

**Exploring the Role of the Dark Tetrad and Self-Efficacy in Emotional  
Manipulation**

Stephanie Gough

BBehavSc (Hons)

*A report submitted as a partial requirement for the degree of  
Master of Psychology (Clinical) at the University of Tasmania.*

## Statement

I declare that the data used in this research report was collected as part of a unique study and that no secondary data analysis was used.

I declare that this research report is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it does not contain material from published sources without proper acknowledgement, nor does it contain material which has been accepted for the award of any other higher degree or graduate diploma in any university.

.....

Stephanie Gough

.....

Date

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Rachel Grieve for her continual support and guidance that she has provided to me over the last two years. I consider her dedication, attention to detail, and kindness instrumental to completing this thesis. I also wish to acknowledge the support provided by the wonderful peer group with whom I have completed my Masters degree. I consider myself lucky to have developed such invaluable friendships during this time. I would like to thank the participants who made the completion of this thesis possible. Finally, I would like to thank my family and Marcus for providing constant encouragement and support throughout my time at university, and especially during my Masters degree.

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Abstract .....  | 1  |
| Introduction .....  | 2  |
| The Function of Emotional Intelligence .....                      | 4  |
| The Influence of the Dark Triad on the ‘Dark Side’ .....          | 6  |
| The Dark Tetrad: Exploring the Potential Influence of Sadism..... | 8  |
| The Potential Role of Self-Efficacy .....                         | 11 |
| The Current Study .....   | 13 |
| Method .....  | 14 |
| Participants .....  | 14 |
| Design and Analytical Approach .....                              | 15 |
| Materials.....  | 16 |
| Procedure.....  | 19 |
| Results .....   | 19 |
| Assumption Testing .....  | 19 |
| Descriptive Statistics .....                                      | 20 |
| Regression Analyses .....   | 24 |
| Discussion .....  | 37 |
| Trait Emotional Manipulation.....                                 | 37 |
| Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate.....                        | 41 |
| Limitations and Additional Considerations .....                   | 46 |
| Implications.....   | 47 |
| Conclusion .....  | 48 |
| References .....  | 50 |
| Appendices .....  | 59 |

## List of Tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1.....  | 21 |
| <i>Mean Scores and Internal Reliabilities for All Measures by Gender</i>  |    |
| Table 2.....  | 22 |
| <i>Results of t-tests Showing Differences on Measures Between Males and Females</i>   |    |
| Table 3.....  | 23 |
| <i>Bivariate Correlations Between All Measures for Males and Females</i>  |    |
| Table 4.....  | 25 |
| <i>Full Multiple Regression Showing Relationships of Predictor Variables with Trait Emotional Manipulation for Males</i>            |    |
| Table 5.....  | 28 |
| <i>Full Multiple Regression Showing Relationships of Predictor Variables with Trait Emotional Manipulation for Females</i>          |    |
| Table 6.....  | 32 |
| <i>Full Multiple Regression Showing Relationships of Predictor Variables with Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate for Males</i>   |    |
| Table 7.....  | 35 |
| <i>Full Multiple Regression Showing Relationships of Predictor Variables with Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate for Females</i> |    |

**Exploring the Role of the Dark Tetrad and Self-Efficacy in Emotional  
Manipulation**

Stephanie Gough

BBehavSc (Hons)

Word count: 9 993 words

### **Abstract**

Emotional manipulation is the use of high-level emotional skills to manipulate others for self-serving reasons. This study examined individuals' belief in their emotional manipulation skills (trait emotional manipulation) and the frequency with which they engaged in emotional manipulation (willingness to emotionally manipulate). The influence of emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, sadism, general self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy on trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate was examined for the first time. Participants comprised 245 women and 136 men who completed an anonymous online questionnaire within a cross-sectional correlational design. Results from regression analyses indicated that males' belief about and use of emotional manipulation skills was predicted by antisocial traits such as psychopathy, whereas females' belief about and use of emotional manipulation skills was predicted by manipulative, power-seeking traits such as narcissism. Limitations from the current study include the use of self-report measures and cross-sectional design. The findings from this study show the differential mechanisms through which emotional manipulation occurs between genders, and the discrepancy between the mechanisms that predict those that believe they can emotionally manipulate others, compared to those who actually do. The variables identified as predictors in this study may be targeted when developing interventions for these individuals.

Emotions are an integrated process of bodily changes, cognitions, and behaviours that occur in response to an internal or external trigger (Mulligan & Scherer, 2012; Scherer, 2005). Emotion allows individuals to coordinate their interactions with others, and thus is considered to perform a socially-adaptive function (Engelberg & Sjöberg, 2005). Individuals with effective emotion skills are considered to be emotionally intelligent (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). While emotional intelligence has previously been considered to be a positive construct, the conceptualisation of the 'dark side' of emotional intelligence, emotional manipulation, has been more recently considered (Austin, Farrelly, Black, & Moore, 2007). Given that emotionally manipulative individuals manipulate others' emotions for self-serving reasons (Austin et al., 2007); research into this construct is valuable to reduce potential harm. Thus the aim of the current study was to continue research into the mechanisms of emotional manipulation by considering both trait emotional manipulation and the willingness to emotionally manipulate others, as well as the possible contribution of sadism and social self-efficacy for the first time.

Emotional intelligence is an individual's ability to use emotion to reach goals, and to accurately appraise, express and regulate their own and others' emotions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Being emotionally intelligent has benefits for both the individual, as well as for those with whom they interact (Austin et al., 2007), as it has been found to be positively associated with competency in social situations, and a higher quality of relationships (Brackett, Rivers, & Salovey, 2011). Further, emotional intelligence has been found to positively predict job performance (O'Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, & Story, 2011). Emotional intelligence can be conceptualised as both an ability, and a personality trait (Petrides, 2011). An individual's emotional intelligence ability can be assessed through maximum-

performance tests, while their self-perceptions of these emotional intelligence abilities (trait emotional intelligence) can be assessed through self-report measures (Petrides, 2011). In this way, Petrides suggests that trait emotional intelligence reflects a personality construct, whereas emotional intelligence ability reflects a cognitive ability.

Austin et al. (2007) proposed the existence of a 'dark side' of emotional intelligence, which they referred to as emotional manipulation. Emotional manipulation is characterised by the manipulation of others' emotions for a self-serving purpose (Austin et al., 2007; Grieve & Mahar, 2010). Emotional manipulation has recently been divided into an individual's self-reported ability (trait emotional manipulation), and their self-report willingness to emotionally manipulate others (Hyde & Grieve, 2014). An individual's trait emotional manipulation can be conceptualised as their perception of their own emotional manipulation skills, whereas an individual's willingness to emotionally manipulate reflects the individual's frequency of actually engaging in emotional manipulation (Hyde & Grieve, 2014). Thus, Hyde and Grieve attempted to differentiate between an individual's perception of their emotional manipulation ability (trait emotional manipulation) and their willingness to actually engage in emotionally manipulating another person.

Hyde and Grieve (2014) modified items from Austin et al.'s (2007) trait emotional manipulation scale to assess how often individuals engaged in emotional manipulation (willingness to emotionally manipulate). Hyde and Grieve extracted two interpretable factors from their exploratory factor analysis, which they identified as trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate. These two factors were moderately positively correlated, indicating that these are distinct

but conceptually related aspects of emotional manipulation. Hyde and Grieve concluded that examining constructs that have been found to be related to trait emotional manipulation would be beneficial to investigate which constructs may further differentiate individuals who can emotionally manipulate from those that actually do.

Whereas emotional intelligence is understood as being beneficial for both the individual and those with whom they interact, emotional manipulation may have negative consequences for those individuals that are being manipulated (Austin et al., 2007). Thus, studying emotional manipulation to find out its predictive mechanisms is also considered important so that the predictive mechanisms may be targeted for interventions in order to provide individuals with more facilitative and prosocial ways of interacting with others (Gough, Grieve, Witteveen, & Tolan, 2015).

Multiple constructs have been found to predict trait emotional manipulation (Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013), whereas only Machiavellianism (Abell, Brewer, Qualter, & Austin, 2016), primary psychopathy, and secondary psychopathy have been found to predict willingness to emotionally manipulate (Hyde & Grieve, 2014). In the subsequent paragraphs, previously identified predictors of trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate will be reviewed, followed by the consideration of further variables of interest, including sadism and social self-efficacy.

### **The Function of Emotional Intelligence**

Individuals who have high emotional intelligence utilise their emotion-related skills in interactions with others (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Although these individuals mostly use their high emotion-related skills in a prosocial manner, Salovey and Mayer have expressed concern regarding the potential for these skills to

be used for nefarious means. Emotional intelligence has been found to significantly contribute to trait emotional manipulation for both genders (Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). This link can be expected, given that emotional manipulation has been conceptualised as the 'dark side' of emotional intelligence (Austin et al., 2007).

While the contribution of emotional intelligence has been found to be direct for males, it has consistently been found to be more complex for females. Specifically, low bivariate correlations between emotional intelligence and trait emotional manipulation for females have been found, but emotional intelligence has significantly contributed to trait emotional manipulation (Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). Due to these consistent findings, it seems that emotional intelligence acts as a suppressor variable in this case, by accounting for irrelevant variance, and thus strengthening the prediction of trait emotional manipulation (Paulhus, Robins, Trzesniewski, & Tracy, 2004). In Grieve and Panebianco's study, emotional intelligence appeared to account for extraneous variance related to secondary psychopathy, as secondary psychopathy became a significant predictor of trait emotional manipulation following the inclusion of emotional intelligence into the regression analysis. Similar results were found in Gough et al.'s study, in that secondary psychopathy strongly predicted trait emotional manipulation for females.

In their study, Hyde and Grieve (2014) found emotional intelligence to have a similar function in the prediction of both trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate. Based on the low bivariate correlations between emotional intelligence and both emotional manipulation constructs, Hyde and Grieve suggested that, consistent with previous research, emotional intelligence

was likely influencing emotional manipulation through suppression effects.

### **The Influence of the Dark Triad on the ‘Dark Side’**

Given that emotional manipulation is conceptualised as the ‘dark side’ of emotional intelligence (Austin et al., 2007), it seems logical that it would be related to the darker aspects of personality. Consistent with this, links have been drawn between trait emotional manipulation and the Dark Triad of personality. The Dark Triad comprises the subclinical socially aversive traits psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism, which are distinct, but overlapping personality constructs (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Furnham, Richards, and Paulhus (2013) identified that all of the Dark Triad traits must be examined together, in order to determine the specific contribution of each trait within multivariate contexts. Thus in line with Furnham et al.’s recommendation, the current research examines the role of all three of the Dark Triad traits simultaneously.

Psychopathy has been conceptualised into two different, related aspects of the construct: primary and secondary psychopathy (Levenson, Kiehl, & Fitzpatrick, 1995). Primary psychopathy is characterised by callous, remorseless, manipulative behaviour, while secondary psychopathy is characterised by neurotic, impulsive, antisocial behaviour (Levenson et al., 1995). Levenson et al. suggest that the underlying anxiety associated with secondary psychopathy is what distinguishes it from primary psychopathy. Primary and secondary psychopathy have both been found to significantly contribute to trait emotional manipulation for both males and females (Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). Further, both primary and secondary psychopathy have been found to significantly predict willingness to emotionally manipulate (Hyde & Grieve, 2014).

Similar to emotional manipulation, Machiavellianism is characterised by the

manipulation of others to promote one's own interests (Christie & Geis, 1970). However, Machiavellians engage in manipulative behaviours in an emotionally detached way (Austin et al., 2007), and often have deficits in emotion processing skills, such as understanding others' emotions (Wastell & Booth, 2003), as well as poor social skills (Andrew, Cooke, & Muncer, 2008). Machiavellianism has been found to be positively correlated with trait emotional manipulation (Austin et al., 2007; Gough et al., 2015). Further, Gough et al. found that Machiavellianism strongly predicted trait emotional manipulation for both males and females, highlighting the manipulative nature of this construct.

Gough et al. (2015) suggested that Machiavellians may believe they are able to emotionally manipulate others, but may not actually be able to do so, due to their poor emotion skills (Austin et al., 2007). In support of this, Gough et al. found Machiavellianism to be significantly negatively correlated with both emotional intelligence and emotional self-efficacy for both genders, highlighting the poor emotion skills, and low belief in emotion skills these individuals possess. In contrast, Abell et al. (2014) found that Machiavellianism predicted females' willingness to emotionally manipulate within a friendship dyad. Thus, the role that Machiavellianism may play for willingness to emotionally manipulate is unclear, especially for males.

Subclinical narcissism refers to an individual who goes to extreme lengths to maintain an unrealistically positive self-image, and is associated with dominance and superiority (Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Pincus et al., 2009). Although not pathological, subclinical narcissism has been associated with several negative outcomes including difficulty maintaining personal relationships (Back, Schmukle, & Egloff, 2010), and counterproductive work behaviour (O'Boyle, Forsyth, Banks,

& McDaniel, 2012). Researchers have suggested that narcissism may have two dimensions, identified as grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Miller et al., 2011; Pincus et al., 2009). Grandiose narcissists show grandiosity, and display aggressive and dominant behaviour towards others, while vulnerable narcissists present a defensive façade in order to hide their inner feelings of inadequacy (Miller et al., 2011).

Despite the differences between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, Miller et al. (2011) suggest that both grandiose and vulnerable narcissists engage in manipulative behaviours towards others. Thus, it may be that the motivations behind manipulating others differ for each dimension of narcissism, but that narcissistic individuals manipulate others regardless. Gough et al. (2015) found narcissism to significantly predict trait emotional manipulation for both males and females. Gough et al. suggested that individuals with narcissistic traits likely engage in emotionally manipulative behaviours as a way of gaining power over others, in order to reach their self-serving goals and maintain their positive self-image.

### **The Dark Tetrad: Exploring the Potential Influence of Sadism**

It has recently been argued that sadism may play an important role in emotional manipulation, in addition to the Dark Triad traits (Chabrol, Van Leeuwen, Rodgers, & Séjourné, 2009). Researchers have argued that sadism may be a possible fourth undesirable personality trait that forms a 'Dark Tetrad' of personality (Chabrol et al., 2009; Furnham et al., 2013). Sadism is defined by cruel, demeaning behaviour towards others in an effort to humiliate and dominate them, or for pleasure or enjoyment (O'Meara, Davies, & Hammond, 2011). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, narcissism, and sadism have been found to be moderately correlated, indicating that these constructs are distinct but overlapping, and thus supporting the inclusion of

sadism into a Dark Tetrad (Chabrol et al., 2009).

Given that all three of the Dark Triad traits significantly predict trait emotional manipulation, a next logical step is to examine sadism as a possible contributor, especially due to the self-serving nature of sadistic individuals (O'Meara et al., 2011). Sadists have been found to have a cold, uncooperative interpersonal style (Southard, Noser, Pollock, Mercer, & Zeigler-Hill, 2015), and have been described as responding to others in a “perverse” empathetic manner, where the individual understands others’ feelings, and responds with enjoyment rather than concern (Baumeister & Lobbetael, 2011).

In their study examining the Dark Tetrad traits within the context of online social media behaviour, Buckels, Trapnell and Paulhus (2014) found sadism to be the sole positive predictor of both overall trolling behaviours and enjoyment related to engaging in trolling behaviours. Specifically, Buckels et al. identified that the relationship between sadism and engaging in trolling behaviours was mediated by the enjoyment of trolling. Buckels et al. concluded that sadists engage in trolling because it provides them with enjoyment. Given that trolling is conceptualised as a deceptive and disruptive behaviour, its link with emotional manipulation is clear, as individuals often engage in emotional manipulation in a deceptive manner (Austin et al., 2007). It is particularly interesting that Buckels et al. found no positive associations between the other Dark Tetrad traits (psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism) and trolling. This highlights the distinct contribution of sadism to antisocial interpersonal behaviours such as trolling, and potentially emotional manipulation.

Schmeelk, Sylvers, and Lilienfeld (2008) found relational aggression, which consists of behaviours such as gossiping and spreading rumours within a social context, to be moderately correlated with sadistic personality disorder. Thus, given

the manipulative nature of behaviours such as gossiping, and considering the previous findings reviewed, it seems prudent to consider sadism as playing an important role in emotional manipulation.

In summary, emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, and vulnerable narcissism have been found to predict trait emotional manipulation (Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). Given that the conceptualisation of an individual's willingness to emotionally manipulate by Hyde and Grieve (2014) is more recent, only Machiavellianism (Abell et al., 2016), primary psychopathy, and secondary psychopathy have been found to predict willingness to emotionally manipulate (Hyde & Grieve, 2014). Sadism has been identified by multiple researchers as a potential part of a Dark Tetrad (Chabrol et al., 2009; Furnham et al., 2013). This, as well as the association between sadism and antisocial, manipulative interpersonal behaviours such as gossiping (Schmeelk et al., 2008), and trolling (Buckels et al., 2014) suggest that sadism likely plays an important role in emotional manipulation.

When considering an individual's belief in their emotional manipulation skills (trait emotional manipulation), compared with their actual self-reported level of engagement in emotional manipulation behaviours (willingness to emotionally manipulate), it seems necessary to consider the potential role of self-efficacy. Although the characteristics associated with the Dark Tetrad show good conceptual links to emotional manipulation, the differentiation between individuals believing they can emotionally manipulate others compared to if they actually do highlights the potential role of individuals' self-belief or confidence in their abilities. The potential contribution of general self-efficacy and social self-efficacy will now be considered.

### **The Potential Role of Self-Efficacy**

General self-efficacy refers to an individual's perceived self-belief of their ability to produce desired outcomes (Löve, Moore, & Hensing, 2011). General self-efficacy has been linked with positive outcomes such as increased life satisfaction (Weber, Ruch, Littman-Ovadia, Lavy, & Gai, 2013) and emotional stability (Judge & Bono, 2001). Individuals with high general self-efficacy often report higher levels of self-esteem (Judge & Bono, 2001). However, general self-efficacy has also been associated with subclinical narcissism (Kwan, Kuang, & Hui, 2009). The association between narcissism and general self-efficacy is not surprising, as narcissists hold the general belief that they can do anything (Pincus et al., 2009).

Given the positive association between general self-efficacy and narcissism, and that general self-efficacy has been found to predict trait emotional manipulation for females (Gough et al., 2015), it seems likely that general self-efficacy will predict trait emotional manipulation for females in this study. Further, given the high self-belief of individuals with high self-efficacy, it seems likely that these individuals will be more likely to actually engage in emotional manipulation, as they may feel more confident in doing so. Thus, general self-efficacy will also likely predict willingness to emotionally manipulate for females.

In addition to general self-efficacy, it has been suggested that an individual's social self-efficacy may play a role in emotional manipulation, given the social context within which emotional manipulation occurs (Gough et al., 2015). Contrary to the findings of Grieve and Panebianco (2013), Gough et al. found secondary psychopathy to be a stronger predictor of trait emotional manipulation than primary psychopathy for females. This finding may be partly attributable to underlying anxiety being identified as the differentiating aspect between primary and secondary

psychopathy (Levenson et al., 1995). These results may be interpreted through explanations provided by both Grieve and Panebianco and Richardson and Green (2003). Richardson and Green found the use of indirect aggression (such as manipulation) to be associated with anxiety in social situations. They suggested that individuals uncomfortable in social situations may resort to indirect aggression as a response in order to reduce their anxiety in these situations. Additionally, Grieve and Panebianco proposed that females who perceive their social skills to be low, and who have high social anxiety may tend to rely on insincere forms of communication, such as emotional manipulation.

In light of Grieve and Panebianco's (2013) suggestion that a female's perception of their social skills makes it more likely they will engage in emotional manipulation, Gough et al. suggested that social self-efficacy may play a role in individuals' emotional manipulation, especially given the social context of emotional manipulation use. Social self-efficacy refers to an individual's confidence in their ability to successfully engage in social situations in order to develop and maintain interpersonal relationships across multiple contexts (Anderson & Betz, 2001). Thus, it may be that in cases where a female is uncomfortable and has low confidence in their ability to engage in social situations (low social self-efficacy), that individual may engage in emotional manipulation (willingness to emotionally manipulate).

Alternatively, it may be the case that those individuals higher in social self-efficacy believe that they can emotionally manipulate others (trait emotional manipulation), but do not actually need to engage in emotionally manipulative behaviours (willingness to emotionally manipulate), as they believe that they have adequate social skills to navigate social situations without the use of manipulation. Thus, although it is unclear through what mechanisms social self-efficacy may

predict emotional manipulation, it may be that social self-efficacy will predict trait emotional manipulation, but not willingness to emotionally manipulate, or that lower social self-efficacy will predict willingness to emotionally manipulate for females.

### **The Current Study**

The aim of the current study was to continue research into the underlying mechanisms of trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate. The potential for harm to individuals who are subject to emotional manipulation such as experiencing feelings of anger, embarrassment, and stress (Ortega et al., 2012), and developing a false sense of security within relationships (Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis, & Beech, 2014) highlights the need for continued research into this manipulative construct.

For the current research, in order to be able to specifically address the potential contribution of the constructs mentioned above, a hierarchical approach was taken. Emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy and Machiavellianism were considered together, as this has been the case in previous research (e.g. Gough et al., 2015). However, given that narcissism has yet to be considered in terms of grandiose and vulnerable subtypes, it is prudent to add these variables separately in the next step, to more fully examine their role in emotional manipulation. Additionally, as sadism is proposed as important to consider in addition to the Dark Triad (Chabrol et al., 2009; Furnham et al., 2013), it was added on its own in the next step. The addition of the self-efficacy variables into the final step of the regression allowed for their specific contribution to be considered.

Consistent with findings by Gough et al. (2015), Grieve and Mahar (2010), and Grieve and Panebianco (2013), it was hypothesised that the combination of emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and

Machiavellianism would significantly predict trait emotional manipulation. Grandiose narcissism and vulnerable narcissism were hypothesised to significantly predict trait emotional manipulation over and above these constructs. The addition of sadism was hypothesised to significantly predict trait emotional manipulation when included. The inclusion of general self-efficacy was hypothesised to predict trait emotional manipulation for females only, based on previous findings by Gough et al., and social self-efficacy was hypothesised to significantly predict trait emotional manipulation for both genders in addition to the other variables.

Based on findings by Hyde and Grieve (2014) and Abell et al. (2016), it was hypothesised that emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism would significantly predict willingness to emotionally manipulate. Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were hypothesised to significantly predict willingness to emotionally manipulate over and above the existing variables. Sadism was hypothesised to significantly predict willingness to emotionally manipulate. Finally, the inclusion of general self-efficacy was hypothesised to significantly predict willingness to emotionally manipulate for females, and lower levels of social self-efficacy was hypothesised to significantly predict willingness to emotionally manipulate for females.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The sample comprised 245 women and 136 men ( $N = 381$ ) who were members of the community ( $n = 98$ ) and university students ( $n = 283$ ). Participants were primarily Caucasian (85.6%) and were aged between 18 and 77 years ( $M = 26.9$  years;  $SD = 10.4$ ). The remaining participants were Asian (10.2%), Aboriginal (2.1%), Latin American (1%), Middle Eastern (0.6%), and African (0.5%). English

was the first language for the majority of participants (90.8%). Participants were required to be 18 years and over to take part in the study.

### **Design and Analytical Approach**

This study utilised a cross-sectional correlational design. Participants completed the study via an anonymous online questionnaire. Data for males and females were analysed separately due to previous research indicating differences in patterns of relationships in relation to emotional manipulation between genders (e.g. Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). Emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, sadism, general self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy served as predictor variables. Trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate were outcome variables. Two four-step multiple hierarchical regressions were completed for each gender, one with trait emotion manipulation as the outcome variable, and one with willingness to emotionally manipulate as the outcome variable.

For each regression, emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism were entered into the first step; grandiose narcissism and vulnerable narcissism were entered into the second step; sadism was entered into the third step; and general self-efficacy and social self-efficacy were entered into the fourth step.

***A priori* power analysis.** The required number of participants for the current study was calculated using Green's (1991) formula ( $N = 104 + k$ , where  $k$  equals number of predictor variables). This was calculated with a medium effect size of .07, alpha level of .05, and power of .8. The current study consisted of nine predictor variables, thus a minimum of 113 participants were required for each gender group,

thus 226 participants in total. Therefore the current study exceeded the required sample size for adequate power.

## **Materials**

The online questionnaire was hosted on Limesurvey (Schmitz, 2012).

**Demographic information.** Participants completed questions about their gender, age, ethnicity, student status, and whether their first language was English (see Appendix A1).

**Emotional intelligence.** Schutte et al.'s (1998) 33-item Assessing Emotions Scale was used to measure emotional intelligence (see Appendix A2). This scale is based on Salovey and Mayer's (1990) model of emotional intelligence, and measures an individual's perceived ability to accurately appraise, regulate, and use emotions in themselves and others (e.g. "I know why my emotions change"). Participants rated their level of agreement to each item on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The Assessing Emotions Scale has excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .90$ ; Gough et al., 2015; Schutte et al., 1998), and adequate test-retest reliability ( $r = .78$ ; Schutte et al., 1998).

**Psychopathy.** Levenson's Self Report Psychopathy Scale (see Appendix A3; Levenson et al., 1995) was used to assess individuals' primary and secondary psychopathy. Primary psychopathy was measured using 16 items that assess individuals' deceptiveness and callousness (e.g. "My main purpose in life is getting as many goodies as I can"). Individuals' secondary psychopathy was assessed with 10 items related to antisocial behaviour and anxiety (e.g. "I don't plan anything very far in advance"). Participants were required to rate their level of agreement to each item on a 4-point scale (1 = *disagree strongly*, 4 = *agree strongly*). Internal consistency has been found to be good for the primary psychopathy subscale ( $\alpha =$

.86; Austin, Saklofske, Smith, & Tohver, 2014; Gough et al., 2015), and adequate for the secondary psychopathy subscale ( $\alpha = .62$ ; Levenson et al., 1995).

**Machiavellianism.** The Mach IV (Christie & Geis, 1970; see Appendix A4) is a 20-item scale that was used to measure Machiavellianism. Participants responded to items relating to deceitfulness using a 5-point Likert scale (e.g. “It is wise to flatter important people”; 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). The Mach IV has been found to have acceptable to good internal consistency ( $\alpha = .78$ ; Austin et al., 2014).

**Narcissism.** Pincus et al.’s (2009) Pathological Narcissism Inventory comprises 52 items that measure grandiose (18 items, e.g. “I often fantasise about being recognised for my accomplishments”) and vulnerable (34 items, e.g. “I often hide my needs for fear that others will see me as needy and dependent”) narcissism, and can be seen in see Appendix A5. Participants responded to items on a 6-point Likert scale (0 = *not at all like me*, 5 = *very much like me*). Internal consistency of the grandiose and vulnerable narcissism subscales has been found to be good ( $\alpha$ s = .88 and .85, respectively; Besser & Zeigler-Hill, 2011).

**Sadism.** The Short Sadistic Impulse Scale (SSIS; O’Meara, Davies, & Hammond, 2011) is a 10-item measure of sadistic tendencies that was derived from the 49-item Sadistic Attitudes and Behaviours Scale (Davies & Hand, 2003). The SSIS utilises a dichotomous response format. For the current study, a 6-point Likert scale was used (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*), as response formats with fewer response options (e.g. two) have been found to reduce the test-retest reliability, internal consistency (Preston & Colman, 2000), and variance of scales (Lozano, García-Cueto, & Muñiz, 2008). The SSIS has been found to have good internal consistency when a Likert scale response style is used ( $\alpha = .88$ ; Buckels et al., 2014). An example item is “Hurting people would be exciting” (see Appendix A6).

**General self-efficacy.** The 10-item General Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) was utilised to assess individuals' perceived general self-efficacy (Appendix A7). Participants rated items on a 4-point Likert scale (e.g. "I can usually handle whatever comes my way"; 1 = *not at all true*, 4 = *exactly true*). Internal consistency of the scale is good ( $\alpha = .82$ ; Leganger, Kraft, & Røysamb, 2000).

**Social self-efficacy.** The Cognitive-Behavioural Social Self-Efficacy Scale (Grieve, Witteveen, Tolan, & Jacobson, 2014) comprises 18 items that assess individuals' perceived social confidence and skill, and is presented in Appendix A8. Participants were required to rate their level of confidence in relation to each item on a 5-point Likert scale (e.g. "Anticipate the things people do"; 1 = *not at all confident*, 5 = *very confident*). Internal consistency of the scale is excellent ( $\alpha = .94$ ; Grieve et al., 2014).

**Trait emotional manipulation.** Austin et al.'s (2007) 10-item emotional manipulation subscale was used to measure trait emotional manipulation, and can be seen in Appendix A9. Participants rated the items on a 5-point Likert scale (e.g. "I can pay someone compliments to get in their 'good books'"; 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). Internal consistency is excellent ( $\alpha = .92$  to  $.93$ ; Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013).

**Willingness to emotionally manipulate.** Hyde and Grieve's (2014) modified version of Austin et al.'s (2007) 10-item emotional manipulation subscale was used to assess the frequency of participants' use of emotional manipulation (see Appendix A10). Participants were required to respond on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *never*, 5 = *daily*). An example item is "How often do you pay someone compliments to get in their 'good books'?". Internal consistency of the modified emotional manipulation scale is good ( $\alpha = .81$ ; Abell et al., 2016).

## **Procedure**

This study gained ethical approval from the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number: H14933; see Appendix B). First year psychology students from University of Tasmania were recruited through an online research participation portal. All other participants were recruited through poster advertisements placed in public areas at University of Tasmania, or advertisements shared on social media sites such as Facebook (Appendix C). Information presented in the advertisements instructed participants to go to the link provided to begin the questionnaire.

The first page of the questionnaire comprised an information sheet about the study (Appendix D). Participants were informed to click 'Next' at the end of the information sheet page if they consented to completing the study. Participants who did not wish to complete the study were able to exit the questionnaire at any time. The questionnaire was completed at a time and place of the participants' choosing, and took approximately 30 minutes to complete. As part of a follow up study not discussed in this thesis, participants provided an anonymous letter-number code comprised of their mother's first initial, and the final four digits of their phone number at the end of the questionnaire. This code was used to link participants' answers to a follow up study. At the conclusion of the follow up study, first year University of Tasmania psychology students were eligible to receive course credit. All other participants had the opportunity to win one of three gift vouchers valued at \$150, \$100, or \$50.

## **Results**

### **Assumption Testing**

Case-wise diagnostics identified 28 outliers (19 female, 9 male; standard

residual > 2; Field, 2013). These cases were excluded from further analyses, as they were found to have undue influence on the results when regression analyses were run with and without these cases. Chi-square tests of independence were run to determine whether any systematic differences were present in the data. Significantly more students in the sample were female than male, Pearson  $\chi^2 (1, N = 381) = 4.87, p = .027$ .

All regression analyses assumptions were tested. Durbin-Watson statistics indicated presence of independence of errors for male and female data for both trait emotional manipulation ( $d = 1.83, d = 2.09$ , respectively) and willingness to emotionally manipulate regressions ( $d = 1.98, d = 1.82$ , respectively). Multicollinearity was not present in the current sample, as all variance inflation factors (VIFs) were well below ten, and all tolerance statistics were greater than .2 (highest VIF = 3.35; lowest tolerance = .30). Correlations between variables were consistent with previous research (Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). Linearity and homoscedasticity assumptions were met for all regression analyses with both genders based on randomly evenly distributed data points on scatterplots. Normal distribution of residuals was present based on histograms and normal probability plots.

### **Descriptive Statistics**

Table 1 displays descriptive scores on all measures for males and females. Mean scores and gender differences on trait emotional manipulation, willingness to emotionally manipulate, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, general self-efficacy were in line with previous research (e.g. Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013; Hyde & Grieve, 2014; Luszczynska, Scholz, & Schwarzer, 2005). Internal reliabilities for all measures were adequate to excellent, and are also

presented in Table 1. The internal reliabilities for the secondary psychopathy and Machiavellianism measures were low, but this was consistent with previous research (Austin et al., 2007; Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013).

Table 1

*Mean Scores and Internal Reliabilities for All Measures by Gender*

|  | Male               | Female             | Male                | Female |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------|
|  | Mean ( <i>SD</i> ) | Mean ( <i>SD</i> ) | Cronbach's $\alpha$ |        |
| Trait emotional manipulation             | 31.18 (8.37)       | 27.36 (8.72)       | .90                 | .91    |
| Willingness to emotionally<br>manipulate | 20.28 (6.40)       | 17.28 (5.30)       | .87                 | .86    |
| Emotional intelligence                   | 117.01 (16.05)     | 122.62 (14.88)     | .90                 | .89    |
| Primary psychopathy                      | 29.38 (7.89)       | 26.70 (8.35)       | .88                 | .90    |
| Secondary psychopathy                    | 21.12 (4.71)       | 20.64 (4.41)       | .72                 | .67    |
| Machiavellianism                         | 55.45 (9.16)       | 53.87 (8.14)       | .75                 | .69    |
| Grandiose narcissism                     | 2.59 (0.85)        | 2.56 (0.87)        | .90                 | .90    |
| Vulnerable narcissism                    | 2.06 (0.92)        | 2.28 (0.87)        | .96                 | .95    |
| Sadism                                   | 19.71 (9.82)       | 15.57 (7.53)       | .89                 | .88    |
| General self-efficacy                    | 30.31 (4.81)       | 29.79 (4.68)       | .89                 | .88    |
| Social self-efficacy                     | 60.29 (11.27)      | 63.00 (11.48)      | .91                 | .93    |

Independent *t*-tests were conducted on all measures to identify any significant differences in scores between genders. Table 2 displays the results of these *t*-tests. Family wise error rates due to multiple comparisons were controlled using a Bonferroni correction ( $\alpha = .05/11 = .005$ ).

Table 2  
*Results of t-tests Showing Differences on Measures Between Males and Females*

|                                       | <i>t</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | Cohen's <i>d</i> | Lower                   | Upper |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|------------------|-------------------------|-------|
|                                       |          |           |          |                  | 95% Confidence Interval |       |
| Trait emotional manipulation          | 4.16     | 379       | <.001    | 0.43             | 2.01                    | 5.63  |
| Willingness to emotionally manipulate | 4.91     | 379       | <.001    | 0.50             | 1.77                    | 4.20  |
| Emotional intelligence                | -3.43    | 379       | .001     | -0.35            | -8.83                   | -2.39 |
| Primary psychopathy                   | 3.06     | 379       | .002     | 0.31             | 0.96                    | 4.40  |
| Secondary psychopathy                 | .99      | 379       | .324     | 0.10             | -0.47                   | 1.43  |
| Machiavellianism                      | 1.73     | 379       | .084     | 0.18             | -0.21                   | 3.37  |
| Grandiose narcissism                  | .32      | 379       | .748     | 0.03             | -2.73                   | 3.79  |
| Vulnerable narcissism                 | -2.31    | 379       | .022     | -0.24            | -13.79                  | -1.10 |
| Sadism                                | 4.60     | 379       | <.001    | 0.47             | 2.37                    | 5.91  |
| General self-efficacy                 | 1.02     | 379       | .307     | 0.10             | -0.48                   | 1.51  |
| Social self-efficacy                  | -2.22    | 379       | .027     | -0.23            | -5.10                   | -0.31 |

*Note.*  $\alpha = .005$ , to adjust for multiple comparisons.

Table 3

*Bivariate Correlations Between All Measures (correlations below the diagonal are for males, above the diagonal are for females).*

|                              | EMT    | EMW    | EI      | PP     | SP      | MA      | GN     | VN     | SA      | GSE     | SSE     |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| Trait emotional manipulation | -      | .62*** | .10     | .45*** | .30***  | .47***  | .50*** | .42*** | .39***  | .12*    | .16**   |
| Willingness to EM            | .60**  | -      | -.11*   | .62*** | .36***  | .43***  | .45*** | .49*** | .63***  | -.04    | -.04    |
| Emotional intelligence       | .19*   | .05    | -       | -.16*  | -.39*** | -.30*** | .19**  | -.21** | -.26*** | .56***  | .67***  |
| Primary psychopathy          | .39*** | .60*** | -.13    | -      | .45***  | .52***  | .39*** | .45*** | .59***  | -.03    | -.09    |
| Secondary psychopathy        | .20**  | .46*** | -.37*** | .47*** | -       | .38***  | .29*** | .51*** | .39***  | -.37*** | -.33*** |
| Machiavellianism             | .32*** | .33*** | -.35*** | .51*** | .40***  | -       | .19**  | .36*** | .44***  | -.08    | -.24*** |
| Grandiose narcissism         | .45*** | .47*** | .26**   | .38*** | .25**   | .25**   | -      | .69*** | .23***  | .06     | .18**   |
| Vulnerable narcissism        | .30*** | .54*** | -.06    | .55*** | .49***  | .42***  | .72*** | -      | .33***  | -.17**  | -.20**  |
| Sadism                       | .35*** | .57*** | -.07    | .56*** | .45***  | .46***  | .45*** | .52*** | -       | -.15*   | -.19**  |
| General self-efficacy        | .26**  | .06    | .38***  | .01    | -.23**  | -.07    | .19*   | -.14   | .04     | -       | .45***  |
| Social self-efficacy         | .34*** | .18*   | .68***  | .01    | -.21**  | -.12    | .42*** | .10    | .14     | .36***  | -       |

*Note.* EMT = trait emotional manipulation; EMW = willingness to emotionally manipulate; EI = emotional intelligence; PP = primary psychopathy; SP = secondary psychopathy; MA = Machiavellianism; GN = grandiose narcissism; VN = vulnerable narcissism; SA = sadism; GSE = general self-efficacy; SSE = social self-efficacy. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Females scored significantly higher on emotional intelligence than males, representing a small effect (Cohen, 1992). Males scored significantly higher than females on willingness to emotionally manipulate, which was a medium effect; higher on trait emotional manipulation and sadism, representing small to medium effects; and higher on primary psychopathy, a small effect. There were no significant differences between genders on secondary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, general self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy, and these differences represented small effects.

The full correlation matrix for all variables for males and females is displayed in Table 3. Bivariate correlations were consistent with previous findings (Chabrol et al., 2009; Grieve et al., 2014; Hyde & Grieve, 2014; O'Connor & Athota, 2013).

### **Regression Analyses**

**Trait emotional manipulation.** Table 4 and Table 5 show the results from the four step multiple hierarchical regression analyses with trait emotional manipulation as the outcome variable for males and females, respectively.

**Males.** In the first step, emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism accounted for 25.4% of variance in trait emotional manipulation,  $R = .53$ ,  $F(4, 131) = 12.49$ ,  $p < .001$ , and represented a large effect size ( $f^2 = 0.34$ ). Being higher in emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy and Machiavellianism significantly predicted trait emotional manipulation.

Table 4  
*Full Multiple Regression Showing Relationships of Predictor Variables with Trait Emotional Manipulation for Males*

| Model                 | <i>B</i>               | <i>SE</i> | Beta | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | 95% Confidence Interval for <i>B</i> |        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------|------|----------|----------|--------------------------------------|--------|
|                       |                        |           |      |          |          | Lower                                | Upper  |
| Step 1                | Constant               | 8.07      |      | -2.04    | .043     | -32.41                               | -0.50  |
|                       | Emotional intelligence | 0.19      | 0.36 | 4.27     | <.001    | 0.10                                 | 0.27   |
|                       | Primary psychopathy    | 0.27      | 0.10 | 2.70     | .008     | 0.07                                 | 0.46   |
|                       | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.19      | 0.16 | 1.17     | .243     | -0.13                                | 0.51   |
|                       | Machiavellianism       | 0.26      | 0.08 | 3.03     | .003     | 0.09                                 | 0.41   |
| Step 2                | Constant               | 8.18      |      | -1.43    | .154     | -27.92                               | 4.46   |
|                       | Emotional intelligence | 0.12      | 0.23 | 2.51     | .013     | 0.03                                 | 0.21   |
|                       | Primary psychopathy    | 0.25      | 0.10 | 2.54     | .012     | 0.06                                 | 0.45   |
|                       | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.18      | 0.16 | 1.09     | .278     | -0.15                                | 0.50   |
|                       | Machiavellianism       | 0.23      | 0.08 | 2.74     | .007     | 0.06                                 | 0.39   |
| Step 3                | Grandiose narcissism   | 3.78      | 0.38 | 3.34     | .001     | 1.54                                 | 6.02   |
|                       | Vulnerable narcissism  | -2.23     | 1.12 | -1.98    | .050     | -4.45                                | -0.004 |
|                       | Constant               | -10.85    | 8.39 | -1.29    | .198     | -27.45                               | 5.75   |
|                       | Emotional intelligence | 0.12      | 0.05 | 2.45     | .015     | 0.02                                 | 0.21   |
|                       | Primary psychopathy    | 0.24      | 0.10 | 2.30     | .023     | 0.03                                 | 0.45   |
| Secondary psychopathy | 0.16                   | 0.17      | 0.97 | .336     | -0.17    | 0.49                                 |        |
| Machiavellianism      | 0.22                   | 0.09      | 2.58 | .011     | 0.05     | 0.39                                 |        |
| Grandiose narcissism  | 3.69                   | 1.15      | 3.21 | .002     | 1.42     | 5.96                                 |        |

(continued)

| Model                  | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | Beta  | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | 95% Confidence Interval for <i>B</i> |       |
|------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------|
|                        |          |           |       |          |          | Lower                                | Upper |
| Vulnerable narcissism  | -2.25    | 1.13      | -0.25 | -2.00    | .048     | -4.48                                | -0.02 |
| Sadism                 | 0.04     | 0.08      | 0.05  | 0.50     | .617     | -0.12                                | 0.20  |
| Step 4 Constant        | -15.47   | 8.67      |       | -1.79    | .077     | -32.62                               | 1.68  |
| Emotional intelligence | 0.04     | 0.06      | 0.08  | 0.72     | .474     | -0.07                                | 0.15  |
| Primary psychopathy    | 0.23     | 0.10      | 0.22  | 2.21     | .029     | 0.02                                 | 0.04  |
| Secondary psychopathy  | 0.21     | 0.17      | 0.12  | 1.29     | .200     | -0.12                                | 0.54  |
| Machiavellianism       | 0.20     | 0.08      | 0.022 | 2.43     | .017     | 0.04                                 | 0.37  |
| Grandiose narcissism   | 2.58     | 1.21      | 0.26  | 2.12     | .036     | 0.18                                 | 4.98  |
| Vulnerable narcissism  | -1.48    | 1.17      | -0.16 | -1.26    | .211     | -3.80                                | 0.85  |
| Sadism                 | 0.01     | 0.08      | 0.01  | 0.15     | .881     | -0.15                                | 0.17  |
| General self-efficacy  | 0.22     | 0.15      | 0.13  | 1.50     | .135     | -0.07                                | 0.51  |
| Social self-efficacy   | 0.15     | 0.08      | 0.20  | 1.90     | .060     | -0.01                                | 0.30  |

Note. Adjusted  $R^2 = .25$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .06$  for Step 2 ( $p = .005$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .001$  for Step 3 ( $p = .617$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .03$  for Step 4 ( $p = .044$ ).

Including grandiose narcissism and vulnerable narcissism in the second step accounted for 30.3% of variance in trait emotional manipulation,  $R = .58$ ,  $F(6, 129) = 10.79$ ,  $p < .001$ ; an additional 5.8% of variance, and a large effect ( $f^2 = 0.43$ ). This was a significant improvement,  $\Delta R^2 = .06$ ,  $\Delta F(2, 129) = 5.62$ ,  $p = .005$ . Higher emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and grandiose narcissism significantly predicted trait emotional manipulation.

The inclusion of sadism in the third step accounted for an additional 0.1%,  $\Delta R^2 = .001$ ,  $\Delta F(1, 128) = .25$ ,  $p = .617$ , a nonsignificant amount. Total variance explained with sadism in the model was 29.9%,  $R = .58$ ,  $F(7, 128) = 9.23$ ,  $p < .001$ , a large effect ( $f^2 = 0.43$ ). Being more emotionally intelligent, and higher in primary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, and vulnerable narcissism significantly predicted trait emotional manipulation.

With the inclusion of general self-efficacy and social self-efficacy in the final step, 32.3% total variance was explained,  $R = .61$ ,  $F(9, 126) = 8.14$ ,  $p < .001$ . This was a large effect ( $f^2 = 0.48$ ). These variables accounted for an additional 3.2% of variance, a significant amount,  $\Delta R^2 = .03$ ,  $\Delta F(2, 126) = 3.21$ ,  $p = .044$ . Within the final model, being higher in primary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and grandiose narcissism significantly predicted trait emotional manipulation.

**Females.** The first step of the regression, comprising emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism explained 35.2% of variance in trait emotional manipulation,  $R = .60$ ,  $F(4, 240) = 34.15$ ,  $p < .001$ ; a large effect ( $f^2 = 0.54$ ). All variables significantly and positively predicted trait emotional manipulation.

Table 5  
*Full Multiple Regression Showing Relationships of Predictor Variables with Trait Emotional Manipulation for Females*

| Model                | B                      | SE     | Beta | t     | p     | 95% Confidence Interval for B |        |
|----------------------|------------------------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------------------------------|--------|
|                      |                        |        |      |       |       | Lower                         | Upper  |
| Step 1               | Constant               | 6.37   |      | -4.80 | <.001 | -43.11                        | -18.01 |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | 0.19   | 0.32 | 5.54  | <.001 | 0.12                          | 0.25   |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.24   | 0.07 | 3.56  | <.001 | 0.11                          | 0.37   |
|                      | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.33   | 0.12 | 2.68  | .008  | 0.09                          | 0.57   |
| Step 2               | Machiavellianism       | 0.41   | 0.38 | 6.06  | <.001 | 0.28                          | 0.54   |
|                      | Constant               | -24.43 | 6.19 | -3.95 | <.001 | -36.62                        | -12.25 |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | 0.13   | 0.04 | 3.62  | <.001 | 0.06                          | 0.20   |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.14   | 0.07 | 2.10  | .037  | 0.01                          | 0.27   |
| Step 3               | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.14   | 0.07 | 1.14  | .257  | -0.10                         | 0.39   |
|                      | Machiavellianism       | 0.39   | 0.06 | 6.13  | <.001 | 0.27                          | 0.51   |
|                      | Grandiose narcissism   | 2.84   | 0.77 | 3.68  | <.001 | 1.32                          | 4.36   |
|                      | Vulnerable narcissism  | 0.47   | 0.80 | 0.59  | .557  | -1.11                         | 2.06   |
|                      | Constant               | -24.99 | 6.11 | -4.09 | <.001 | -37.03                        | -12.96 |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | 0.14   | 0.04 | 4.00  | <.001 | 0.07                          | 0.21   |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.06   | 0.07 | 0.82  | .414  | -0.08                         | 0.20   |
|                      | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.11   | 0.12 | 0.92  | .357  | -0.13                         | 0.36   |
| Machiavellianism     | 0.37                   | 0.06   | 5.80 | <.001 | 0.24  | 0.50                          |        |
| Grandiose narcissism | 2.77                   | 0.76   | 3.64 | <.001 | 1.27  | 4.27                          |        |

(continued)

| Model                  | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | Beta | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | 95% Confidence Interval for <i>B</i> |        |
|------------------------|----------|-----------|------|----------|----------|--------------------------------------|--------|
|                        |          |           |      |          |          | Lower                                | Upper  |
| Vulnerable narcissism  | 0.50     | 0.79      | 0.05 | 0.63     | .528     | -1.06                                | 2.06   |
| Sadism                 | 0.20     | 0.07      | 0.17 | 2.73     | .007     | 0.05                                 | 0.34   |
| Step 4 Constant        | -28.18   | 6.18      |      | -4.56    | <.001    | -40.35                               | -16.01 |
| Emotional intelligence | 0.07     | 0.04      | 0.12 | 1.55     | .122     | -0.12                                | 0.15   |
| Primary psychopathy    | 0.04     | 0.07      | 0.04 | 0.52     | .607     | -0.10                                | 0.18   |
| Secondary psychopathy  | 0.18     | 0.13      | 0.09 | 1.41     | .160     | -0.07                                | 0.43   |
| Machiavellianism       | 0.37     | 0.06      | 0.34 | 5.80     | <.001    | 0.24                                 | 0.49   |
| Grandiose narcissism   | 2.40     | 0.77      | 0.24 | 3.13     | .002     | 0.89                                 | 3.90   |
| Vulnerable narcissism  | 0.85     | 0.79      | 0.09 | 1.07     | .284     | -0.71                                | 2.42   |
| Sadism                 | 0.20     | 0.07      | 0.18 | 2.86     | .005     | 0.06                                 | 0.34   |
| General self-efficacy  | 0.1      | 0.11      | 0.06 | 1.00     | .319     | -0.11                                | 0.33   |
| Social self-efficacy   | 0.13     | 0.05      | 0.17 | 2.60     | .010     | 0.03                                 | 0.23   |

Note. Adjusted  $R^2 = .35$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .07$  for Step 2 ( $p < .001$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .02$  for Step 3 ( $p = .007$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .02$  for Step 4 ( $p = .016$ ).

The inclusion of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism in the second step explained an additional 7.2% of variance, a significant amount,  $\Delta R^2 = .07$ ,  $\Delta F(2, 238) = 15.20$ ,  $p < .001$ . Total variance explained in the second step was 42.1%,  $R = .66$ ,  $F(6, 238) = 30.52$ ,  $p < .001$ , which was a very large effect ( $f^2 = 0.73$ ). Higher emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and grandiose narcissism significantly predicted trait emotional manipulation.

The third step inclusion of sadism accounted for 43.6% of variance in trait emotional manipulation,  $R = .67$ ,  $F(7, 237) = 27.94$ ,  $p < .001$ , a very large effect ( $f^2 = 0.77$ ). This was an additional 1.7% of variance; a significant amount,  $\Delta R^2 = .02$ ,  $\Delta F(1, 237) = 7.45$ ,  $p = .007$ . Being more emotionally intelligent, and higher on Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, and sadism significantly predicted trait emotional manipulation.

The inclusion of general self-efficacy and social self-efficacy in the final step accounted for an additional 1.9% of variance in trait emotional manipulation, which was a significant amount,  $\Delta R^2 = .02$ ,  $\Delta F(2, 235) = 4.22$ ,  $p = .016$ . The final model accounted for 45.1% of variance in trait emotional manipulation,  $R = .69$ ,  $F(9, 235) = 23.26$ ,  $p < .001$ ; an extremely large effect ( $f^2 = 0.82$ ). Within the final model, higher Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, sadism, and social self-efficacy significantly predicted trait emotional manipulation.

**Willingness to emotionally manipulate.** Results from the four step hierarchical regression analyses with willingness to emotionally manipulate as the outcome variable for males and females are presented in Table 6 and Table 7, respectively.

**Males.** In the first step, emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism accounted for 42.9% of variance in

willingness to emotionally manipulate,  $R = .67$ ,  $F(4, 131) = 26.31$ ,  $p < .001$ . This was a very large effect ( $f^2 = 0.75$ ). Being more emotionally intelligent, higher in primary and secondary psychopathy significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate.

With the inclusion of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism in the second step, an additional 3.3% of variance was explained,  $\Delta R^2 = .03$ ,  $\Delta F(2, 129) = 4.12$ ,  $p = .019$ . Total variance explained in the second step was 45.4%,  $R = .69$ ,  $F(6, 129) = 19.75$ ,  $p < .001$ ; an extremely large effect ( $f^2 = 0.83$ ). Higher emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, and secondary psychopathy significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate.

In the third step, the inclusion of sadism accounted for an additional 2.9% of variance in willingness to emotionally manipulate; a significant amount,  $\Delta R^2 = .03$ ,  $\Delta F(1, 128) = 7.62$ ,  $p = .007$ . Total variance explained in the third step was 48.1%,  $R = .71$ ,  $F(7, 128) = 18.88$ ,  $p < .001$ , comprising an extremely large effect,  $f^2 = 0.93$ . Higher emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and sadism significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate.

The addition of general self-efficacy and social self-efficacy in the final model accounted for an additional 0.4% of variance, a nonsignificant amount,  $\Delta R^2 = .004$ ,  $\Delta F(2, 126) = 0.50$ ,  $p = .608$ . The final model accounted for 47.7% of variance in willingness to emotionally manipulate, a slight reduction from the third step,  $R = .72$ ,  $F(9, 126) = 14.68$ ,  $p < .001$ , and representing an extremely large effect ( $f^2 = 0.91$ ). Within the final model, higher primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and sadism significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate.

Table 6  
*Full Multiple Regression Showing Relationships of Predictor Variables with Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate for Males*

| Model                |                        | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | Beta  | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | 95% Confidence Interval for <i>B</i> |       |
|----------------------|------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------|
|                      |                        |          |           |       |          |          | Lower                                | Upper |
| Step 1               | Constant               | -13.65   | 5.39      |       | -2.53    | .013     | -24.33                               | -2.98 |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | 0.10     | 0.03      | 0.25  | 3.41     | .001     | 0.04                                 | 0.16  |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.36     | 0.07      | 0.45  | 5.53     | <.001    | 0.23                                 | 0.49  |
|                      | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.42     | 0.11      | 0.31  | 3.95     | <.001    | 0.21                                 | 0.64  |
| Step 2               | Machiavellianism       | 0.05     | 0.06      | 0.07  | 0.86     | .392     | -0.06                                | 0.16  |
|                      | Constant               | -8.85    | 5.53      |       | -1.60    | .112     | -19.80                               | 2.09  |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | 0.07     | 0.03      | 0.17  | 2.18     | .031     | 0.01                                 | 0.13  |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.31     | 0.07      | 0.38  | 4.52     | <.001    | 0.17                                 | 0.44  |
| Step 3               | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.33     | 0.11      | 0.24  | 2.97     | .004     | 0.11                                 | 0.55  |
|                      | Machiavellianism       | 0.02     | 0.06      | 0.02  | 0.28     | .783     | -0.10                                | 0.13  |
|                      | Grandiose narcissism   | 0.91     | 0.77      | 0.12  | 1.19     | .236     | -0.60                                | 2.42  |
|                      | Vulnerable narcissism  | 0.90     | 0.76      | 0.13  | 1.18     | .240     | -0.61                                | 2.40  |
|                      | Constant               | -5.67    | 5.52      |       | -1.03    | .306     | -16.58                               | 5.25  |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | 0.06     | 0.03      | 0.16  | 2.05     | .042     | 0.002                                | 0.13  |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.26     | 0.07      | 0.31  | 3.71     | <.001    | 0.12                                 | 0.39  |
|                      | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.27     | 0.11      | 0.20  | 2.44     | .016     | 0.05                                 | 0.49  |
| Machiavellianism     | -0.02                  | 0.06     | -0.02     | -0.26 | .795     | -0.13    | 0.10                                 |       |
| Grandiose narcissism | 0.58                   | 0.76     | 0.08      | 0.77  | .444     | -0.90    | 2.08                                 |       |

(continued)

| Model  | <i>B</i>               | <i>SE</i> | Beta | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | 95% Confidence Interval for <i>B</i> |       |
|--------|------------------------|-----------|------|----------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------|
|        |                        |           |      |          |          | Lower                                | Upper |
| Step 4 | Vulnerable narcissism  | 0.81      | 0.12 | 1.09     | .279     | -0.67                                | 2.27  |
|        | Sadism                 | 0.15      | 0.05 | 2.76     | .007     | 0.04                                 | 0.26  |
|        | Constant               | -6.86     | 5.82 | -1.18    | .240     | -18.38                               | 4.65  |
|        | Emotional intelligence | 0.04      | 0.04 | 1.14     | .255     | -0.03                                | 0.12  |
|        | Primary psychopathy    | 0.25      | 0.07 | 3.63     | <.001    | 0.11                                 | 0.39  |
|        | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.28      | 0.11 | 2.53     | .013     | 0.06                                 | 0.50  |
|        | Machiavellianism       | -0.02     | 0.06 | -0.33    | .740     | -0.13                                | 0.09  |
|        | Grandiose narcissism   | 0.29      | 0.82 | 0.35     | .725     | -1.33                                | 1.90  |
|        | Vulnerable narcissism  | 1.01      | 0.79 | 1.28     | .204     | -0.55                                | 2.57  |
|        | Sadism                 | 0.14      | 0.06 | 2.58     | .011     | 0.03                                 | 0.25  |
|        | General self-efficacy  | 0.06      | 0.10 | 0.58     | .567     | -0.14                                | 0.25  |
|        | Social self-efficacy   | 0.04      | 0.05 | 0.77     | .445     | -0.06                                | 0.14  |

*Note.* Adjusted  $R^2 = .43$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .05$  for Step 2 ( $p = .019$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .03$  for Step 3 ( $p = .007$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .004$  for Step 4 ( $p = .608$ ).

**Females.** In the first step, emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism explained 39.1% of variance,  $R = .63$ ,  $F(4, 240) = 40.15$ ,  $p < .001$ , a very large effect ( $f^2 = 0.64$ ). Higher primary psychopathy and Machiavellianism significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate.

The inclusion of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism to the other variables in the second step explained 44.6% of variance,  $R = .68$ ,  $F(6, 238) = 33.75$ ,  $p < .001$ , representing a very large effect ( $f^2 = 0.81$ ). The narcissism variables accounted for an additional 5.9% of variance, which was a significant amount,  $\Delta R^2 = .06$ ,  $\Delta F(2, 238) = 12.95$ ,  $p < .001$ . Higher primary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and grandiose narcissism significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate.

Sadism was included in the third step, and accounted for an additional 10% of variance; a significant amount,  $\Delta R^2 = .10$ ,  $\Delta F(1, 237) = 53.63$ ,  $p < .001$ . Total variance explained in the third step was 54.6%,  $R = .75$ ,  $F(7, 237) = 42.99$ ,  $p < .001$ , which was an extremely large effect,  $f^2 = 1.20$ . In the third step, higher primary psychopathy, grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, and sadism significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate.

The inclusion of general self-efficacy and social self-efficacy in the final step did not significantly increase the total variance explained,  $\Delta R^2 = .003$ ,  $\Delta F(2, 235) = 0.76$ ,  $p = .471$ . Total variance explained in the final model was 54.5%,  $R = .75$ ,  $F(9, 235) = 33.53$ ,  $p < .001$ , also representing an extremely large effect ( $f^2 = 1.20$ ). In the final model, primary psychopathy, grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, and sadism significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate.

Table 7  
*Full Multiple Regression Showing Relationships of Predictor Variables with Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate for Females*

| Model                |                        | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | Beta  | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | 95% Confidence Interval for <i>B</i> |       |
|----------------------|------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------|
|                      |                        |          |           |       |          |          | Lower                                | Upper |
| Step 1               | Constant               | -0.54    | 3.75      |       | -0.15    | .885     | -7.94                                | 6.85  |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | 0.02     | 0.02      | 0.05  | 0.84     | .401     | -0.02                                | 0.06  |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.32     | 0.04      | 0.51  | 8.22     | <.001    | 0.25                                 | 0.40  |
|                      | Secondary psychopathy  | 0.10     | 0.07      | 0.09  | 1.43     | .153     | -0.04                                | 0.25  |
| Step 2               | Machiavellianism       | 0.09     | 0.04      | 0.14  | 2.33     | .020     | 0.01                                 | 0.17  |
|                      | Constant               | 2.01     | 3.68      |       | 0.55     | .584     | -5.23                                | 9.26  |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | -0.01    | 0.02      | -0.01 | -0.22    | .823     | -0.05                                | 0.04  |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.27     | 0.04      | 0.43  | 6.90     | <.001    | 0.19                                 | 0.35  |
| Step 3               | Secondary psychopathy  | -0.02    | 0.07      | -0.01 | -0.24    | .814     | -0.16                                | 0.13  |
|                      | Machiavellianism       | 0.08     | 0.04      | 0.12  | 2.09     | .037     | 0.01                                 | 0.16  |
|                      | Grandiose narcissism   | 1.05     | 0.046     | 0.17  | 2.29     | .023     | 0.15                                 | 1.95  |
|                      | Vulnerable narcissism  | 0.89     | 0.48      | 0.15  | 1.85     | .065     | -0.06                                | 1.83  |
|                      | Constant               | 1.19     | 3.33      |       | 0.36     | .720     | -5.36                                | 7.75  |
|                      | Emotional intelligence | 0.01     | 0.02      | 0.04  | 0.74     | .461     | -0.02                                | 0.05  |
|                      | Primary psychopathy    | 0.15     | 0.04      | 0.24  | 3.94     | <.001    | 0.08                                 | 0.23  |
|                      | Secondary psychopathy  | -0.06    | 0.07      | -0.05 | -0.87    | .387     | -0.19                                | 0.07  |
| Machiavellianism     | 0.05                   | 0.04     | 0.07      | 1.33  | .184     | -0.02    | 0.12                                 |       |
| Grandiose narcissism | 0.95                   | 0.42     | 0.16      | 2.29  | .023     | 0.13     | 1.76                                 |       |

(continued)

| Model  | <i>B</i>               | <i>SE</i> | Beta | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | 95% Confidence Interval for <i>B</i> |       |      |
|--------|------------------------|-----------|------|----------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------|------|
|        |                        |           |      |          |          | Lower                                | Upper |      |
| Step 4 | Vulnerable narcissism  | 0.93      | 0.43 | 0.15     | 2.15     | .033                                 | 0.08  | 1.78 |
|        | Sadism                 | 0.29      | 0.04 | 0.41     | 7.32     | <.001                                | 0.21  | 0.36 |
|        | Constant               | 0.61      | 3.42 |          | 0.18     | .859                                 | -6.12 | 7.34 |
|        | Emotional intelligence | -0.001    | 0.02 | -0.004   | -0.05    | .958                                 | -0.05 | 0.05 |
|        | Primary psychopathy    | 0.15      | 0.04 | 0.24     | 3.80     | <.001                                | 0.07  | 0.23 |
|        | Secondary psychopathy  | -0.05     | 0.07 | -0.04    | -0.69    | .493                                 | -0.19 | 0.09 |
|        | Machiavellianism       | 0.05      | 0.04 | 0.07     | 1.35     | .179                                 | -0.02 | 0.12 |
|        | Grandiose narcissism   | 0.85      | 0.42 | 0.14     | 2.01     | .046                                 | 0.02  | 1.68 |
|        | Vulnerable narcissism  | 1.02      | 0.44 | 0.17     | 2.32     | .022                                 | 0.15  | 1.88 |
|        | Sadism                 | 0.29      | 0.04 | 0.41     | 7.34     | <.001                                | 0.21  | 0.36 |
|        | General self-efficacy  | 0.01      | 0.06 | 0.01     | 0.12     | .904                                 | -0.11 | 0.13 |
|        | Social self-efficacy   | 0.03      | 0.03 | 0.07     | 1.20     | .230                                 | -0.02 | 0.09 |

*Note.* Adjusted  $R^2 = .39$  for Step 1 ( $p < .001$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .06$  for Step 2 ( $p < .001$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .10$  for Step 3 ( $p < .001$ );  $\Delta R^2 = .003$  for Step 4 ( $p = .471$ ).

## **Discussion**

The aim of the current research was to extend research into the mechanisms underpinning emotional manipulation by considering both trait emotional manipulation and the willingness to emotionally manipulate others. The possible contribution of sadism and social self-efficacy was examined for the first time in this study. As hypothesised, the combination of emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, sadism, general self-efficacy, and emotional self-efficacy significantly predicted both trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate for both males and females. However, when all variables were included together, different predictors made significant contributions for trait emotion manipulation compared to willingness to emotionally manipulate, and this varied between genders.

### **Trait Emotional Manipulation**

The hypothesis that emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism would significantly predict trait emotional manipulation was supported for females. Secondary psychopathy did not predict males' trait emotional manipulation. These findings are mostly consistent with research by Gough et al. (2015), Grieve and Mahar (2010), and Grieve and Panebianco (2013), with the exception of secondary psychopathy not predicting trait emotional manipulation for males. Secondary psychopathy may have been a significant predictor for females only due to the underlying anxiety associated with secondary psychopathy (Levenson et al., 1995), and Grieve and Panebianco and Richardson and Green's (2003) link between indirect aggression and anxiety in social situations for females. Specifically, it may be that females who are

uncomfortable within a social situation think that they need to engage in emotional manipulation to be successful, and reduce their anxiety in these interactions.

The hypothesis that grandiose and vulnerable narcissism would significantly predict trait emotional manipulation was partially supported. Grandiose narcissism predicted trait emotional manipulation for both genders. This supports findings by Gough et al. (2015) who suggested that narcissistic individuals emotionally manipulate others in order to gain power over them, and is consistent with the dominance of others seen in individuals high in grandiose narcissism (Miller et al., 2011). Further, Vonk, Zeigler-Hill, Mayhew, and Mercer (2013) have suggested that grandiose narcissists manipulate others using their social skills, in order to successfully navigate and progress within social contexts.

Vulnerable narcissism did not significantly predict trait emotional manipulation for females in any step of the regression analysis, and initially did not predict trait emotional manipulation for males. However, following the inclusion of sadism, vulnerable narcissism did significantly predict trait emotional manipulation for males. Interestingly, lower levels of vulnerable narcissism significantly predicted trait emotional manipulation. Thus, the fewer feelings of inadequacy experienced by males, the more likely they were to believe that they would be able to emotionally manipulate others. This may be due to males who have a more stable self-concept being more likely to believe that they are able to emotionally manipulate others. Conversely, males with a more unstable self-concept, such as those high in vulnerable narcissism, have reduced belief in their abilities to successfully do anything, including engage in emotional manipulation. This likely reflects the general dissatisfaction that individuals high in vulnerable narcissism possess about themselves (Bosson et al., 2008). It would be beneficial to expand on the specific

role of vulnerable narcissism in future research.

The hypothesis that sadism would significantly predict trait emotional manipulation was supported for females, but not for males. This is consistent with findings by Buckels et al. (2014) and Schmeelk et al. (2008) that linked sadism with manipulative behaviours such as online trolling, and gossiping. That sadism predicted trait emotional manipulation for females, but not males may underlie a distinction between males' and females' belief in their emotional manipulation skills. Specifically, sadistic females who are more likely to humiliate and dominate others for their own pleasure or enjoyment are also more likely to believe they can emotionally manipulate others. Given Buckels et al.'s finding that individuals' enjoyment of trolling behaviours mediated the relationship between sadism and overall trolling behaviour; it may be that females', but not males' belief in their emotional manipulation skills is related to a sense of pleasure or enjoyment.

Primary psychopathy was no longer a significant predictor for females when sadism was included, perhaps indicating that females are more likely to believe they can emotionally manipulate others if they have more sadistic tendencies, rather than a more callous demeanour, as in primary psychopathy. This is in direct contrast to males' trait emotional manipulation, whereby it seems that males higher in callous, antisocial characteristics are more likely to self-report higher emotional manipulation skills. This highlights the different mechanisms that underlie trait emotional manipulation for males and females, especially within the Dark Tetrad of personality.

With all variables included, the hypothesis that general self-efficacy would predict trait emotional manipulation for females only, and social self-efficacy would significantly predict trait emotional manipulation over and above the other variables was partially supported. Social self-efficacy significantly predicted trait emotional

manipulation for females, indicating that those individuals who perceive their social skills to be higher, also believe that they are able to engage in emotional manipulation. This finding is in contrast with Gough et al.'s (2015) suggestion that a perceived lack of social skills may lead females to emotional manipulation, but supports the notion that females higher in social self-efficacy likely have higher self-belief regarding engaging in emotional manipulation. It is unclear why social self-efficacy plays a role for female, but not male participants. Within the regression, social self-efficacy appears to have approached significance at a traditional alpha level of .05 ( $p = .060$ ) in the prediction of trait emotional manipulation for males. Thus, it may be that despite having enough power in the current study to be able to identify significant individual predictors (in line with Green, 1991), the effect size of the prediction of social self-efficacy may have been too small to reveal statistical significance in this instance.

As in previous research by Gough et al. (2015), Grieve and Mahar (2010), and Grieve and Panebianco (2013), emotional intelligence seems to have suppressed extraneous variance in the prediction of trait emotional manipulation for both males and females. This is shown through the low bivariate correlations between emotional intelligence and trait emotional manipulation, but initial significant influence within the regression models. Whereas in Gough et al.'s study, emotional intelligence seemed to suppress extraneous variance for secondary psychopathy, emotional intelligence seems to have performed a different function in the current study.

Given that emotional intelligence was a significant predictor of trait emotional manipulation until the final step of the regression analysis for both males and females, it seems plausible that the inclusion of the self-efficacy variables impacted the influence of emotional intelligence. Specifically, the contribution of

social self-efficacy to trait emotional manipulation was significant for females, and approached significance for males. Additionally, high (although not to the point of multicollinearity) bivariate correlations were found between emotional intelligence and social self-efficacy for males and females ( $r_s = .68$  and  $.67$ , respectively). Taken together, this indicates that emotional intelligence may have initially suppressed extraneous variance within the regression model that was later better accounted for by social self-efficacy. This may reflect the particularly social (or antisocial) nature of emotionally manipulative behaviours.

Overall, when considering trait emotional manipulation, it seems that both males' and females' belief in their ability to emotionally manipulate others is influenced by high Machiavellianism and grandiose narcissism. These findings are consistent with findings by Gough et al. (2015), and highlight the manipulative nature of emotional manipulation, as well as the desire for power and authority over others. That primary psychopathy predicted trait emotional manipulation for males and not females suggests that males who are more antisocial, callous, and have little remorse are more likely to believe they are able to engage in emotional manipulation. In contrast, females with more perceived social skills and those who seek to harm others for their own pleasure are more likely to believe in their ability to emotionally manipulate others. This represents a direct contrast between males and females, in that males seem to be more antisocially influenced, whereas females are more socially influenced.

### **Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate**

As hypothesised, the combination of emotional intelligence, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, and Machiavellianism significantly predicted participants' willingness to emotionally manipulate. However, only emotional

intelligence, primary psychopathy, and secondary psychopathy had a significant influence for males, and only primary psychopathy and Machiavellianism for females. These findings are mostly in line with those by Hyde and Grieve (2014), and Abell et al. (2016). The significant contribution of Machiavellianism to willingness to emotionally manipulate for females, but not males supports Abell et al.'s previous findings that Machiavellian females may engage in emotional manipulation without regard for possible negative consequences.

The hypothesis that grandiose and vulnerable narcissism would significantly predict willingness to emotionally manipulate for males and females was partially supported. Grandiose narcissism made a significant contribution for females' use of emotional manipulation, but not for males' use. This is partially consistent with previous findings by Gough et al. (2015). It seems that for females, their desire to gain authority and power over others increases the likelihood that they will engage in emotional manipulation, whereas this does not play a role for males. Males have been found to have more authority and power over others compared with females within a workplace setting (McLaughlin, Uggen, & Blackstone, 2012; Powell, 2012).

It may be that all males, including those high in grandiose narcissism already have authority and power over others, and thus do not actually need engage in emotional manipulation. This is further reflected in that grandiose narcissism predicted males' trait emotional manipulation, but not willingness to emotionally manipulate, whereas grandiose narcissism predicted both females' emotional manipulation constructs. Thus, males who scored higher on grandiose narcissism believe that they are able to emotionally manipulate others, but do not actually engage in this behaviour, likely due to gaining power and authority in other ways. Conversely, females higher in grandiose narcissism believe they are able to

emotionally manipulate others, and also need to engage in this behaviour as a way to gain authority and power over others. In this way, grandiose narcissism does not play a role in predicting males' willingness to emotionally manipulate others.

Interestingly, vulnerable narcissism became a significant predictor for females when sadism was included in the model. Thus it seems that both grandiose and vulnerable narcissistic females are more likely to engage in emotionally manipulative behaviours. Narcissistic females may emotionally manipulate others in order to both exert power and authority over others, and in order to hide their feelings of inadequacy (Miller et al., 2011). Consistent with underlying feelings of inadequacy, vulnerable narcissism has been associated with anxiety (Miller et al., 2011). Thus, females may engage in emotionally manipulative behaviours in order to regulate their anxiety in situations, and be able to be in more control within social situations which they find uncomfortable (Miller et al., 2011).

The hypothesis that sadism would significantly predict willingness to emotionally manipulate was supported for both genders. This is in line with conceptualisations of sadistic individuals as those who engage in demeaning behaviour in order to humiliate others, or to seek enjoyment or pleasure (O'Meara et al., 2011). The finding that sadistic individuals engage in emotionally manipulative behaviours is also consistent with findings of other interpersonal styles associated with sadism including uncooperative and cold, gossiping, and online trolling behaviour (Buckels et al., 2014; Schmeelk et al., 2008; Southard et al., 2015). Given that emotional manipulation is a form of indirect (and thus presumably more socially acceptable) aggression, it may be that it is a way for these individuals to be able to enact their sadistic traits with others. These findings highlight the manipulative nature of sadistic individuals, who likely emotionally manipulate others for their own

enjoyment, and to gain pleasure from hurting others (O'Meara et al., 2011).

The hypothesis that higher general self-efficacy and lower social self-efficacy would predict willingness to emotionally manipulate for females was not supported. In the current study, general self-efficacy did not contribute to emotional manipulation for either gender. This may be due to the specific social context of emotional manipulation, as suggested by Gough et al. (2015). Social self-efficacy did not predict willingness to emotionally manipulate for females, despite predicting trait emotional manipulation. Thus, it seems likely that females with higher social self-efficacy believe that they can emotionally manipulate, but do not actually engage in this behaviour. This may be due to the social nature of social self-efficacy, and that individuals with higher perceived social skills do not actually need to engage in emotional manipulation, as they feel competent enough to navigate social situations without resorting to the use of more 'antisocial' forms of communicating.

Despite initially predicting females' willingness to emotionally manipulate, Machiavellianism was not a significant predictor with all variables included. As Machiavellianism predicted trait emotional manipulation for females, this may be due to Machiavellian females believing that they can emotionally manipulate others, but ultimately lacking the skills to do so, and therefore being less likely to engage in emotional manipulation. Specifically, it seems likely that female Machiavellians' poor emotional and social skills (Andrew et al., 2008; Wastell & Booth, 2003) make it less likely that they will engage in emotional manipulation, even though they believe they are able to. This is supported in the current study by significant negative bivariate correlations between Machiavellianism and emotional intelligence ( $r = -.30$ ), and social self-efficacy ( $r = -.24$ ) for females, which highlight this deficit in females' prosocial emotional and social skills.

Overall, higher primary psychopathy and sadism predicted both males' and females' willingness to emotionally manipulate. This reflects the callous nature of emotional manipulation, and that both genders likely engage in emotional manipulation for pleasure or enjoyment. Interestingly, secondary psychopathy predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate for males. This may highlight the antisocial and impulsive nature of emotional manipulation for males. In other words, males who engage in emotionally manipulative behaviours may not necessarily plan to do so, but fall back on this tactic in social situations. Conversely, females seem to be more motivated by grandiose and vulnerable narcissistic tendencies, where they emotionally manipulate others in order to both gain power and authority over others, as well as mask their feelings of inadequacy. Given the possible antisocial nature of emotional manipulation for males, it may be prudent to consider the role of moral judgement in emotional manipulation, given that psychopathy and moral judgement have been found to be negatively related (Campbell et al., 2009). Within the context of emotional manipulation, it seems likely that individuals lower in moral judgement may be more likely to report engaging in emotionally manipulative behaviours, due to lacking empathy, sympathy, and having low belief in doing the "right" thing (Campbell et al., 2009).

When considering sadism, it is clear that it has an important role in the prediction of trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate for females. However, it is interesting to note that sadism predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate, but not trait emotional manipulation for males. This shows a discrepancy between genders, where the enjoyment and pleasure gained from harming others plays a factor for females in both their belief in their emotional manipulation skills, as well as the degree to which they actually engage in these

behaviours, whereas this is not the case for males. For males, it seems that those who scored higher on sadism did not have increased belief in their emotional manipulation skills, but that higher sadism did predict males' willingness to emotionally manipulate. It is unclear why this discrepancy exists between males and females, but this finding highlights the differential mechanisms that underlie males' and females' emotional manipulation, and the continued need to examine the genders separately.

### **Limitations and Additional Considerations**

The use of self-report data for this study may have resulted in participants altering their response style in order to present themselves in a more socially desirable manner. This social desirability response bias is common in studies that utilise a self-report response format (van de Mortel, 2008). The use of an anonymous online response format likely reduced the potential effects of social desirability response bias, as this format has been found to increase rates of self-disclosure, particularly for sensitive information (Kays, Gathercoal, & Buhrow, 2012).

The use of a cross-sectional design places some limitations upon the conclusions that are able to be drawn from the current study. Notably, causality within the identified relationships cannot be confirmed. However, it is important to keep in mind that the variables in the current study were included due to previous research identifying these as contributing to emotional manipulation (e.g. Austin et al., 2007; Gough et al., 2015; Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013).

As previously mentioned, future research would benefit from examining the potential role of moral judgement in the prediction of trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate. Additionally, given the seemingly antisocial nature of males' use of emotional manipulation, future research may

compare the use of emotional manipulation when relating to strangers compared with those closer to the individual. Specifically, it may be that males are more likely to engage in emotional manipulation when in social situations with strangers than friends, as they do not wish to damage the quality of relationships with friends. Conversely, it may be that these individuals may wish to make a positive first impression on strangers, and thus refrain from engaging in emotional manipulation.

### **Implications**

Findings from this study show the common underlying mechanisms in males' and females' belief and use of their emotional manipulation skills, including manipulative tendencies, and an increased wish for power. Additionally, differences in males' and females' belief and use of their emotional manipulation skills can be seen. Specifically, the findings from the current study highlight the particularly antisocial nature of males' emotional manipulation, and the more manipulative and power-seeking nature of females' emotional manipulation. Results from the current study further contribute to the nomological understanding of emotional manipulation. Specifically, by examining the mechanisms underlying trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate, this research has contributed to the development of theories regarding emotional manipulation.

Variables identified in the current study highlight the predictive mechanisms of both trait emotional manipulation and willingness to emotionally manipulate for both males and females. The difference in the pattern of results between genders makes clear the need for differential interventions aimed at males and females. Thus, while both genders may benefit from being required to seek pleasure from other sources, rather than harming others, males would additionally benefit from interventions targeted at increasing their social skills, given the antisocial nature of

their use of emotional manipulation behaviours. Social skills training has been found to reduce reoffending among psychopaths, indicating that individuals with subclinical levels of this trait would also be likely to benefit from engaging in social skills training (Harris & Rice, 2006). Additionally, females would benefit from interventions aimed at decreasing their feelings of inadequacy, and helping them to develop a sense of power in other ways, rather than emotionally manipulating others. Given that high general self-efficacy did not contribute to emotional manipulation in the current study, and that high general self-efficacy has been associated with emotional stability (Judge & Bono, 2001), females may benefit from interventions specifically aimed at improving their general self-efficacy.

### **Conclusion**

The aim of the current study was to continue research into the mechanisms of emotional manipulation by considering both trait emotional manipulation and the willingness to emotionally manipulate others, as well as the possible contribution of sadism and social self-efficacy for the first time. As previously identified predictors of trait emotional manipulation, emotional intelligence, psychopathy, Machiavellianism, narcissism, and general self-efficacy were also considered. Machiavellianism and grandiose narcissism were found to predict trait emotional manipulation for both genders, while primary psychopathy was an additional predictor for males, and sadism and social self-efficacy were additional predictors for females. Males' and females' willingness to emotionally manipulate was predicted by primary psychopathy and sadism. Males' willingness to emotionally manipulate was additionally predicted by secondary psychopathy, while females' was additionally predicted by grandiose and vulnerable narcissism.

Thus, it can be concluded that individuals higher in Machiavellianism and

grandiose narcissism believe they are able to emotionally manipulate others. However, Machiavellians lack the social and emotional skills to actually engage in this emotionally manipulative behaviour. Additionally, grandiose narcissistic males do not need to engage in these behaviours, as they are able to gain power over others in other ways, such as through existing gender power dynamics. The key role of sadism was highlighted in this study, in that both males and females engage in emotionally manipulative behaviours in order to gain pleasure from harming others.

The examination of the predictive mechanisms of emotional manipulation is important, given the social context of this behaviour, and potential harm to others. Findings from this study highlight the particularly antisocial nature of males' use of emotional manipulation, and the more manipulative, power-seeking nature of females' use of emotional manipulation.

## References

- Abell, L., Brewer, G., Qualter, P., & Austin, E. (2016). Machiavellianism, emotional manipulation, and friendship functions in women's friendships. *Personality and Individual Differences, 88*, 108 – 113. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.001
- Anderson, S., & Betz, N. E. (2001). Sources of social self-efficacy expectations: Their measurement and relation to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 58*, 98 – 117. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2000.1753
- Andrew, J., Cooke, M., & Muncer, S. J. (2008). The relationship between empathy and Machiavellianism: An alternative to empathising – systemising theory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*, 1203 – 1211. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2007.11.014
- Austin, E. J., Farrelly, D., Black, C., & Moore, H. (2007). Emotional intelligence, Machiavellianism and emotional manipulation: Does EI have a dark side? *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*, 179 – 189. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2006.11.019
- Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., Smith, M., & Tohver, G. (2014). Associations of the managing the emotions of others (MEOS) scale with personality, the dark triad and trait EI. *Personality and Individual Differences, 65*, 8 – 13. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.060
- Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2010). Why are narcissists so charming at first sight? Decoding the narcissism – popularity link at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 132 – 145. doi: 10.1037/a0016338
- Baumeister, R. F., & Lobbetael, J. (2011). Emotions and antisocial behaviour. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 22*, 635 – 649. doi:

10.1080/14789949.2011.617535

Bosson, J. K., Lakey, C. E., Campbell, W. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Jordan, C. H., & Kernis, M. H. (2008). Untangling the links between narcissism and self-esteem: A theoretical and empirical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 1415 – 1439. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00089.x

Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5, 88 – 103. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00334.x

Buckels, E. E., Trapnell, P. D., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Trolls just want to have fun. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 97 – 102. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.060

Campbell, J., Schermer, J. A., Villani, V. C., Nguyen, B., Vickers, L., & Vernon, P. A. (2009). A behavioural genetic study of the dark triad of personality and moral development. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 12, 132 – 136. doi: 10.1375/twin.12.2.132

Chabrol, H., Van Leeuwen, N., Rodgers, R., & Séjourné, N. (2009). Contributions of psychopathic, narcissistic, Machiavellian, and sadistic personality traits to juvenile delinquency. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 734 – 739. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.020

Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155 – 159. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

- Davies, J., & Hand, N. (2003). *Sadistic interest: An exploratory study*. British Psychological Society, Division of Forensic Psychology annual conference.
- Engelberg, E., & Sjöberg, L. (2005). Emotional intelligence and inter-personal skills. In R. Schulze & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence: An international handbook* (pp. 289 – 307). Retrieved from [http://www.dynam-it.com/lennart/attachments/123\\_EI\\_e\\_Ch14\\_Engelberg\\_Sjoeberg.pdf](http://www.dynam-it.com/lennart/attachments/123_EI_e_Ch14_Engelberg_Sjoeberg.pdf)
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Furnham, A., Richards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). The dark triad of personality: A 10 year review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7, 199 – 216. doi: 10.1111/spc3.12018
- Gough, S., Grieve, G., Witteveen, K., & Tolan, G. (2015). *It's all about me: The effect of narcissism on malevolent interpersonal interactions*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Green, S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 26, 499 – 510. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr2603\_7
- Grieve, R., & Mahar, D. (2010). The emotional manipulation-psychopathy nexus: Relationships with emotional intelligence, alexithymia and ethical position. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 945 – 950. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.028
- Grieve, R., & Panebianco, L. (2013). Assessing the role of aggression, empathy, and self-serving cognitive distortions in trait emotional manipulation. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 65, 79 – 88. doi: 10.1111/j.1742-9536.2012.00059.x
- Grieve, R., Witteveen, K., Tolan, G. A., & Jacobson, B. (2014). Development and

validation of a measure of cognitive and behavioural social self-efficacy.

*Personality and Individual Differences*, 59, 71 – 76. doi:

10.1016/j.paid.2013.11.008

Harris, G. T., & Rice, M. E. (2006). Treatment of psychopathy: A review of empirical findings. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychopathy* (pp. 555 – 572). Retrieved from <http://www.gwern.net/docs/algernon/2006-harris.pdf>

Hyde, J., & Grieve, R. (2014). Able and willing: Refining the measurement of emotional manipulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64, 131 – 134. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.036

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits – self-esteem, generalised self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability – with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80 – 92. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.1.80

Kays, K. M., Gathercoal, K., & Buhrow, W. C. (2012). Does survey format influence self-disclosure on sensitive question items? *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 28, 251 – 256. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2011.09.007

Kwan, V. S. Y., Kuang, L. L., & Hui, N. H. H. (2009). Identifying the sources of self-esteem: The mixed medley of benevolence, merit, and bias. *Self and Identity*, 8, 176 – 195. doi: 10.1080/15298860802504874

Leganger, A., Kraft, P., & Røysamb, E. (2000). Perceived self-efficacy in health behaviour research: Conceptualisation, measurement and correlates. *Psychology and Health*, 15, 51 – 69. doi: 10.1080/08870440008400288

Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalised population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 151 – 158. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.1.151

- Löve, J., Moore, C. D., & Hensing, G. (2011). Validation of the Swedish translation of the general self-efficacy scale. *Quality of Life Research, 21*, 1249 – 1253. doi: 10.1007/s11136-011-0030-5
- Lozano, L. M., García-Cueto, E., & Muñiz, J. (2008). Effect of the number of response categories on the reliability and validity of rating scales. *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioural and Social Sciences, 4*, 73 – 79. doi: 10.1027/1614-2241.4.2.73
- Luszczynska, A., Scholz, U., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). The general self-efficacy scale: Multicultural validation studies. *The Journal of Psychology, 139*, 439 – 457. doi: 10.3200/JRLP.139.5.439-457
- McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review, 77* 625 – 647. doi: 10.1177/0003122412451728
- Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality, 79*, 1013 – 1042. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00711.x
- Mulligan, K., & Scherer, K. R. (2012). Toward a working definition of emotion. *Emotion Review, 4*, 345 – 357. doi: 10.1177/1754073912445818
- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the dark triad and work behaviour: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 557 – 579. doi: 10.1037/a0025679
- O'Boyle, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 32*, 788 – 818. doi:

10.1002/job.714

- O'Connor, P. J., & Athota, V. S. (2013). The intervening role of agreeableness in the relationship between trait emotional intelligence and Machiavellianism: Reassessing the potential dark side of EI. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55*, 750 – 754. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2013.06.006
- O'Meara, A., Davies, J., & Hammond, S. (2011). The psychometric properties and utility of the short sadistic impulse scale (SSIS). *Psychological Assessment, 23*, 523 – 531. doi: 10.1037/a0022400
- Ortega, R., Elipe, P., Mora-Merchán, J. A., Genta, M. L., Brighi, A., Guarini, A., ... Tippett, N. (2012). The emotional impact of bullying and cyberbullying on victims: A European cross-national study. *Aggressive Behaviour, 38*, 342 – 356. doi: 10.1002/ab.21440
- Paulhus, D. L., Robins, R. W., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Tracy, J. L. (2004). Two replicable suppressor situations in personality research. *Multivariate Behavioural Research, 39*, 303 – 328. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr3902\_7
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556 – 563. doi: 10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6
- Petrides, K. V. (2011) Ability and trait emotional intelligence. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, S. von Stumm and A. Furnham (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Individual Differences* (pp. 656 - 678). Retrieved from <http://www.psychometriclab.com/admins/files/trait%20ei%20-%20hid.pdf>
- Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimental, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the pathological narcissism inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 21*, 365 – 379. doi:

10.1037/a0016530

- Powell, G. N. (2012). Six ways of seeing the elephant: The intersection between of sex, gender, and leadership. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 27, 119 – 141. doi: 10.1108/17542411211214167
- Preston, C. C., & Colman, A. M. (2000). Optimal number of response categories in rating scales: Reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences. *Acta Psychologica*, 104, 1 – 15. doi: 10.1016/S0001-6918(99)00050-5
- Richardson, D. S., & Green, L. R. (2003). Defining direct and indirect aggression: The Richardson conflict response questionnaire. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 16, 11 – 30. Accessed from <http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=15279315>
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9, 185-211. Retrieved from [http://heblab.research.yale.edu/pub\\_pdf/pub106\\_Salovey,Mayer1990EmotionalIntelligence.pdf](http://heblab.research.yale.edu/pub_pdf/pub106_Salovey,Mayer1990EmotionalIntelligence.pdf) website:
- Scherer, K. (2005). What are emotions? And how can they be measured? *Social Science Information*, 44, 695 – 729. doi: 10.1177/0539018405058216
- Schmeelk, K. M., Sylvers, P., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2008). Trait correlates of relational aggression in a nonclinical sample: DSM-IV personality disorders and psychopathy. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 22, 269 – 283. doi: 10.1521/pedi.2008.22.3.269
- Schmitz, C. (2012). LimeSurvey: An open source survey tool. Hamburg, Germany: LimeSurvey Project Team. Retrieved from <http://www.limesurvey.org>
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C.

- J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 167-177. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00001-4
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalised self-efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in healthy psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, England: NFER-NELSON.
- Southard, A. C., Noser, A. E., Pollock, N. C., Mercer, S. H., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). The interpersonal nature of dark personality features. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 34, 555 – 586. doi: 10.1521/jscp.2015.34.7.555
- van de Mortel, T. F. (2008). Faking it: Social desirability response bias in self-report research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25, 40 – 48. Retrieved from [http://epubs.scu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=hahs\\_pubs](http://epubs.scu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=hahs_pubs)
- Vonk, J., Zeigler-Hill, V., Mayhew, P., & Mercer, S. (2013). Mirror, mirror on the wall, which form of narcissist knows self and others best of all? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 396 – 401. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2012.10.010
- Wastell, C., & Booth, A. (2003). Machiavellianism: An alexithymic perspective. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 22, 730-744. doi: 10.1521/jscp.22.6.730.22931
- Weber, M., Ruch, W., Littman-Ovadia, H., Lavy, S., & Gai, O. (2013). Relationships among higher-order strengths factors, subjective wellbeing, and general self-efficacy – The case of Israeli adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55, 322 – 327. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2013.03.006

Whittle, H. C., Hamilton-Giachritsis, C. E., & Beech, A. R. (2014). "Under his spell": Victims' perspectives of being groomed online. *Social Sciences*, 3, 404 – 426. doi: 10.3390/socsci3030404

## Appendices

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Appendix A: Testing Materials .....                        | 60 |
| A1: Demographic Questions .....                            | 60 |
| A2: Assessing Emotions Scale .....                         | 61 |
| A3: Levenson’s Self Report Psychopathy Scale .....         | 63 |
| A4: Mach IV .....  | 65 |
| A5: Pathological Narcissism Inventory .....                | 67 |
| A6: Short Sadistic Impulse Scale .....                     | 70 |
| A7: General Self-Efficacy Scale .....                      | 71 |
| A8: Cognitive-Behavioural Social Self-Efficacy Scale ..... | 72 |
| A9: Emotional Manipulation Subscale .....                  | 73 |
| A10: Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate Scale .....     | 74 |
| Appendix B: Tasmanian Social Sciences HREC Approval .....  | 75 |
| Appendix C: Research Advertisement .....                   | 77 |
| Appendix D: Information Sheet and Consent Form .....       | 78 |

## Appendix A1

### Demographic Questions

**What is your gender?**

- Female  
 Male  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_

**What is your current age in years?**

\_\_\_\_\_

*You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.*

**Is English your first language?**

- Yes  
 No

**Are you currently studying at university?**

- Yes  
 No

**What is your ethnicity?**

*Check any that apply.*

- Caucasian  
 Aboriginal  
 Torres Strait Islander  
 Asian  
 Middle Eastern  
 Latin American  
 African  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix A2

### Assessing Emotions Scale (Schutte et al., 1998)

Directions: please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree).

1. I know when to speak about my personal problems to others
2. When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them
3. I expect that I will do well on most things I try
4. Other people find it easy to confide in me
5. I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people\*
6. Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important
7. When my mood changes, I see new possibilities
8. Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living
9. I am aware of my emotions as I experience them
10. I expect good things to happen
11. I like to share my emotions with others
12. When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last
13. I arrange events others enjoy
14. I seek out activities that make me happy
15. I am aware of the non-verbal messages I send to others
16. I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others
17. When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me

18. By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing
19. I know why my emotions change
20. When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas
21. I have control over my emotions
22. I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them
23. I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on
24. I compliment others when they have done something well
25. I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send
26. When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I have experienced this event myself
27. When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas
28. When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail\*
29. I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them
30. I help other people feel better when they are down
31. I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles
32. I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice
33. It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do\*

*Note.* Items marked \* are reverse scored. Total score is derived by summing the item responses.

### Appendix A3

Levenson's Self Report Psychopathy Scale (Levenson, Kiehl, & Fitzpatrick, 1995)

Directions: please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements from one (disagree strongly) to four (agree strongly).

#### Primary psychopathy

1. Success is based on survival of the fittest; I am not concerned about the losers
2. For me, what's right is whatever I can get away with
3. In today's world, I feel justified in doing anything I can get away with to succeed
4. My main purpose in life is getting as many goodies as I can
5. Making lots of money is my most important goal
6. I let others worry about higher values; my main concern is with the bottom line
7. People who are stupid enough to get ripped off usually deserve it
8. Looking out for myself is my top priority
9. I tell other people what they want to hear so that they will do what I want them to do
10. I would be upset if my success came at someone else's expense\*
11. I often admire a really clever scam
12. I make a point of trying not to hurt others in pursuit of my goals\*
13. I enjoy manipulating other people's feelings
14. I feel bad if my words or actions cause someone else to feel emotional pain\*
15. Even if I were trying very hard to sell something, I wouldn't lie about it\*
16. Cheating is not justified because it is unfair to others\*

**Secondary psychopathy**

1. I find myself in the same kinds of trouble, time after time
2. I am often bored
3. I find that I am able to pursue one goal for a long time\*
4. I don't plan anything very far in advance
5. I quickly lose interest in tasks I start
6. Most of my problems are due to the fact that other people just don't understand me
7. Before I do anything, I carefully consider the possible consequences\*
8. I have been in a lot of shouting matches with other people
9. When I get frustrated, I often "let off steam" by blowing my top
10. Love is overrated

*Note.* Items marked \* are reverse scored. Total score is derived by summing the item responses.

## Appendix A4

Mach IV (Christie & Geis, 1970)

Directions: please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree).

1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so
2. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear
3. One should take action only when sure it is morally right\*
4. Most people are basically good and kind\*
5. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance
6. Honesty is the best policy in all cases\*
7. There is no excuse for lying to someone else\*
8. Generally speaking, men won't work hard unless they're forced to do so
9. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest\*
10. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight\*
11. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives\*
12. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble
13. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught
14. Most people are brave\*
15. It is wise to flatter important people
16. It is possible to be good in all respects\*

17. Barnum was very wrong when he said there's a sucker born every minute\*
18. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there
19. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death
20. Most people forget more easily the death of a parent than the loss of their property

*Note.* Items marked \* are reverse scored. Total score is derived by summing the item responses.

## Appendix A5

### Pathological Narcissism Inventory (Pincus et al., 2009)

Directions: For each statement, please indicate which response is most accurate for you from zero (not at all like me) to five (very much like me).

1. I often fantasise about being admired and respected
2. My self-esteem fluctuates a lot
3. I sometimes feel ashamed about my expectations of others when they disappoint me
4. I can usually talk my way out of anything
5. It's hard to feel good about myself when I'm alone
6. I can make myself feel good by caring for others
7. I hate asking for help
8. When people don't notice me, I start to feel bad about myself
9. I often hide my needs for fear that others will see me as needy and dependent
10. I can make anyone believe anything I want them to
11. I get mad when people don't notice all that I do for them
12. I get annoyed by people who are not interested in what I say or do
13. I wouldn't disclose all my intimate thoughts and feelings to someone I didn't admire
14. I often fantasise about having a huge impact on the world around me
15. I find it easy to manipulate people
16. When others don't notice me, I start to feel worthless
17. Sometimes I avoid people because I'm concerned that they'll disappoint me

18. I typically get very angry when I'm unable to get what I want from others
19. I sometimes need important others in my life to reassure me of my self-worth
20. When I do things for other people, I expect them to do things for me
21. When others don't meet my expectations, I often feel ashamed about what I wanted
22. I feel important when others rely on me
23. I can read people like a book
24. When others disappoint me, I often get angry at myself
25. Sacrificing for others makes me the better person
26. I often fantasise about accomplishing things that are probably beyond my means
27. Sometimes I avoid people because I'm afraid they won't do what I want them to
28. It's hard to show others the weaknesses I feel inside
29. I get angry when criticised
30. It's hard to feel good about myself unless I know other people admire me
31. I often fantasise about being rewarded for my efforts
32. I am preoccupied with thoughts and concerns that most people are not interested in me
33. I like to have friends who rely on me because it makes me feel important
34. Sometimes I avoid people because I'm concerned they won't acknowledge what I do for them
35. Everybody likes to hear my stories
36. It's hard for me to feel good about myself unless I know other people like me
37. It irritates me when people don't notice how good a person I am
38. I will ever be satisfied until I get all that I deserve
39. I try to show what a good person I am through my sacrifices

40. I am disappointed when people don't notice me
41. I often find myself envying others' accomplishments
42. I often fantasise about performing heroic deeds
43. I help others in order to prove I'm a good person
44. It's important to show people I can do it on my own, even if I have some doubts inside
45. I often fantasise about being recognised for my accomplishments
46. I can't stand relying on other people because it makes me feel weak
47. When others don't respond to me the way that I would like them to, it is hard for me to still feel ok with myself
48. I need others to acknowledge me
49. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world
50. When others get a glimpse of my needs, I feel anxious and ashamed
51. Sometimes it's easier to be alone than to face not getting everything I want from other people
52. I can get pretty angry when others disagree with me

*Note.* Total score is derived by calculating the mean of the item responses.

## Appendix A6

### Short Sadistic Impulse Scale (O'Meara et al., 2011)

Directions: please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements from one (strongly disagree) to six (strongly agree).

1. People would enjoy hurting others if they gave it a go
2. Hurting people would be exciting
3. I have hurt people because I could
4. I wouldn't intentionally hurt anyone\*
5. I have hurt people for my own enjoyment
6. I have humiliated others to keep them in line
7. I would enjoy hurting someone physically, sexually, or emotionally
8. I enjoy seeing people hurt
9. I have fantasies which involve hurting people
10. Sometimes I get so angry I want to hurt people

*Note.* Items marked \* are reverse scored. Total score is derived by summing the item responses.

## Appendix A7

### General Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995)

Directions: please indicate how true each of the following statements are for you from one (not at all true) to four (exactly true).

1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way

*Note.* Total score is derived by summing the item responses.

## Appendix A8

### Cognitive-Behavioural Social Self-Efficacy Scale (Grieve et al., 2014)

Directions: please rate how confident you are that, as of now, you can do the following from one (not at all confident) to five (very confident).

1. Predict other people's behaviour
2. Understand others' choices
3. Know how my actions will make others feel
4. Feel comfortable around new people who I don't know
5. Anticipate the things people do
6. Understand other peoples' feelings
7. Fit in easily in social situations
8. Understand why people might become angry with me
9. Understand others' wishes
10. Enter new situations and meeting people for the first time
11. Be able to say what I think without people becoming angry or irritated
12. Find people predictable
13. Understand what others are trying to accomplish without the need for them saying anything
14. Realise when I have hurt others
15. Predict how others will react to my behaviour
16. Understand what others really mean through their expression, their body language etc.
17. Find good conversation topics
18. Anticipate others' reactions to what I do

*Note.* Total score is derived by summing the item responses.

## Appendix A9

### Emotional Manipulation Subscale (Austin et al., 2007)

Directions: please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree).

1. I know how to embarrass someone to stop them behaving in a particular way
2. I know how to make another person feel uneasy
3. I know how to play two people off against each other
4. I know how to make someone feel ashamed about something that they have done in order to stop them from doing it again
5. I know how to 'wind up' my close family and friends
6. I can use my emotional skills to make others feel guilty
7. I can make someone feel anxious so that they will act in a particular way
8. I can pay someone compliments to get in their 'good books'
9. I am good at reassuring people so that they're more likely to go along with what I say
10. I sometimes pretend to be angrier than I really am about someone's behaviour in order to induce them to behave differently in future

*Note.* Total score is derived by summing the item responses.

## Appendix A10

### Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate Scale (Hyde & Grieve, 2014)

Directions: please answer each of the following questions where one = never and five = daily.

1. How often do you embarrass someone to stop them behaving in a particular way?
2. How often have you tried to make another person feel uneasy?
3. How often do you play two people off against each other?
4. How often do you make someone feel ashamed about something that they have done in order to stop them from doing it again?
5. How often do you 'wind up' your close family and friends?
6. How often do you use emotional skills to make others feel guilty?
7. How often do you make someone feel anxious so they would behave in a particular way?
8. How often do you pay someone compliments to get in their 'good books'?
9. How often do you reassure people so that they are more likely to go along with what you say?
10. How often do you pretend to be angrier than you really were about someone's behaviour in order to induce them to behave differently in future?

*Note.* Total score is derived by summing the item responses.

## Appendix B

### Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee Approval

Social Science Ethics Officer  
 Private Bag 01 Hobart  
 Tasmania 7001 Australia  
 Tel: (03) 6226 2763  
 Fax: (03) 6226 7148  
 Katherine.Shaw@utas.edu.au




---

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (TASMANIA) NETWORK

13 May 2015

Dr Rachel Grieve  
 Psychology  
 Private Bag 30

Dear Dr Grieve

Re: MINIMAL RISK ETHICS APPLICATION APPROVAL  
 Ethics Ref: H0014933 - Emotion and social interaction

---

We are pleased to advise that acting on a mandate from the Tasmania Social Sciences HREC, the Chair of the committee considered and approved the above project on 13 May 2015.

This approval constitutes ethical clearance by the Tasmania Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee. The decision and authority to commence the associated research may be dependent on factors beyond the remit of the ethics review process. For example, your research may need ethics clearance from other organisations or review by your research governance coordinator or Head of Department. It is your responsibility to find out if the approval of other bodies or authorities is required. It is recommended that the proposed research should not commence until you have satisfied these requirements.

Please note that this approval is for four years and is conditional upon receipt of an annual Progress Report. Ethics approval for this project will lapse if a Progress Report is not submitted.

The following conditions apply to this approval. Failure to abide by these conditions may result in suspension or discontinuation of approval.

1. It is the responsibility of the Chief Investigator to ensure that all investigators are aware of the terms of approval, to ensure the project is conducted as approved by the Ethics Committee, and to notify the Committee if any investigators are added to, or cease involvement with, the project.
2. **Complaints:** If any complaints are received or ethical issues arise during the course of the project, investigators should advise the Executive Officer of the Ethics Committee on 03 6226 7479 or [human.ethics@utas.edu.au](mailto:human.ethics@utas.edu.au).

A PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

3. Incidents or adverse effects: Investigators should notify the Ethics Committee immediately of any serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants or unforeseen events affecting the ethical acceptability of the project.
4. Amendments to Project: Modifications to the project must not proceed until approval is obtained from the Ethics Committee. Please submit an Amendment Form (available on our website) to notify the Ethics Committee of the proposed modifications.
5. Annual Report: Continued approval for this project is dependent on the submission of a Progress Report by the anniversary date of your approval. You will be sent a courtesy reminder closer to this date. **Failure to submit a Progress Report will mean that ethics approval for this project will lapse.**
6. Final Report: A Final Report and a copy of any published material arising from the project, either in full or abstract, must be provided at the end of the project.

Yours sincerely

Natasha Jones  
Ethics Officer  
Tasmania Social Sciences HREC

**DO YOU HAVE 30-45 MINUTES TO FILL OUT AN ONLINE SURVEY?**

**ARE YOU OVER THE AGE OF 18?**

**WANT TO WIN A \$150, \$100 or \$50 COLES/MYER VOUCHER?**

Researchers at the University of Tasmania are interested in the role of personality and emotion in adults' social interactions.

You will be asked to complete an anonymous 30-45 minute survey, and then another briefer 5 minute survey two weeks later.

If you are aged 18 years or over, and are interested in taking part in this study, please go to

**<http://goo.gl/sURgJY>**

to complete the online survey.

**For further information, please contact Steph at [stephanie.gough@utas.edu.au](mailto:stephanie.gough@utas.edu.au). HREC approval code: H14933**

## Appendix D

### Information Sheet and Consent Form

#### Emotion and Social Interaction - Part 1 Participant Information Sheet

##### 1. Invitation

You are invited to participate in an **anonymous two-part study** examining emotion and social interaction. This study is being conducted in partial fulfilment of a Psychology Masters degree for Stephanie Gough under the supervision of Dr Rachel Grieve in the School of Medicine (Psychology) at the University of Tasmania.

##### 2. What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of this study is to investigate the personality and social factors involved in the use of emotion in adults, and how these factors influence social interactions.

##### 3. Why have I been invited to participate?

You are eligible to participate in this study because you are a **male or female aged 18 or over**. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. There will be no consequences for individuals who do not wish to participate in this study.

##### 4. What will I be asked to do?

If you choose to participate, you will be asked to answer an anonymous online questionnaire **lasting approximately 30-45 minutes**, and then **two weeks later**, you will be asked to complete another much briefer questionnaire lasting **approximately 5 minutes**. You will be able to complete these questionnaires at a time and place of your own choosing.

For the first part of the study, you will be asked questions about your demographic characteristics (such as your age and gender), as well as measures of your personality characteristics and questions about how you use emotion in your exchanges with other people. For example, you will be asked whether you agree that *'It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals'* and *'I have humiliated others to keep them in line'* and *'The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear'*. At the end of the survey, you will have the option to click on a link to a separate page (not connected to your questionnaire responses) where you can supply your name and email address so we can send you the link to the second part of the study in two weeks' time.

For the second part of the study, you will be asked to provide demographic information, as well as a few questions about your social interactions over the last 2 weeks. For example, *'in the last two weeks, how often have you paid someone compliments to get in their "good books"?'*

##### 5. Are there any possibly benefits from participation in this study?

It is not anticipated that taking part in this study will result in any direct benefits to participants. However, participants will have the **chance to win one of three**

**Coles/MYER gift cards valued at \$150.00, \$100.00, and \$50.00** for completing **both parts of this study** (please note, there will be no way to link your contact details for your prize entry with your questionnaire answers).

Alternatively, **first year students studying Psychology at the University of Tasmania will be eligible to receive 1 hour of research participation credit** for their participation in **both parts of this study**. Credit will be applied to students on SONA **within one week of completing the second part of this study**. In addition, information from this study may assist understanding the use of emotions in social situations.

**6. Are there any possible risks from participation in this study?**

There are no specific risks anticipated with participation in this study. However, if participants would like to access counselling services they can contact the university counselling service (for UTAS students) or their GP.

**7. What if I change my mind during or after the study?**

It is important that you understand that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose to discontinue participation at any point throughout the study without providing an explanation. All information you have provided to that point will be treated in a confidential manner.

**8. What will happen to the information when this study is over?**

All data will be collected using a secure online service. Once the data is transferred for analysis, it will be stored on a password-protected server in the School of Psychology. Research data will be kept for at least 5 years from the date of first publication. Following this, data will be deleted.

**9. How will the results of the study be published?**

A summary of the findings of the study will be posted on the University of Tasmania Division of Psychology web page, as well as in an academic journal. No participants will be identified in the publication of the summary of the research findings.

**10. What if I have questions about this study?**

If you would like to discuss any aspect of this study please feel free to contact the research team:

Stephanie Gough – email [stephanie.gough@utas.edu.au](mailto:stephanie.gough@utas.edu.au)

Dr Rachel Grieve – email [rachel.grieve@utas.edu.au](mailto:rachel.grieve@utas.edu.au) – phone (03) 6226 2244

**\*\*Please email [stephanie.gough@utas.edu.au](mailto:stephanie.gough@utas.edu.au) if you do not receive the option to provide your email address at the end of this survey to receive the link to the second part of the study\*\***

This study has been approved by the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have concerns or complaints about the conduct of this study, please contact the Executive Officer of the HREC (Tasmania) Network on (03) 6226 7479 or email [human.ethics@utas.edu.au](mailto:human.ethics@utas.edu.au). The Executive Officer is the person nominated to receive complaints from research participants. Please quote ethics reference number H14933.

**Thank you for taking the time to consider this study.**

**If you have read and understood all of the above information, and any questions have been answered to your satisfaction, you can proceed with the questionnaire.**

**If you are 18 years or older and give consent to participate in the above described research, please click the 'Next' button. Otherwise, please exit this window by clicking the cross.**