to evaluate the work environment. For a potential new hire, meeting with coworkers and learning about their personalities ensures that their behavior and/or satisfaction will not suffer. For an upper-level manager, evaluating subordinates is important to ensure that one bad apple is not ruining the rest of the bunch. Specifically, these concepts could apply to managers applying the equity theory. This theory states that inputs and outputs should be equal in ratio for all employees. In a theoretical work environment, this theory would hold true as no individuals are participating in OCBs or CWBs. However, introducing individuals with dark triad characteristics will in-turn introduce OCBs and CWBs that throw off the equilibrium as actions such as sabotage take place. By applying this theory, the importance of understanding how the personality of coworkers can impact an individual in the workplace is exemplified.

Appendix:

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Machiavellianism	2.9014	0.59308	71
Narcissism	3.0976	0.50149	71
Psychopathy	2.0224	0.59904	70
OCBs	3.2667	0.48558	69
CWBs	1.6754	0.46539	69
Overall Satisfaction	1.9388	0.14708	70
Dark Triad	2.6687	0.45833	70
Organization Satisfaction	1.9286	0.22977	70
Supervision Satisfaction	1.9786	0.102	70
People Satisfaction	1.919	0.21562	70

Table 1: Overall Means

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Machiavellianism	2.8137	0.59778	53
Narcissism	3.0849	0.4911	53
Psychopathy	1.9299	0.56565	53
OCBs	3.2981	0.50701	52
CWBs	1.6115	0.41899	52
Overall Satisfaction	1.9533	0.11568	52
Dark Triad	2.6095	0.46858	53
Organization Satisfaction	1.9519	0.17877	52
Supervision Satisfaction	1.9712	0.11772	52
People Satisfaction	1.9423	0.17113	52

Table 2: Sororities Means

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Machiavellianism	3.2167	0.45676	15
Narcissism	3.1333	0.55188	15
Psychopathy	2.2653	0.66502	14
OCBs	3.1214	0.41912	14
CWBs	1.9214	0.57268	14
Overall Satisfaction	1.8762	0.22823	15
Dark Triad	2.8546	0.4017	14
Organization Satisfaction	1.8333	0.36187	15
Supervision Satisfaction	2	0	15
People Satisfaction	1.8222	0.33014	15

Table 3: Fraternities Means

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Machiavellianism	2.8073	0.73627	24
Narcissism	3.131	0.53975	24
Psychopathy	1.9821	0.69389	24
OCBs	3.2083	0.51913	24
CWBs	1.6958	0.42373	24
Overall Satisfaction	1.9167	0.15715	24
Dark Triad	2.6401	0.58537	24
Organization Satisfaction	1.9167	0.24077	24
Supervision Satisfaction	1.9583	0.14116	24
People Satisfaction	1.8889	0.23399	24

Table 4: Alpha Omicron Pi Means

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Machiavellianism	2.8125	0.30362	6
Narcissism	3.0119	0.51788	6
Psychopathy	2.2381	0.49211	6
OCBs	3.48	0.66106	5
CWBs	1.68	0.47645	5
Overall Satisfaction	1.9714	0.06389	5
Dark Triad	2.6875	0.3243	6
Organization Saisfaction	1.9	0.22361	5
Supervision Satisfaction	2	0	5
People Satisfaction	2	0	5

Table 5: Chi Omega Means

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Machiavellianism	3.0694	0.40558	9
Nacissism	2.9127	0.59094	9
Psychopathy	2.127	0.66026	9
OCBs	3.1667	0.45826	9
CWBs	1.8222	0.57831	9
Overall Satisfaction	1.9524	0.10102	9
Dark Triad	2.703	0.37096	9
Organization Satisfaction	1.9444	0.16667	9
Supervision Satisfaction	2	0	9
People Satisfaction	1.9259	0.22222	9

Table 6: Sigma Chi Means

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Machiavellianism	3.0341	0.36696	11
Narcissism	3.039	0.48378	11
Psychopathy	1.7662	0.44846	11
OCBs	3.3545	0.46554	11
CWBs	1.5	0.41713	11
Overall Satisfaction	1.987	0.04307	11
Dark Triad	2.6131	0.33967	11
Organization Satisfaction	2	0	11
Supervision Satisfaciton	1.9545	0.15076	11
People Satisfaction	2	0	11

Table 7: Zeta Tau Alpha Means

Variables	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Psychopathy	OCBs	CWBs	Overall Satisfaction	Dark Triad	Organization Satisfaction	Supervision Satisfaction	People Satisfaction
Machiavellianism	1	.602**	.440**	0.079	.294*	-0.059	.841**	-0.172	0.054	0.011
Narcissism	.602**	1	.433**	0.086	.431**	-0.145	.811**	-.285*	-0.037	-0.017
Psychopathy	.440**	.433**	1	0.119	.422**	-0.079	.784**	-0.105	-0.198	0.011
OCBs	0.079	0.086	0.119	1	0.182	0.109	0.126	-0.009	0.103	0.149
CWBs	.294*	.431**	.422**	0.182	1	-.388**	.452**	-.461**	-0.119	-.254*
Overall Satisfaction	-0.059	-0.145	-0.079	0.109	-.388**	1	-0.118	.788**	.394**	.908**
Dark Triad	.841**	.811**	.784**	0.126	.452**	-0.118	1	-0.228	-0.079	-0.001
Organization Satisfaction	-0.172	-.285*	-0.105	-0.009	-.461**	.788**	-0.228	1	0.088	.515**
Supervision Satisfaction	0.054	-0.037	-0.198	0.103	-0.119	.394**	-0.079	0.088	1	.249*
People Satisfaction	0.011	-0.017	0.011	0.149	-.254*	.908**	-0.001	.515**	.249*	1
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										

Table 8: Overall Correlations

Variables	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Psychopathy	OCBs	CWBs	Overall Satisfaction	Dark Triad	Organization Satisfaction	Supervision Satisfaction	People Satisfaction
Machiavellianism	1	.637**	.529**	0.167	0.235	0.182	.861**	-0.052	0.025	.311*
Narcissism	.637**	1	.586**	0.17	.482**	0.011	.856**	-0.203	-0.049	0.182
Psychopathy	.529**	.586**	1	0.143	.357**	-0.149	.832**	-0.121	-.287*	-0.019
OCBs	0.167	0.17	0.143	1	0.248	0.075	0.187	-0.196	0.13	0.195
CWBs	0.235	.482**	.357**	0.248	1	-.335*	.409**	-.424**	-0.192	-0.145
Overall Satisfaction	0.182	0.011	-0.149	0.075	-.335*	1	0.021	.634**	.619**	.852**
Dark Triad	.861**	.856**	.832**	0.187	.409**	0.021	1	-0.141	-0.121	0.188
Organization Satisfaction	-0.052	-0.203	-0.121	-0.196	-.424**	.634**	-0.141	1	0.166	0.228
Supervision Satisfaction	0.025	-0.049	-.287*	0.13	-0.192	.619**	-0.121	0.166	1	.402**
People Satisfaction	.311*	0.182	-0.019	0.195	-0.145	.852**	0.188	0.228	.402**	1
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										

Table 9: Sororities Correlations

Variables	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Psychopathy	OCBs	CWBs	Overall Satisfaction	Dark Triad	Organization Satisfaction	Supervision Satisfaction	People Satisfaction
Machiavellianism	1	0.464	0.178	0.075	0.474	-0.434	.691**	-0.333	b	-0.457
Narcissism	0.464	1	0.186	-0.075	0.492	-0.421	.738**	-0.468	b	-0.337
Psychopathy	0.178	0.186	1	0.027	.559*	0.122	.707**	0.006	b	0.193
OCBs	0.075	-0.075	0.027	1	0.165	0.106	0.037	0.273	b	-0.027
CWBs	0.474	0.492	.559*	0.165	1	-0.409	.700**	-0.468	b	-0.323
Overall Satisfaction	-0.434	-0.421	0.122	0.106	-0.409	1	-0.333	.906**	b	.951**
Dark Triad	.691**	.738**	.707**	0.037	.700**	-0.333	1	-0.375	b	-0.263
Organization Satisfaction	-0.333	-0.468	0.006	0.273	-0.468	.906**	-0.375	1	b	.731**
Supervision Satisfaction	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
People Satisfaction	-0.457	-0.337	0.193	-0.027	-0.323	.951**	-0.263	.731**	b	1
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										
b Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.										

Table 10: Fraternities Correlations

Variables	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Psychopathy	OCBs	CWBs	Overall Satisfaction	Dark Triad	Organization Satisfaction	Supervision Satisfaction	People Satisfaction
Machiavellianism	1	.858**	.605**	0.316	0.382	0.251	.922**	-0.064	0.024	.428*
Narcissism	.858**	1	.625**	0.245	0.353	0.134	.914**	-0.163	-0.007	0.325
Psychopathy	.605**	.625**	1	0.311	0.344	-0.12	.841**	-0.065	-0.388	0.013
OCBs	0.316	0.245	0.311	1	0.216	-0.022	0.331	-0.307	0.005	0.175
CWBs	0.382	0.353	0.344	0.216	1	-0.397	.405*	-.430*	-.439*	-0.151
Overall Satisfaction	0.251	0.134	-0.12	-0.022	-0.397	1	0.099	.629**	.677**	.863**
Dark Triad	.922**	.914**	.841**	0.331	.405*	0.099	1	-0.103	-0.146	0.284
Organization Satisfaction	-0.064	-0.163	-0.065	-0.307	-.430*	.629**	-0.103	1	0.213	0.214
Supervision Satisfaction	0.024	-0.007	-0.388	0.005	-.439*	.677**	-0.146	0.213	1	.512*
People Satisfaction	.428*	0.325	0.013	0.175	-0.151	.863**	0.284	0.214	.512*	1
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										

Table 11: Alpha Omicron Pi Correlations

Variables	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Psychopathy	OCBs	CWBs	Overall Satisfaction	Dark Triad	Organization Saisfaction	Supervision Satisfaction	People Satisfaction
Machiavellianism	1	-0.108	0.167	.953*	0.045	-0.173	0.339	-0.173	b	b
Narcissism	-0.108	1	0.643	0.011	0.547	-0.721	.824*	-0.721	b	b
Psychopathy	0.167	0.643	1	0.224	0.019	-0.237	.900*	-0.237	b	b
OCBs	.953*	0.011	0.224	1	0.078	-0.186	0.4	-0.186	b	b
CWBs	0.045	0.547	0.019	0.078	1	-.962**	0.296	-.962**	b	b
Overall Satisfaction	-0.173	-0.721	-0.237	-0.186	-.962**	1	-0.529	1.000**	b	b
Dark Triad	0.339	.824*	.900*	0.4	0.296	-0.529	1	-0.529	b	b
Organization Saisfaction	-0.173	-0.721	-0.237	-0.186	-.962**	1.000**	-0.529	1	b	b
Supervision Satisfaction	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
People Satisfaction	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
b Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.										

Table 12: Chi Omega Correlations

Variables	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Psychopathy	OCBs	CWBs	Overall Satisfaction	Dark Triad	Organization Satisfaction	Supervision Satisfaction	People Satisfaction
Machiavellianism	1	0.387	-0.187	0.022	0.206	-0.509	0.459	-0.283	b	-0.398
Narcisssim	0.387	1	0.261	0.077	0.43	-0.121	.827**	-0.237	b	-0.01
Psychopathy	-0.187	0.261	1	-0.191	.703*	0.064	0.664	-0.658	b	0.397
OCBs	0.022	0.077	-0.191	1	0.352	-0.54	-0.064	0.055	b	-0.6
CWBs	0.206	0.43	.703*	0.352	1	-0.53	.720*	-.764*	b	-0.18
OverallSatisfaction	-0.509	-0.121	0.064	-0.54	-0.53	1	-0.212	0.354	b	.884**
Dark Triad	0.459	.827**	0.664	-0.064	.720*	-0.212	1	-0.619	b	0.085
Organization Satisfaction	-0.283	-0.237	-0.658	0.055	-.764*	0.354	-0.619	1	b	-0.125
Supervision Satisfaction	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
People Satisfaction	-0.398	-0.01	0.397	-0.6	-0.18	.884**	0.085	-0.125	b	1
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										
b Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.										

Table 13: Sigma Chi Correlations

Variables	Machiavellianism	Narcissism	Psychopathy	OCBs	CWBs	Overall Satisfaction	Dark Triad	Organization Satisfaction	Supervision Satisfaction	People Satisfaction
Mahiavellianism	1	0.369	0.314	0.178	0.196	0.257	.673*	b	0.257	b
Narcissism	0.369	1	0.54	0.066	.782**	-0.169	.845**	b	-0.169	b
Psychopathy	0.314	0.54	1	-0.295	0.481	-0.173	.809**	b	-0.173	b
OCBs	0.178	0.066	-0.295	1	0.33	0.466	-0.035	b	0.466	b
CWBs	0.196	.782**	0.481	0.33	1	0.239	.654*	b	0.239	b
Overal Satisfaction	0.257	-0.169	-0.173	0.466	0.239	1	-0.064	b	1.000**	b
Dark Triad	.673*	.845**	.809**	-0.035	.654*	-0.064	1	b	-0.064	b
Organization Satisfaction	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
Supervision Satisfaction	0.257	-0.169	-0.173	0.466	0.239	1.000**	-0.064	.b	1	b
People Satisfaction	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
b Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.										

Table 14: Zeta Tau Alpha Correlations

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.008	.270		3.729	<.001	.468	1.547
	MPS	.231	.092	.294	2.522	.014	.048	.414
a. Dependent Variable: CWB								

Table 15: Overall Machiavellianism/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.445	.319		1.394	.168	−.192	1.081
	PNI	.397	.101	.431	3.909	<.001	.194	.599

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 16: Overall Narcissism/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.333	.167		13.948	<.001	1.999	2.667
	PNI	−.130	.053	−.285	−2.448	.017	−.236	−.024

a. Dependent Variable: OrganizationSatisfaction

Table 17: Overall Narcissism/Organization Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.006	.180		5.575	<.001	.646	1.366
	SRPIII	.328	.087	.422	3.777	<.001	.155	.501

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 18: Overall Psychopathy/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.147	.062		34.539	<.001	2.023	2.271
	CWB	−.123	.036	−.388	−3.449	<.001	−.195	−.052

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

Table 19: Overall CWBs/Overall Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.468	.293		1.595	.116	−.118	1.054
	DarkTriad	.449	.109	.452	4.122	<.001	.231	.666

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 20: Overall Dark Triad/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.311	.094		24.681	<.001	2.124	2.498
	CWB	−.229	.054	−.461	−4.250	<.001	−.337	−.121

a. Dependent Variable: OrganizationSatisfaction

Table 21: Overall CWBs/Organization Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.120	.095		22.346	<.001	1.930	2.309
	CWB	−.118	.055	−.254	−2.154	.035	−.227	−.009

a. Dependent Variable: PeopleSatisfaction

Table 22: Overall CWBs/People Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.694	.110		15.461	<.001	1.474	1.914
	MPS	.088	.038	.311	2.317	.025	.012	.165

a. Dependent Variable: PeopleSatisfaction

Table 23: Sororities Machiavellianism/People Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.342	.331		1.035	.306	−.322	1.006
	PNI	.410	.106	.482	3.889	<.001	.198	.622

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 24: Sororities Narcissism/CWBs Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.105	.195		5.657	<.001	.713	1.498
	SRPIII	.264	.098	.357	2.699	.009	.067	.460

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 25: Sororities Psychopathy/CWBs Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.086	.056		37.051	<.001	1.973	2.199
	SRPIII	−.060	.028	−.287	−2.119	.039	−.116	−.003

a. Dependent Variable: SupervisionSatisfaction

Table 26: Sororities Psychopathy/Supervision Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.103	.061		34.348	<.001	1.980	2.225
	CWB	−.093	.037	−.335	−2.518	.015	−.166	−.019

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

Table 27: Sororities CWBs/Overall Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.666	.303		2.199	.033	.058	1.274
	DarkTriad	.363	.114	.409	3.172	.003	.133	.592

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 28: Sororities Dark Triad/CWBs Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.244	.091		24.678	<.001	2.061	2.426
	CWB	−.181	.055	−.424	−3.314	.002	−.291	−.071

a. Dependent Variable: OrganizationSatisfaction

Table 29: Sororities CWBs/Organization Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.745	.516		1.444	.176	−.390	1.881
	SRPIII	.513	.229	.559	2.238	.047	.009	1.018

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 30: Fraternities Psychopathy/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	−.981	.882		−1.112	.290	−2.922	.960
	DarkTriad	1.012	.311	.700	3.250	.008	.326	1.697

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 31: Fraternities Dark Triad/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.507	.178		8.491	<.001	1.139	1.876
	MPS	.136	.061	.428	2.219	.037	.009	.263

a. Dependent Variable: PeopleSatisfaction

Table 32: Alpha Omicron Pi Machiavellianism/People Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.922	.381		2.419	.024	.132	1.713
	DarkTraid	.293	.141	.405	2.076	.050	.000	.586

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 33: Alpha Omicron Pi Dark Triad/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.331	.191		12.204	<.001	1.935	2.727
	CWB	−.244	.109	−.430	−2.232	.036	−.471	−.017

a. Dependent Variable: OrganizationSatisfaction

Table 34: Alpha Omicron Pi CWBs/Organization Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.206	.111		19.806	<.001	1.975	2.437
	CWB	−.146	.064	−.439	−2.293	.032	−.279	−.014

a. Dependent Variable: SupervisionSatisfaction

Table 35: Alpha Omicron Pi CWBs/Supervision Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	−1.921	1.001		−1.918	.151	−5.107	1.266
	MPS	1.946	.359	.953	5.423	.012	.804	3.088

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

Table 36: Chi Omega Machiavellianism/OCBs Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.188	.037		59.811	<.001	2.072	2.305
	CWB	−.129	.021	−.962	−6.112	.009	−.196	−.062

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

Table 37: Chi Omega CWBs/Overall Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.659	.128		20.763	<.001	2.251	3.066
	CWB	−.452	.074	−.962	−6.112	.009	−.687	−.216

a. Dependent Variable: OrganizationSaisfaction

Table 38: Chi Omega CWBs/Organization Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.513	.522		.983	.358	−.721	1.748
	SRPIII	.615	.236	.703	2.612	.035	.058	1.172

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 39: Sigma Chi Psychopathy/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	−1.212	1.115		−1.087	.313	−3.847	1.424
	DarkTriad	1.122	.409	.720	2.745	.029	.155	2.089

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 40: Sigma Chi Dark Triad/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.346	.134		17.537	<.001	2.029	2.662
	CWB	−.220	.070	−.764	−3.130	.017	−.386	−.054

a. Dependent Variable: OrganizationSatisfaction

Table 41: Sigma Chi CWBs/Organizational Satisfaction Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	−.550	.550		−.999	.344	−1.795	.695
	PNI	.674	.179	.782	3.767	.004	.269	1.080

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 42: Zeta Tau Alpha Narcissism/CWBs Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	−.598	.816		−.733	.482	−2.443	1.248
	DarkTriad	.803	.310	.654	2.591	.029	.102	1.504

a. Dependent Variable: CWB

Table 43: Zeta Tau Alpha Dark Triad/CWBs Regression

Literature Cited

Becker, J., & O'Hair, D. (2007). Machiavellians' Motives in Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Applied Communication Research,* 35(3), 246–67.

Boddy, C., Ladyshewsky, R., & Galvin, P. (2010). The Influence of Corporate Psychopaths on Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Commitment to Employees. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 97(1), 1–19.

Castille, C., Kuyumcu, D., & Bennett, R. (2017). Prevailing to the Peers' Detriment: Organizational Constraints Motivate Machiavellians to Undermine Their Peers. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 104, 29–36.

Cohen, Aaron (2016). Are They Among Us? A Conceptual Framework of the Relationship Between the Dark Triad Personality and Counterproductive Workplace Behaviors (CWBs). *Human Resource Management Review,* 26(1), 69-85.

Dahling, J., Whitaker, B., & Levy, P. (2009). The Development and Validation of a New Machiavellianism Scale. *Journal of Management,* 35(2), 219-257.

Fox, S., Spector, P., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. (2012). The Deviant Citizen: Measuring Potential Positive Relations Between Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 85(1), 199-220.

Harpur, T., Hakstian, A., & Hare, R. (1985). Factor Structure of the Psychopathy Checklist. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56(5), 741-747.

Hunter, J., Gerbing, D., & Boster, F. (1982). Machiavellian Beliefs and Personality: Construct Invalidity of the Machiavellian Dimension. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 43, 1293–1305.

Jonason, P., Wee, S., & Li, N. (2015). Competition, Autonomy, and Prestige: Mechanisms Through Which the Dark Triad Predict Job Satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 72, 112–16.

LeBrenton, J., Shiverdecker, L., & Grimaldi, E. (2018). The Dark Triad and Workplace Behavior. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5*, 387-414.

O'Boyle, E., Forsyth, D., Banks, G., McDaniel, M., & Kozlowski, S. (2012). A Meta-Analysis of the Dark Triad and Work Behavior: A Social Exchange Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 97, 557–79.

O'Boyle, Ernest H, (2010). A Test of the General CWB-OCB Emotion Model. *Virginia Commonwealth University, Ann Arbor.*

Paulhus, D., & Jones, D. (2015). Measures of Dark Personalities. *Measures of Personality and Social Psychology Constructs,* 562-594.

Pincus, A., Ansell, E., Pimentel, C., Cain, N., Wright, A., Levy, K., Struss, M. (2009). Initial Construction and Validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment,* 21, 365–79.

Raskin, R., & Hall, C. (1979). A Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Psychological Report,* 54, 890-902.

Rhee, S., Hur, W., & Kim, M. (2017). The Relationship of Coworker Incivility to Job Performance and the Moderating Role of Self-Efficacy and Compassion at Work: The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Approach. *Journal of Business and Psychology,* 32, 711-726.

Smith, Patricia (1974). The Development of a Method of Measuring Job Satisfaction: The Cornell Studies. *Studies in Personnel and Industrial Psychology,* 272-279.

Spector, P., Fox, S., Penny, L., Bruusema, K., Goh, Angeline., & Kessler, S. (2006). The Dimensionality of Counterproductivity: Are All Counterproductive Behaviors Created Equally? *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 68(3), 446-460.

Webster, B., & Smith, M. (2019). The Dark Triad and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: The Moderating Role of High Involvement Management Climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(5), 621-635.

Williams, K., Paulhus, D., Hare, R. (2007). Capturing the Four-Factor Structure of Psychopathy in College Students Via Self-Report. *Journal of Personality Assessment,* 88(2), 205-291.