

Journal of
Cross-Cultural Psychology

DARK TRIAD TRAITS, SOCIAL POSITION AND PERSONALITY: A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY

Journal:	*Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*
Manuscript ID	JCCP-21-217.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Article
Keyword:	Dark Triad traits, SD3, HEXACO, AFFM, Croscultural personality

Abstract: This research explores the Dark Triad traits in 18 cultures from Europe, America, Africa, and Asia. We examined the relationships among Dark Triad traits, as measured by the SD3, with gender, age, social status, and two personality models, HEXACO and Zuckerman's alternative five factor model (AFFM). There were 10,298 participants (5,410 women and 4,888 men) with a mean age of 40.31 (SD= 17.32) years old. Between 6% and 16% of the variance in the Dark Triad traits was accounted by culture. Men scored higher than women on all three traits in most cultures, but gender differences were generally larger in European countries. The relationship between the Dark Triad traits dimensions and age is negative, but the largest effect size is small (Psychopathy; η^2 = .018). Psychopathy is associated with low Social Position, and Narcissism with high Social Position. In regard to Personality traits, Narcissism is positively related to Extraversion, and Psychopathy is negatively related to Conscientiousness for the HEXACO, and Narcissism is positively related to Activity and Sensation Seeking, and Machiavellianism and Psychopathy are positively related to Aggressiveness and Sensation Seeking for the AFFM.

Key word: Dark Triad traits, SD3, HEXACO, AFFM, cross-cultural, personality

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last 19 years, a large number of publications have appeared revealing an integrated constellation of malevolent personality traits called the Dark Triad traits (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), based on the interrelated maladaptive personality traits of Machiavellian, Narcissism, and Psychopathy. During this time, numerous articles have also analyzed their psychometric properties as well as the relationships with other psychological constructs, including personality traits (Furnham et al., 2013; Bucher et al., 2020; O'Boyle et al., 2015; Muris et al., 2017; Vize et al, 2018a; Vize et al., 2018b; Włodarska et al., 2019). From the same standpoint, other authors have investigated the relationships between the Dark Triad and sociographic variables such as age, gender, and socioeconomic status. With regard to gender differences, men scored higher than women in all three Dark Triad traits, but when the shared variance among the Dark Triad traits was controlled, only Psychopathy remained statistically significantly associated with gender (Muris et al., 2017). In this way, men scored higher than women on all scales of the Dark Triad traits in a recent macro study conducted in a large sample in different countries (Rogoza et al., 2020). The Dark Triad also present some relationships with age. Younger women were more attracted to the Dark Triad traits than were older women (Qureshi et al., 2016) and Machiavellianism and Narcissism were associated with good current socioeconomic status even in children (Jonason, et al., 2016; Jonason et al., 2020).

1.1. Dark Triad traits and personality

Regarding relationships with personality traits, the Dark Triad traits have been intensively studied in relation to the Five Factor Model (FFM) and HEXACO personality model. To a lesser extent, the Dark Triad traits have also been tested in relation to Gray's Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (RST) and the Eysenck personality model (Lee & Ashton, 2005; Włodarska et al., 2019), especially the Extraversion scale of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire (Jones & Paulhus, 2011). Zuckerman's model is closely related to Eysenck's (Zuckerman & Glicksohn, 2016) and Gray's personality models. For instance, Psychoticism and Gray's behavioral approach

system (BAS) are related to Zuckerman's Aggressiveness and Sensation Seeking traits (Aluja et al., 2013). Therefore, it could be expected that Psychopathy, and to a lesser extent Machiavellianism, will be located together with Aggressiveness and Sensation Seeking (Hare, 1982), while Narcissism should be associated with Extraversion (Aluja et al., 2012).

Lee and Ashton (2005) originally found that the Dark Triad traits had a strong negative correlation with the HEXACO Honesty-Humility factor. Later, Hodson et al. (2018), found that the Dark Triad traits obtained a near-complete overlapping latent correlation -0.95 between a general Dark Triad factor Honesty-Humility, suggesting that the Dark Triad overlaps with the low pole of the HEXACO Honesty-Humility factor composed of traits of sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, and modesty. Psychopathy and Machiavellianism showed negative correlations with Big Five Agreeableness. On the other hand, Narcissism was positively correlated with Big Five Extraversion and HEXACO Extraversion. A meta-analysis by Muris et al. (2017) reinforced the relationships between the Dark Triad traits and FFM/HEXACO. Psychopathy and Machiavellianism (but not Narcissism) related negatively to the FFM factor of Agreeableness and the HEXACO factor of Honesty-Humility. Machiavellianism and Psychopathy were negatively associated with the Honesty-Humility facets of sincerity and equity, while Narcissism was most associated with deficits in greed avoidance and modesty. In addition, since the Dark Triad shows quite a large negative relationship with the Honesty-Humility factor of the HEXACO, and recent papers show that women score higher than men in Honesty-Humility (García, et al., 2021; Lee, & Ashton, 2020), it is expected that men will score higher than women in the Dark Triad. This effect is expected to be larger in western cultures, given the previous evidence of larger gender differences in these countries (García et al., 2021), compared to non-western ones. This is the so-called Gender-Equality-Personality Paradox.

1.2. Cross-cultural exploration of Dark Triad

Although there are many studies about the Dark Triad traits (measured with different instruments, in many cultures independently); there are relatively few cross-cultural studies (Cooke

& Michie, 1999; Foster et al., 2003; Jonason et al., 2013; Jonason et al., 2017). These studies are generally based only on a few cultures and are mainly limited to small samples. Jonason et al. (2013) found that the Dark Triad traits is associated with different culturally-based sociological constructs. For example, the Dark Triad traits correlated with individual differences in life history strategies. Some cross-cultural work on the Dark Triad traits has focused on gender. For example, a recent psychometric study examined the structure of the Dark Triad Dirty Dozen (DTDD; Jonason & Webster, 2010) in 49 countries and several regions all around the world (Rogoza et al., 2020). In Japan and Korea, the authors found no statistically significant differences in Psychopathy for men and women. They suggest that Psychopathy is a socially aversive trait that could be under-stated in these countries because of strong cultural pressure, and that the power of this self-regulatory pressure could bridge gender differences (Rogoza et al., 2020).

Rogoza et al., (2020) also concluded that culture had a strong effect on Narcissism, and that cultures with integrated and hierarchical cultural systems were more narcissistic. Gender differences in Narcissism were greater in more developed societies, as women had less propensity for Narcissism in these countries (Jonason et al., 2020). Moreover, the cultural context may shape how people express their personality traits (Thalmayer & Rossier, 2019), and cultural context may also shape the clinical presentation of some disorders (Paris & Lis, 2013). For example, the expression of aggressive behaviors seems to vary across cultures (Cooke, 1996). This may be because more individualistic cultures value self-control, whereas more collectivistic cultures value the importance of maintaining a reputation (Severance et al., 2013).

Similarly, the behavioral pattern associated with Psychopathy or antisocial personality disorders seems to be observed in most cultures (Rossier et al., 2008; Rossier et al., 2017), but the prevalence rate seems to vary quite a lot across cultures, being higher in individualistic than collectivistic cultures (Cooke, 1996). Although all these studies suggest that culture has an important impact on the behavioral expression of some maladaptive personality and sub-clinical traits, the impact of culture on this expression has yielded some inconsistent results (Canino et al., 2010), even allowing for the possibility that the Dark Triad traits might be less expressed in

collectivistic cultures characterized by strong social control. For this reason, the study of Dark Triad traits cultural differences deserves much more attention.

1.3. Dark Triad traits and socioeconomic status

Socioeconomic Status (SES) or Social Position (SP) is a construct based on an individual's economic, and sociological position. On the whole, socioeconomic status has been a powerful determinant of health. People of high social status tend to be in better health than people with low social status (Erreygers, 2013). This significant impact of socioeconomic status on health includes a multitude of health deficits, some of which are psychological. As evidence of this, numerous studies have demonstrated inverse relationships between SES and mental health (Kivimäki et al., 2020; De Vries et al., 2020; Tyagi & Ranga, 2018), particularly in children and adolescents (Reiss et al., 2019; Quon & McGrath, 2014). Also, socioeconomic-status or social position has been inversely associated with the development and prevalence of personality disorders (Torgersen et al., 2001; Walsh et al., 2013; Grant et al., 2004; Cohen et al., 2008), including antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) and psychopathic personality (Hare, 2003; Compton et al., 2005). In regard to the Dark Triad, although initial results were positive (Turner & Martínez, 1977), the overall literature is more congruent with the idea that Machiavellianism is unrelated with occupational status and job success (Fehr et al., 1992). There is also little research about the relationship between Narcissism and socioeconomic status, although one study showed that narcissistic personality tendencies are stronger in upper-class individuals (Piff, 2014). Narcissism has also been positively linked to physical and mental health (Jonason et al., 2015). For the Psychopathy trait, Huang et al., (2019) found a significant negative correlation with SES. Furthermore, childhood socioeconomic status has been correlated positively with Narcissism, and current socioeconomic status has been correlated positively with Narcissism and Machiavellianism. Current income also correlated positively with Narcissism. These correlations did not differ much between men and women (Jonason et al., 2016). All these findings provide indirect evidence for SES associations with the Dark Triad traits, but few studies have evaluated this relationship with direct measures of SES.

1.4 Aims of the present study

This study has several aims: a) to study the differences on Dark Triad traits across different cultures all over the world, b) to investigate the relationship between Dark Triad traits and gender and age using the SD3 to overcome the limitations of the DTDD used in previous studies (Rogoza et al., 2020), and provide more robust findings, c) to assess the relationship between social status and Dark Triad traits, and d) to test the pattern of Dark Triad traits associations with two different personality models (HEXACO and AFFM). Based on prior research, Narcissism is expected to be associated with high social position and Psychopathy with low social position. The expected relationship between Machiavellianism and social position is uncertain, as we have not found strong evidence in the literature. The relationships between Dark Triad traits and HEXACO have been evaluated extensively in past studies (for meta-analyses, see Muris et al., 2017; Vize et al., 2018b). The current research is expected to confirm the reported pattern of results using large samples in different countries. Specifically, all three Dark Triad traits scales are expected to be related negatively to Honesty–Humility. Machiavellianism is also expected to correlate negatively with Agreeableness and positively with Extraversion. Narcissism is additionally expected to associate positively with Extraversion and Psychopathy and negatively with Conscientiousness. Psychopathy, and to a lesser extent Machiavellianism, is also expected to relate to AFFM Aggressiveness and Sensation Seeking traits (as measured by the ZKA-PQ/SF).

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants

The participants in this study were a total of 10,298 subjects (5,410 women and 4,888 men), from 18 cultures/national contexts (Spain [Catalan and Spanish], Germany, Italy, Hungary, Switzerland [French-speaking and German-speaking], Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Poland, United States, Chile, China, Qatar, Israel, Tunisia, Senegal, and Togo, and 13 languages (Spanish, Catalan, German, Italian, Hungarian, French, Bosnian, Polish, English, Chinese [Mandarin],

Arabic, and Hebrew) [1]. Table 1 provides the mean and standard deviation of age, and the number of men and women by culture. The mean age was 40.31 (*SD* = 17.32) years for the total sample, excluding Senegal, which only provides the age ranges. In most cultures, the average age was around 40 years old, except for China and Togo, which had mean ages of 24.75 and 30.03 respectively. Total sample frequencies for age ranges were: [18-30 years: 3,758 (36.5%); 31-45 years: 2,378 (23.1%); 46-60 years: 2,413 (23.4%) and > 60 years old: 1,748 (17%), with one missing]. Average age was 39.81 years (*SD* = 17.37) for women, and 40.87 years (*SD* = 17.41) for men. Although the age difference for gender was statistically significant ($t(1) = 2.83$, $p < .005$), the effect size was negligible (Cohen's $d = -0.12$) (Cohen, 1988). The 18 cultures studied were divided between the "High income" or "Europe/US/Israel" and "Other cultures".

2.2. Measures.

2.1.1. Short Dark Triad (SD3)

The SD3 is a 27-item Dark Triad questionnaire developed by Jones and Paulhus (2014), which has a factor structure of three factors with 9 items each: Machiavellianism (MA), Narcissism (NA), and Psychopathy (PS). The response format is presented in a Likert-type format with anchors of 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 5 (*strongly agree*). SD3 has obtained strong convergent validity with other Dark Triad questionnaires. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistencies for MA, NA, and PS were about .70 in the original study (Jones & Paulhus, 2014).

2.1.2. HEXACO-60

HEXACO-60 is a short 60-item inventory that assesses the six personality factors of the HEXACO model of personality: Honesty-Humility (HH), Emotionality (EM), Extraversion (EX), Agreeableness versus anger (AG), Conscientiousness (CO), and Openness to Experience (OE)

[1] Some of the data have already been used for other studies. The French-speaking Swiss, Belgium, and Togolese data have been partly used in a study aimed at predicting perceived employability (Atitsogbe, Hansenne, Pari, & Rossier, 2020). Moreover, this data collection has been included in a larger research project aimed at assessing the cross-cultural validity of several inventories assessing personality traits, such as the ZKA-PQ or the HEXACO-60 (Aluja et al., 2019; Garcia et al., 2021).

(Ashton, andLee,2009) The response format is a Likert scale of 5 points: 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Correlations between the HEXACO-60 and long form of HEXACO range from .87 to .93 in the college sample, and from .83 to .92 in the community sample. The internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .77 to .80 in a college sample, and from .73 to .80 in a community sample (Ashton & Lee, 2009).

2.2.3. The Zuckerman-Kuhlman-Aluja Personality Questionnaire-Short version

The ZKA-PQ shortened version (ZKA-PQ/SF; Aluja et al., 2018) is an 80-item shortened form derived from the 200-item ZKA-PQ long form (Aluja et al., 2010). The response format is a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree (4)* in both formats. The ZKA-PQ/SF has 20 facets (four items per facet) and five factors: Aggressiveness (AG), Activity (AC), Extraversion (EX), Neuroticism (NE), and Sensation Seeking (SS). Validity and reliability indexes of the ZKA-PQ shortened version were appropriate, as was reported in the cross cultural ZKA-PQ study (Aluja et al., 2019).

2.3. Procedure.

Researchers from Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Spain (Catalan and Spanish speakers) Chile, China, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Poland, Senegal, Spain, Switzerland (French- and German-speaking), Tunisia, the United States, Qatar and Togo accepted the invitation to collaborate in the study. Information about age, gender, educational level and professional level was gathered in the same protocol. Data was collected between 2016 and 2018. For the last two variables, Hollingshead's Social Position Index was calculated (SPI; Hollingshead , 1957; Hollingshead & Redlich, 1958). This index is based on two 7-point scales: An Occupation Scale (1: -higher executives- to 7: -unskilled employees-) and an Education Scale (1: -graduate professionals- to 7: -less than seven years of school-). The formula for obtaining the SPI score was the following [SPI = (Occupation score * 7) + (Education score * 4)]. The range of scores provided by the authors is: upper: < 17; upper-middle: 17-31; middle: 32-47; low-middle: 48-63; and low: > 63 (Hollingshead

& Redlich, 1958). Note that lower scores represent higher Social Position. For more details, see Table S-1 in supplementary material.

Each researcher administered the protocol in paper and pencil form to adult volunteers in their community, except the American sample. Instructions were given to distribute the questionnaires to an equal number of men and women, within the following age ranges: a) 18 to 30 years, b) 31 to 45 years, c) 46 to 60 years and d) more than 60 years old. In the United States sample, participants were recruited and paid through Amazon's Mechanical Turk crowd sourcing platform, using the same age and gender criteria as the other samples. Methodological files and details that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author.

2.4. Translations

In regard to the ZKA-PQ/SF, a native language version of ZKA-PQ (long form) was available to all researchers from an earlier study (Rossier et al., 2016). The back-translation procedure for these versions was described in detail in Blanch and Aluja (2016). For HEXACO-60, validated translations available at www.hexaco.org were used, except for the Arabic, Polish and Hebrew versions, which were specially translated and adapted for this study. For the SD3, available translations for some cultures were also used. When prior translations were unavailable, the researcher of that culture had to translate the HEXACO-60 and/or the SD3 into that language with the help of a local team of specialists in validation studies and linguists. A psychologist fluent in English, and who did not contribute to the native translation, back-translated the translated version into English. The HEXACO-60 back-translation was then sent to Michel Asthon, and SD3 to Delroy L. Paulhus, both coauthors of respective questionnaires. When non-equivalent items were identified, a professional translator compared the back-translated English version and the original English version. Based on these two analyses, researchers received suggestions regarding the revision of items seemingly not equivalent in the translated and original versions.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Dark Triad traits factor structure, Procrustes matrix and factor congruence coefficients.

We conducted a parallel analysis (Horn, 1965), based on minimum rank factor analysis (Timmerman & Lorenzo-Seva, 2011). We analyzed polychoric correlation matrices as performed by Jones and Paulhus (2014) in the original study. Polychoric correlation is advised when the univariate distributions of ordinal items are asymmetric or with excess of kurtosis (Muthen & Kaplan, 1985). The number of random correlation matrices was 500 and the method to obtain random correlation matrices was permutation of the raw data (Buja & Eyuboglu, 1992). Parallel analysis suggested that three factors be retained. Using the Unweighted Least Squares (ULS) with normalized Promax rotation, we obtained four adjusted eigenvalues: 5.80, 2.14, 2.02, 1.48. Eigenvalues of the reduced correlation matrix were 4.35, 1.22, 1.06 and 0.66. Determinant of the matrix values was 0.008, Bartlett's statistic 49806.5 (df = 351; $p = 0.000010$) and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test 0.87 (Ferrando & Lorenzo-Seva, 2017). The goodness of fit statistics were Minimum Fit Function Chi square with 273 degrees of freedom [5833.482 ($p < 0.001$)], Chi-Square for independence model with 351 degrees of freedom [107079.385], Comparative Fit Index (CFI) [0.948], Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) [0.98], Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) [0.97], and Root Mean Square of Residuals (RMSR) [0.04].

Second, we performed congruence coefficients after Procrustes rotation using the current SD3 total matrix and the original SD3 factor analysis matrix as reference (Jones & Paulhus, 2014). Table S-2 (supplementary material) shows the final Procrustes matrix (after targeted rotation) with the original SD3 exploratory factor matrix (Jones & Paulhus, 2014). Most of the items of the three factors have loads of .30 or more on their respective factor. Factor I obtains secondary loads of .30 or higher on items 1, 4 and 7 in factor III, item 9 of factor II loads on factor 3, and items 3, 5, 6 of factor II obtain secondary loads on factor I.

Third, in Table 3 we present the congruency coefficients of the factorial matrix of each culture in reference to the original factor matrix with the same extraction and rotation method used

in the whole sample matrix. The average congruency coefficients of Machiavellianism and Narcissism was 0.89 and of Psychopathy 0.79 (total: 0.86). A value in the range .85–.94 corresponds to a fair similarity (Lorenzo-Seva & Berge, 2006). Differences in the three factors for each culture were observed, especially in regard to Psychopathy, where 13 cultures got values between .63 and .84. For Machiavellianism, Qatar (.82), Senegal (.80), Togo (.78) and Tunisia (-.83) obtained factorial congruence values below .85. Finally, Belgium (.84), Qatar (.78), Senegal (.63) and Tunisia (.85) got values below .85 in Narcissism. Congruence coefficients were lower than those observed for the Dark Triad Dirty Dozen in 49 countries (N = 11,723; 65.8% women; mean age: 21.53), but show the same profile since the worst result was reported for Psychopathy (.88) compared to Machiavellianism (0.94), and Narcissism (.96) (Jonason et al., 2020).

3.2. Invariance of the Dark Triad traits (SD3)

In order to assess the level of invariance of the SD3, each dimension was defined as a latent and each item as observed variable. These dimensions were allowed to covary. A first CFA computed to evaluate the overall adequacy of this three-dimension structure for the entire sample showed overall inadequate fit indices ($\chi^2(321) = 13{,}750.26$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 42.84$, TLI = .703, CFI = .729, and RMSEA = .064). The level of invariance across our 18 samples was investigated by computing a Multi-Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis (MGCFA, see Rossier et al., 2016 for an example of this procedure). This analysis suggested that the SD3 reached cross-cultural does not reach configural ($\chi^2(5{,}778) = 21{,}547.18$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 3.73$, TLI = .682, CFI = .709, RMSEA = .016), metric ($\chi^2(6{,}186) = 23{,}898.10$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 3.86$, TLI = .666, CFI = .673, RMSEA = .017, $\Delta\chi^2(408) = 2{,}350.92$, $p < .001$, ΔTLI = .016, ΔCFI = .036, ΔRMSEA = .001), or scalar invariance ($\chi^2(6{,}288) = 24{,}767.76$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 3.94$, TLI = .657, CFI = .659, RMSEA = .017, $\Delta\chi^2(102) = 869.66$, $p < .001$, ΔTLI = .009, ΔCFI = .014, ΔRMSEA < .001).

Results can be improved by considering that each latent variable results of three parcels using a systematic algorithm (Coffmann & MacCallum, 2005; Little et al., 2002). The first CFA

computed to evaluate the adequacy of this three-dimension structure for the entire sample showed overall adequate fit indices ($\chi^2(24) = 907.99$, $p <. 001$, $\chi^2/df = 37.83$, TLI = .930, CFI = 953, and RMSEA = .060). The level of invariance across the 18 samples computing a MGCFA suggested that the SD3 reached cross-cultural configural invariance ($\chi^2(432) = 1670.74$, $p <. 001$, $\chi^2/df = 3.87$, TLI = .906, CFI = .938, RMSEA = .017), and but not metric ($\chi^2(534) = 2042.58$, $p <. 001$, $\chi^2/df = 3.83$, TLI = .908, CFI = .924, RMSEA = .017, $\Delta\chi^2(102) = 371.84$, $p <. 001$, ΔTLI = .002, ΔCFI = .014, ΔRMSEA < .001), or scalar invariance ($\chi^2(636) = 2918.99$, $p <. 001$, $\chi^2/df = 4.59$, TLI = .883, CFI = .885, RMSEA = .019, $\Delta\chi^2(102) = 876.41$, $p < .001$, ΔTLI = .025, ΔCFI = .039, ΔRMSEA = .002).

The level of invariance across gender was investigated by computing a MGCFA. Across gender, the SD3 did not reached adequate fit indices for configural invariance ($\chi^2(642) = 14{,}306.33$, $p <. 001$, $\chi^2/df = 22.28$, TLI = .697, CFI = .723, RMSEA = .045). Configural invariance being a prerequisite for both metric and scalar invariance, these levels were also not reached even if the ΔTLI , ΔCFI , and ΔRMSEA were acceptable for both metric ($\Delta\chi^2(24) = 112.48$, $p <. 001$, ΔTLI < .001, ΔCFI = .002, ΔRMSEA < .001), and scalar invariance ($\Delta\chi^2(6) = 3.64$, $p = .725$, ΔTLI < .001, ΔCFI < .001, ΔRMSEA < .001). A MGCFA using parcels showed on the contrary, that the SD3 reached configural ($\chi^2(48) = 941.87$, $p <. 001$, $\chi^2/df = 16.62$, TLI = .928, CFI = .952, RMSEA = .043), metric ($\chi^2(54) = 963.30$, $p <. 001$, $\chi^2/df = 17.84$, TLI = .935, CFI = .951, RMSEA = .040, $\Delta\chi^2(6) = 21.43$, $p =. 002$, ΔTLI < .001, ΔCFI = .001, ΔRMSEA < .001), and scalar invariance ($\chi^2(60) = 969.25$, $p <. 001$, $\chi^2/df = 16.15$, TLI = .941, CFI = .951, RMSEA = .038, $\Delta\chi^2(6) = 5.95$, $p = .429$, ΔTLI < .001, ΔCFI < .001, ΔRMSEA < .001).

3.3. Dark Triad traits (SD3) position in the HEXACO and ZKA-PQ personality space

To observe the position of the three SD3 dimensions in the six-factor space of the HEXACO and the five-factor space of ZKA-PQ, two factor analyses were carried out using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) extraction method with Varimax rotation (Table S-3 and S-4, supplementary material). Personality facets from HEXACO and ZKA-PQ with the three SD3 dimensions were

analyzed. We obtained similarly robust satisfactory goodness of fit indexes for the two factor matrices, respectively (RMSEA = 0.04/0.05; CFI = 0.98/0.97, and RMSR = 0.03/0.04) (Browne & Cudeck, 1992).

The Machiavellianism, Narcissism and Psychopathy traits obtained high negative loadings on the Honesty-Humility factor (-.65, -.58 and -.55, respectively) in the HEXACO solution. Narcissism also loaded .55 on Extraversion, and Psychopathy loaded on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness factors (-.34 and -.32, respectively). The facets of each factor of the ZKA-PQ/SF are placed on their respective factor. Psychopathy is located with similar loadings (.48 and .49) on both the Aggressiveness and Sensation Seeking factors, respectively. Narcissism, with a lower loading, is positioned on the Sensation Seeking (.38) and Activity factors (.32), while Machiavellianism, also with a lower loading, is positioned on the Aggressiveness factor (.33).

Table S-5 (Supplementary material) shows the factor solutions extracting 3, 4, 5 and 6 factors using the same factor extraction (ML) and rotation method (Varimax), but including only the dimensions of SD3, ZKA-PQ and HEXACO. In the three-factor solution, Psychopathy and Machiavellianism were located with high Aggressiveness and Sensation Seeking, and low Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness on the first factor. Narcissism loaded on the second factor with Extraversion (ZKA-PQ and HEXACO), Activity and, with a lower loading, Openness. In the following factorial solutions (from 4 to 6 factors), the three dimensions of SD3 are always grouped on the same factor, although Narcissism also loaded on the Extraversion factor with similar weight. In the four-factor solution, the three dimensions of SD3 are grouped with Sensation Seeking (positive), and Honesty-Humility and Conscientiousness (negative). In the five-factor solution, they grouped with Honesty-Humility, and Sensation Seeking forms the fifth factor; in the six-factor solution, the three dimensions of SD3 are grouped into a single factor together with Honesty-Humility. It should be remarked that Honesty-Humility loaded on the factor formed by the three SD3 dimensions on every solution depicted in Table S-5 (Supplementary material).

Additionally, we tested the hypothesis of Hodston et al (2018) on the superposition of the three scales of the Dark Triad and the four facets of Honestity-Humility. Exploratory factor

analysis, using the oblique rotation principal component extraction method, of the seven variables in all countries confirms this overlap, except for Togo and Senegal. Figure 4 shows the factorial weights and the diagram obtained by means of the structural equation models in the present study and in that of Hodston et al. (2018), with very similar results.

3.4. Descriptive statistics and gender differences by culture and reliability

Table 1 show the means, standard deviation, Cohen's *d* gender differences, and Cronbach's internal consistency index for each SD3 dimension classified by Europe/US/Israel cultures and other cultures. Men obtained higher scores than women for all three SD3 dimensions, but there are differences by culture. For Machiavellianism, the culture with the highest Cohen's *d* is Poland, although with a medium effect size[2] (.69), and the average *d* for all cultures was .25. For the Narcissism dimension, men scored higher than women in the German-speaking Swiss culture (.50) and Poland (.45); the average Cohen's *d* across cultures was .18. For Psychopathy, however, gender differences were greater, with a Cohen's *d* average of .35. The cultures in which men rated highest in Psychopathy compared to women were Switzerland (German-speaking) (.75), Germany (.62), Italy (.58), China (.51) and Hungary (.50). It is also observed that the Gender-Equality-Personality Paradox is supported since gender differences were larger in European countries and the US. In fact, when only European countries and the US were considered, the average of gender differences were .31, .25 and .45 for Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy, respectively, higher values than those observed in Non-Western countries (.23, .11 and .28, respectively). This pattern is in agreement with the larger gender differences observed in the DTDD on WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic) compared to non-WEIRD countries (Rogoza et al., 2020)

The low-income cultures obtained a significantly higher mean in Machiavellianism, Narcissism and Psychopathy (p <.001). Controlling for age, gender and SPI, the differences are the same, but with a small effect size for Machiavellianism and Psychopathy and medium for

[2] Cohen's *d*: .01: very small, .20: small, .50: medium, .80: large, 1.20: very large.

Narcissism (η^2 = .008, .053, .008 respectively). If European/US/Israel and other cultures are compared, the significant differences remain, but with a medium effect size for Narcissism and Psychopathy (η^2 = .017, .10.2, .082 respectively) (Figure 1).

The averages of alpha internal consistency in all cultures were .72, .72 and .73 for Machiavellianism, Narcissism and Psychopathy, respectively. The alpha coefficients were similar to those reported in the development SD3 two studies: Machiavellianism (.74/.76), Narcissism (.68/.78) and Psychopathy (.73/.73) (Jones & Paulhus, 2014). Nevertheless, some reliability differences between cultures are observed in the three dimensions. African or Arab cultures tended to have lower alpha coefficients. Note that these cultures also obtained low alphas for the ZKA-PQ and HEXACO in the same sample (Aluja et al., 2019; García et al., 2021).

Figure S-10 (Supplementary material) shows gender differences by age groups in the three dimensions of SD3 for the full sample of all cultures. There are only significant gender differences in Psychopathy for the age range of 18 to 30. The graph also shows that the three SD3 dimensions slightly decline with age, but more markedly in Machiavellianism and Psychopathy. However, for the three dimensions there is a small increase beyond the age of 60.

3.5. Dark Triad traits (SD3) Pearson and partials correlations

The correlations in the entire sample were Machiavellianism and Narcissism (.34), Machiavellianism and Psychopathy (.43) and Narcissism and Psychopathy (.38). In the original SD3 validation (three studies), Machiavellianism correlated with Narcissism, Machiavellianism correlated positively with Psychopathy (.50, .30 and .47) and Psychopathy with Narcissism at .34, 31 and .42 (Jones & Paulhus, 2014). Table S-6 shows the Pearson and partial correlations controlling for age and gender for SD3 scales for culture. All correlations were significant (p < 001) in all samples, but there were important differences between cultures. The correlation between Machiavellianism and Narcissism had a range between .18 and .45, between Machiavellianism and Psychopathy a range between .22 and .57, and the range of correlations between Narcissism and Psychopathy was between .22 and .45.

3.6. Cultural differences in Dark Triad traits (SD3)

We studied the SD3 differences across cultures using a GLM Multivariate procedure. We first controlled for age and gender, (Table S-8, supplementary material). The GLM test is based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means corrected by the co-variables effect. The culture factor accounts for a significant amount of variance for all three SD3 dimensions (Machiavellianism $\eta^2 = .057$, Narcissism $\eta^2 = .159$ and Psychopathy $\eta^2 = .124$). Significant effects of age and gender were also found for the three SD3 dimensions ($p <. 001$), but effect size was smaller than for culture, especially in the case of Narcissism and Psychopathy) (Table 2). The *z*-standardized scores for SD3 dimensions between cultures controlling for gender and age are plotted in Figure 2, graph A. The cultures near to or slightly exceeding ±.50 were Qatar (PS: .59), Senegal (NA: .77) and US (NA: -.54). Cultures with values between .35 and .50 are as follows: in Machiavellianism, Chile (-.39); in Narcissism, Belgium (-.38), Catalonia (-.36), China (-.37) and Switzerland (French-speaking) (-.35), and in Psychopathy, Spain (-.31).

A second GLM Multivariate analysis controlling for age, gender, Social Position Index, Honesty-Humility, Aggressiveness, Sensation Seeking and Extraversion (average ZKA-PQ and HEXACO Extraversion scores) was carried out (Table S-9, supplementary material). Honesty-Humility had effects on Machiavellianism ($\eta^2 = .125$), Narcissism[3] ($\eta^2 = .085$) and Psychopathy ($\eta^2 = .124$). Aggressiveness influenced Psychopathy ($\eta^2 = .110$). Sensation Seeking had an effect on Psychopathy ($\eta^2 = .063$), and the Extraversion of ZKA-PQ and HEXACO (average) had an effect of $\eta^2 = .095$ on Narcissism. The results indicated that there were significant differences for all three dimensions of SD3 ($p < .001$) in the two data matrices using a Paired Samples Test according to the two conditions (Figure2 graphic B). The values of both arrays are shown in the supplementary material (S-7, supplementary material). The graph values were, in general, somewhat lower than in

[3] $\eta^2 < 0.0099$ = negligible; $\eta^2 > 0.01$: small; $\eta^2 \geq 0.0588$ medium; $\eta^2 \geq 0.1379$: large effect size (Cohen, 1988, pp. 274–288).

graph A. The cultures with the greatest differences were China, Hungary, and Tunisia.

3.7. Social Position Index and Dark Triad traits (SD3) dimensions

To study the relationship between the three dimensions of SD3 and the Social Position Index (SPI), the means between the five SPI ranges were compared using an ANOVA. For Machiavellianism, there were no significant mean differences ($F_{(4, 7651)} = .440$, $p < .780$), but there were for Narcissism ($F_{(4, 7651)} = 20.83$, $p < .001$) and Psychopathy ($F_{(4, 7651)} = 6.49$, $p < .001$). SPI ranges of SD3 differences are reported in Figure3. Subjects with an upper or upper-middle SPI had higher scores on Narcissism, while subjects with a low SPI had low scores. With regard to the Psychopathy dimension, however, the data indicate the opposite; people with upper or upper-middle position have low scores and those with low SPI had high scores in Psychopathy.

4. DISCUSSION

The present study explored the Dark Triad personality traits using the SD3 in different cultures across Europe, America, Africa, and Asia. We focused on gender and age differences, their relationship to social status, and the relationship between the Dark Triad and personality, as modeled by HEXACO and AFFM. It is the first time that the three questionnaires have been studied simultaneously in a wide sample of countries. The global factor congruence of SD3 with respect to the original factorial matrix is at the lower limit of the satisfactory range (.85-.95), but some countries obtain low factorial congruence indices, particularly in the Psychopathy dimension. While ZKA-PQ and HEXACO-60 have shown good psychometric properties and cross-cultural generalizability in this same sample (Aluja et al., 2019; García et al., 2021), with the exception of some Arab or African cultures, SD3 shows moderate internal consistency values (around .70), although similar to the original study (Jones & Paulhus, 2014). The factorial structure of the SD3 of the entire sample replicated the 3 original factors considering congruence coefficients or the goodness-of-fit indicators using parcels but not the goodness-of-fit indicators resulting from a regular CFA. It is worthy to note that the parcel approach that been criticized by many

psychometricians and methodologists (e.g., Marsh, Lüdtke, Nagengast, Morin, & von Davier, 2013). These results illustrate the difficulties of assessing the structure underlying a personality inventory using a large set of lowly correlated items using a CFA approach (e.g., McCrae, Zonderman, Costa, Bond, & Paunonen, 1996). Using a regular MGCFA approach, the SD3 did not reach configural, metric or scalar invariance. Considering parcels did allow to reach configural and somehow metric invariance, but clearly not scalar invariance, as did the ZKA-PQ/SF and HEXACO-60 in the same samples (Aluja et al., 2019; García et al., 2021). Several methodologists would claim that in this case means cannot be compared across cultures (Rossier & Duarte, 2019). However, this type of mismatch between the psychometric approach (large sample of uncorrelated items) and the statistical approach (parsimonious highly correlated observed variables), and the over emphasis given to the question of the measurement invariance did lead several methodologists to suggest that the criteria to assess invariance across cultures were too strict, considering differences not directly related with the latent constructs (Millsap, 2011). A recent contribution highlights the limitation of measurement invariance construct and shows that when cross-group differences are important measurement invariance is very difficult to reach, because it is closely linked with the arithmetic of the closed-ended scaled that are used (Welzel, Brunkert, Kruse, & Inglehart, 2021). For personality measurements, invariance is indeed usually observed when differences are very small (e.g. Rossier, Hansenne, Baudin, & Morizot, 2012). Moreover, Welzel and colleagues (2021) suggested that the cross-cultural validity of multi-item index should not be assessed considering single items. This could be an argument in favor of the parcel approach, even if this approach does not solve the arithmetical limitation mentioned.

Considering the gender and cultural differences on the Dark Triad traits observed in the present paper, the idea that processes of enculturation and socialization play a role in the prevalence of Dark Triad is supported. However, it should be noted that effect sizes of the differences between gender and cultures on the three Dark Triad traits were usually below $d = .40$, suggesting a not very large effect size. This is congruent with behavioral genetic studies about the Dark Triad. Psychopathy and Narcissism have strong genetic (about 60%) and non-shared environment (about

35%) percentages of variance, which is typical in the field of personality (Vernon et al., 2008). Machiavellianism, however, is a notable exception, as shared environment seems the most relevant factor accounting for phenotypic differences (39%), with a heritability of only 30% (Vernon et al., 2008). In the present study, culture accounts for fewer differences in Machiavellianism than in Psychopathy and Narcissism. It should be noted that the profiles observed in this study are like the profiles observed in other samples from the same countries. Hence, the profile we observed in the US, with higher scores for men and higher scores on Machiavellianism and Narcissism, is similar to the profile observed by Jones and Paulhus (2014) or Persson, Kajonius, and García (2019). Curiously, scores that were expected to be higher in individualistic cultures were in fact lower in most Western cultures compared to African and Asian cultures. While the important social control feature of collectivistic cultures might lead to a reduction in the prevalence of antisocial or narcissistic personality disorders symptoms (Rossier et al., 2017), this control could also tend to increase the expression of maladaptive personality and sub-clinical traits, being perceived as socially more acceptable than clinical traits. We could speculate that the level of social stigma of mental illness that is known to be higher in Eastern cultures (Krendl & Pescosolido, 2020) (and that could be generally higher in non-Western collectivistic cultures) might explain lower prevalence rates for personality disorders but higher levels on socially more accepted sub-clinical traits that could be perceived as more acceptable, as in our African, Middle-Eastern, and Asian samples. These results support the idea that cultural context shapes how people express their personality in reference to others. Nevertheless, exactly how culture influences this expression remains largely unknown and should be further studied.

The three Dark Triad traits present relationships with HEXACO and AFFM in agreement with our predictions. All three scales correlate negatively with Agreeableness (Vize et al., 2019; Watt et al., 2017), but most strongly with Honesty-Humility (Lee & Ashton, 2014). Psychopathy is negatively related to Conscientiousness, and positively to Aggressiveness and Sensation Seeking. Narcissism correlates positively with Extraversion. Machiavellianism and Psychopathy are related to Aggressiveness. It is also worth remarking that, in a three-factor space, Psychopathy and

Machiavellianism load on the same factor as Aggressiveness, Honesty-Humility, Sensation Seeking and Conscientiousness. This factor appears highly similar to the Eysenck Psychoticism trait (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1977; Eysenck et al., 1985). In this solution, Narcissism loads on the Extroversion factor, along with Activity and Openness.

It is also striking that, in the four, five and six factor solutions, the three Dark Triad traits scales tend to load on the same factor with Honesty-Humility from the HEXACO. Our results demonstrate an almost perfect overlap between the three Dark Triad scales and the four Honesty-Humility facets, corroborating the results of Hodston et al. (2018). In fact, the present study replicates what has been found previously, in that this sixth factor of the HEXACO model could be the best personality correlate of the Dark Triad traits (Lee & Ashton, 2014), although other personality traits such as Sensation Seeking clearly add explanatory power. It is interesting to note that if the Dark Triad has been consistently and strongly associated with the Honesty-Humility personality trait, a recent study showed that this Triad is even more strongly associated with the pathological trait of Antagonism from the Personality Inventory for the DSM-5 (Dinić, Wertag, Sokolovska, & Tomašević, 2021). This might be seen as consistent with the fact that this triad is a set of sub-clinical personality traits, so somewhere in between common and subclinical personality. Overall, the present study supports the notion that the Dark Triad consists of a homogeneous cluster of maladaptive personality and sub-clinical traits (Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006), and is, therefore, not in agreement with studies suggesting a non-significant correlation between Narcissism and Machiavellianism (Lee & Ashton, 2005; Rogoza & Cieciuch, 2018).

The literature reports that low Social Position or socioeconomic status is linked to Psychopathy, and that groups of subjects with higher social standing present higher rates of Narcissism. The results of the present study replicate this pattern of relationships across 18 different cultures. Therefore, the present paper also reinforces the idea that these sub-clinical traits, as well as the personality traits associated, could have a real impact on social phenomena. Hence, the present paper highlights the need to consider these psychological variables in actions to prevent and tackle things like poverty and social deprivation. What is also relevant is that this pattern of results is

observed across a variety of cultures that clearly differ in political and economic systems, welfare and other political, economic and social indexes. Finally, our results are in agreement with previous studies that point out that Machiavellianism plays no role in the observed differences on SES.

The Dark Triad has shown practical utility in the prediction and explanation of many behavioral outcomes such as counterproductive behaviors in organizational settings (DeShong et al., 2015), addiction (Jauk & Dieterich, 2019), clinical symptoms (Gómez-Leal et al., 2019), educational preferences (Krick et al., 2016), and mate choice (Jonason et al., 2015). The results of the present study suggest this practical utility, indicating that the Dark Triad is a potentially useful tool for research and psychological practitioners all over the world.

This research has strengths and limitations. Among the strengths is a particularly large sample (>10,000) that comes from community subjects, not only students. The proportion of man and woman participants is similar, and the average age is over 40 years, and was somewhat stratified to avoid excessive sampling biases. In regard to limitations, sampling procedures in every culture were not entirely representative of the culture of reference, although a concerted effort was made to achieve appropriate representation across age and gender. African or Arab cultures tended to have lower alpha coefficients and low factor congruence coefficients in SD3 but also in ZKA-PQ and HEXACO in the same sample (Aluja et al., 2019; García et al., 2021). This could be due to difficulties in comprehension or motivation, biased response styles within countries, or low education levels (Laajaj et al., 2019). Hence, replication of the present studies is recommended with larger and more representative samples, even including sub-samples with different educational levels to control for this variable. Finally, SD3 presents some high secondary loadings on a different factor, as recognized by the authors in the limitations section of the original study. As some of the psychometric properties of SD3 are not entirely satisfactory, more suitable instruments should be used in future studies on Dark Triad traits.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank Dr. Delroy L. Paulhus, Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, 2136 West Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6T 1Z4 Canada, coauthor of Short Dark Triad (SD3), by overseeing back translations of different SD3 languages and their comments on the study. We also want to thank Dr. Peter Karl Jonason of the Western Sydney University, School of Social Sciences and Psychology, Australia, for his advice and suggestions on the study. Both researchers are experts in Dark Triad traits construct. This research was funded by a grant from the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (PID2019-103981RB-I00).

5. REFERENCES

Aluja, A. (2019). In memoriam of Marvin Zuckerman: His impact on Spanish Psychology. *Psicothema*, *31*, 184-193. https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2019.35

Aluja, A., Blanch, A., García, L. F., García, O., & Escorial, S. (2012). Zuckerman-Kuhlman-Aluja Personality Questionnaire (ZKA-PQ) as a predictor of MCMI-III personality disorders scales. *Personality and Mental Health, 6,* 217-227. https://doi.org/10.1002/pmh.1185

Aluja, A., Escorial, S., García, L. F., García, Ó., Blanch, A., & Zuckerman, M. (2013). Reanalysis of Eysenck's, Gray's, and Zuckerman's structural trait models based on a new measure: The Zuckerman–Kuhlman–Aluja Personality Questionnaire (ZKA-PQ). *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*, 192-196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.08.030

Aluja, A., García, O., & García, L.F. (2003). Relationships among extraversion, openness to experience, and sensation seeking. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35,* 671-680. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(02)00244-1

Aluja, A., Kuhlman, M. & Zuckerman, M. (2010). Development of the Zuckerman-Kuhlman-Aluja personality questionnaire (ZKA-PQ): A factor/facet version of the Zuckerman-Kuhlman personality questionnaire (ZKPQ). *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *92*, 416–431. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1476307

Aluja, A., Lucas, I., Blanch, A., García, O., & García, L. F. (2018). The Zuckerman-Kuhlman-Aluja Personality Questionnaire shortened form (ZKA-PQ/SF). *Personality and Individual Differences*, *134*, 174-181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.06.015

Aluja, A., Rossier, J., Oumar, B., García, L. F., Bellaj, T., Ostendorf, F., ... & Čekrlija, Đ. (2019). Multicultural Validation of the Zuckerman–Kuhlman–Aluja Personality Questionnaire Shortened Form (ZKA-PQ/SF) Across 18 Countries. *Assessment*, *27*, 728-748. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191119831770

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008). The prediction of Honesty-Humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 1216–1228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.03.006

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO–60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340-345. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878

Atitsogbe, K. A., Hansenne, M., Pari, P., & Rossier, J. (2020). Normal personality, the dark triad, proactive attitude and perceived employability: A cross-cultural study in Belgium, Switzerland and Togo. *Psychologica Belgica*, *60*, 217–235. https://doi.org/10.5334/pb.520

Blanch, A. & Aluja, A. (2016). Text mining a self-report back-translation. *Psychological Assessment, 28*, 750. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000213

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods and Research*, *21*, 230-258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124192021002005

Bucher, L., Tran, U. S., Prinz, G. M., Burgard, T., Bosnjak, M., & Voracek, M. (2020). Keeping meta-analyses alive and well: Using Psych Open CAMA to implement a community-augmented meta-analysis on the Dark Triad of personality. http://dx.doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.2752

Buja, A., & Eyuboglu, N. (1992). Remarks on parallel analysis. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 27(4), 509-540. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2704_2

Canino, G., Polanczyk, G., Bauermeister, J. J., Rohde, L. A., & Frick, P. J. (2010). Does the prevalence of CD and ODD vary across cultures? *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *45*, 695-704. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-0242-y

Coffman, D. L., & MacCallum, R. C. (2005). Using parcels to convert path analysis models into latent variable models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *40*, 235–259. https://doi.org/10.1207/ s15327906mbr4002_4

Cohen P, Chen H, Gordon K, Johnson J, Brook J, Kasen S. (2008). Socioeconomic background and the developmental course of schizotypal and borderline personality disorder symptoms. *Development and Psychopathology, 20*, 633–650. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095457940800031X

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Academic Press.

Compton, W.M., Conway, K.P., Stinson, F.S., Colliver, J.D., & Grant, B.F. (2005) Prevalence, correlates, and comorbidity of DSM-IV antisocial personality syndromes and alcohol and specific drug use disorders in the United States: Results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 66*, 677–685. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.v66n0602

Cooke, D. J. (1996). Psychopathic personality in different cultures. What do we know? What do we need to find out? *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *10*, 23–40. https://doi.org/10.1521/predi.1996.10.1.23

Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (1999). Psychopathy across cultures: North American and Scotland compared. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 10*, 58-68. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.108.1.58

De Vries, Y. A., Ten Have, M., de Graaf, R., van Dorsselaer, S., de Ruiter, N. M. P., & de Jonge, P. (2020). The relationship between mental disorders and actual and desired subjective social status. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, *29*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796019000805

DeShong, H. L., Grant, D. M., & Mullins-Sweatt, S. N. (2015). Comparing models of counterproductive workplace behaviors: The Five-Factor Model and the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 74*, 55-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.001

Dinić, B. M., Wertag, A., Sokolovska, V., & Tomašević, A. (2021). The good, the bad, and the ugly: Revisiting the Dark Core. *Current Psychology*. Advanced online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01829-x

Erreygers, G. (2013). A dual Atkinson measure of socioeconomic inequality of health. *Health Economics*, *22*, 466-479. https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.2820

Eysenck, H. J. (1992). Four ways five factors are not basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *13*, 667-673. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90237-J

Eysenck, H.J. & Eysenck, S.B.G. (1976). *Psychoticism as a Dimension of Personality.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Eysenck, S. B. G., & Eysenck, H. J. (1977). The place of impulsiveness in a dimensional system of personality description. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 16*, 57–68. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1977.tb01003.x

Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 6,* 21–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(85)90026-1

Fehr, B., Samsom, D., & Paulhus, D. L. (1992). The construct of Machiavellianism: Twenty years later. In C. D. Spielberger & J. N. Butcher (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (Vo1.9, pp.77-116). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Ferrando, P.J., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2017). Program FACTOR at 10: origins, development and future directions. Psicothema, 29(2), 236-241. doi: 10.7334/psicothema2016.304 for the factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *38*, 171-189.

Foster, J.D., Campbell, W.K. & Twenge, J.M. (2003). Individual differences in narcissism: Inflated self-views across the lifespan and around the world. J*ournal of Research in Personality, 37*, 469-486. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00026-6

Furnham, A., Wealthierards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). The Dark Triad of personality: A 10-year review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *7*, 199-216. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12018

García, L. F., Aluja, A., Rossier, J., Ostendorf, F., Glicksohn, J., Oumar, B., Bellaj, T., Ruch, W., Wang, W., Kövi, Z., Ścigała, D., Čekrlija, Đ., Stivers, A. W., Di Blas, L., Valdivia, M., Ben Jemaa, S., Atitsogbe, K. A., & Hansenne, M. (2021). Exploring the stability of HEXACO-60 structure and the association of gender, age, and social position with personality traits across

18 countries. *Journal of personality.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12664

Gómez-Leal, R., Megías-Robles, A., Gutiérrez-Cobo, M. J., Cabello, R., Fernández-Abascal, E. G., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2019). Relationship between the Dark Triad and depressive symptoms. *PeerJ, 7,* e8120. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8120

Grant, K. E., Katz, B. N., Thomas, K. J., O'Koon, J. H., Meza, C. M., DiPasquale, A. M., ... & Bergen, C. (2004). Psychological symptoms affecting low-income urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*, 613-634. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558403260014

Hare, R. D. (1982). Psychopathy and the personality dimensions of psychoticism, extraversion and neuroticism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *3*, 35-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(82)90072-1

Hare, R.D. (2003). Manual for the Revised Psychopathy Checklist. 2nd ed. Multi-Health Systems: Toronto, Ontario.

Hodson, G., Book, A., Visser, B. A., Volk, A. A., Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2018). Is the dark triad common factor distinct from low honesty-humility? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *73*, 123-129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.012

Hollingshead, A. B. (1957). *Two Factor Index of Social Position.* New Haven, CT: Privately printed.

Hollingshead, A. d. B. & Redlich, F. C. (1958). *Social class and mental illness: A community study*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in a factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, *30*, 179-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491301100116

Huang, N., Zuo, S., Wang, F., Cai, P., & Wang, F. (2019). Environmental attitudes in China: The roles of the Dark Triad, future orientation and place attachment. *International Journal of Psychology*, *54*, 563-572. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12518

Jakobwitz, S., & Egan, V. (2006). The dark triad and normal personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40(2),* 331–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.07.006

Jauk, E., & Dieterich, R. (2019). Addiction and the Dark Triad of Personality. *Frontiers in psychiatry, 10,* 662. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2019.00662

Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2010). The Dirty Dozen: A concise measure of the Dark Triad. *Psychological Assessment*, *22*, 420–432. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019265

Jonason, P. K., Baughman, H. M., Carter, G. L., & Parker, P. (2015). Dorian Gray without his portrait: Psychological, social, and physical health costs associated with the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *78*, 5-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.01.008

Jonason, P. K., Foster, J., Oshio, A., Sitnikova, M., Birkas, B., & Gouveia, V. (2017). Self-construals and the Dark Triad traits in six countries. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *113*, 120-124.

Jonason, P. K., Icho, A., & Ireland, K. (2016). Resources, harshness, and unpredictability: the socioeconomic conditions associated with the Dark Triad traits. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474704915623699

Jonason, P. K., Lyons, M., & Blanchard, A. (2015). Birds of a "bad" feather flock together: The Dark Triad and mate choice. *Personality and Individual Differences, 78,* 34–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.01.018

Jonason, P. K., Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Piotrowski, J., Sedikides, C., Campbell, W. K., Gebauer, J. E., ... & Atitsogbe, K. A. (2020). Country-Level Correlates of the Dark Triad Traits in 49 Countries. *Journal of Personality*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12569

Jonason, P.K., Li, N.P., Czarna, A.Z. (2013). Quick and dirty: Some psychosocial costs associated with the Dark Triad in three countries. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *11*, 172-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491301100116

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Introducing the Short Dark Triad (SD3): A Brief Measure of Dark Personality Traits. *Assessment*, *21*(1), 28–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191113514105

Jones, D.N., Daniel N., Paulhus, D.L., & Delroy L. (2011). The role of impulsivity in the Dark Triad of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*, 679-682. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.04.011

Kivimäki, M., Batty, G. D., Pentti, J., Shipley, M. J., Sipilä, P. N., Nyberg, S. T., ... & Marmot, M. G. (2020). Association between socioeconomic status and the development of mental and physical health conditions in adulthood: a multi-cohort study. *The Lancet Public Health*, *5*, e140-e149. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(19)30248-8

Krendl, A. C., & Pescosolido, B. A. (2020). Countries and cultural differences in the stigma of mental illness: The East-West divide. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *51*, 149-167. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022119901297

Krick, A., Tresp, S., Vatter, M., Ludwig, A., Wihlenda, M., & Rettenberger, M. (2016). The relationships between the dark triad, the moral judgment level, and the students' disciplinary choice: Self-selection, indoctrination, or both? *Journal of Individual Differences, 37*, 24–30. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000184

Laajaj, R., Macours, K., Hernandez, D.A., Arias, O., Gosling, S.D., Potter, J., Rubio-Codina, M., & Vakis, R. (2019). Challenges to capture the big five personality traits in non-WEIRD populations. *Science Advances, 5,* eaaw5226. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aaw5226

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

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2014). The Dark Triad, the Big Five, and the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 67,* 2–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.048

Lee, K, & Ashton, M.C. (2020). Sex differences in HEXACO personality characteristics across countries and ethnicities. *Journal of Personality, 88,* 1075-1090. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12551

Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., Visser, B. A., & Gallucci, A. (2013). Sex, power, and money: Prediction from the Dark Triad and Honesty-Humility. *European Journal of Personality*, *27*, 169-184. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2242

Little, T. D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *9*, 151–173. https://doi.org/10.1207/ S15328007SEM0902_1

Lorenzo-Seva, U., & Ferrando, P. J. (2013). FACTOR 9.2 a comprehensive program for fitting exploratory and semi confirmatory factor analysis and IRT models. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 37*, 497–498. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621613487794

Lorenzo-Seva, U., & Ten Berge, J. M. (2006). Tucker's congruence coefficient as a meaningful index of factor similarity. *Methodology*, *2*(2), 57-64. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241.2.2.57

Maples, J. L., Lamkin, J., & Miller, J. D. (2014). A test of two brief measures of the Dark Triad: The Dirty Dozen and Short Dark Triad. *Psychological Assessment*, *26*, 326–331. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035084

Marsh, H. W., Lüdtke, O., Nagengast, B., Morin, A. J. S., & von Davier, M. (2013). Why item parcels are (almost) never appropriate: Two wrongs do not make a right—Camouflaging misspecification with item parcels in CFA models. *Psychological Methods*, *18*(3), 257–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032773

McCrae, R. R., Zonderman, A. B., Costa, P. T., Jr., Bond, M. H., & Paunonen, S. V. (1996). Evaluating replicability of factors in the Revised NEO Personality Inventory: Confirmatory factor analysis versus Procrustes rotation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(3), 552–566. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.552

Miller, J. D., Few, L. R., Seibert, L. A., Watts, A., Zeichner, A., & Lynam, D. R. (2012). An examination of the Dirty Dozen measure: A cautionary tale about the costs of brief measures. *Psychological Assessment*, *24*, 1048-1053. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028583

Millsap, R. E. (2011). *Statistical approaches to measurement invariance*. Routledge.

Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the dark triad (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 183-204. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616666070

Muthén, B., & Kaplan, D. (1985). A comparison of some methodologies for the factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 38*(2), 171–189. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1985.tb00832.x

O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., Story, P. A., & White, C. D. (2015). A meta-analytic test of redundancy and relative importance of the dark triad and five-factor model of personality. *Journal of personality*, *83*, 644-664. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12126

Paris, J., & Lis, E. (2013). Can sociocultural and historical mechanisms influence the development of borderline personality disorder? *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *50*, 140-151. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461512468105

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *36*, 556-563. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6

Persson, B. N., Kajonius, P. J., & García, D. (2019). Revisiting the structure of the short dark triad. *Assessment*, *26*, 3-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191117701192

Piff, P. K. (2014). Wealth and the inflated self: Class, entitlement, and narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40,* 34–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213501699

Quon, E. C., & McGrath, J. J. (2014). Subjective socioeconomic status and adolescent health: a meta-analysis. *Health Psychology*, *33*, 433. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033716

Qureshi, C., Harris, E., & Atkinson, B. E. (2016). Relationships between age of females and attraction to the Dark Triad personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *95*, 200-203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.02.047

Rauthmann, J. F. (2013). Investigating the Mach IV with item response theory and proposing the trimmed the Mach*. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.742905

Reiss, F. (2013). Socioeconomic inequalities and mental health problems in children and adolescents: a systematic review. *Social Science and Medicine*, *90*, 24-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.04.026

Reiss, F., Meyrose, A. K., Otto, C., Lampert, T., Klasen, F., & Ravens-Sieberer, U. (2019). Socioeconomic status, stressful life situations and mental health problems in children and adolescents: Results of the German BELLA cohort-study. *PLoS one*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0213700

Rogoza, R., & Cieciuch, J. (2018). Dark Triad traits and their structure: An empirical approach. *Current Psychology*, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9834-6

Rogoza, R., Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Jonason, P. K., Piotrowski, J., Campbell, K. W., Gebauer, J., … & Wlodarczyk, A. (2020). Structure of Dark Triad Dirty Dozen across eight world regions. *Assessment*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191120922611

Rossier, J., Aluja, A., Blanch, A., Barry, O., Hansenne, M., Carvalho, A. F., ... & Suranyi, Z. (2016). Cross-cultural generalizability of the alternative five-factor model using the Zuckerman–Kuhlman–Aluja personality questionnaire. *European Journal of Personality*, *30*, 139-157. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2045

Rossier J., & Duarte M. E. (2019) Testing and assessment in an international context: Cross- and multi-cultural issues. In J. Athanasou & H. Perera (Eds.), *International handbook of career guidance* (pp. 613-637). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25153-6_28

Rossier, J., Hansenne, M., Baudin, N., & Morizot, J. (2012). Zuckerman's revised Alternative Five-Factor Model: Validation of the Zuckerman-Kuhlmun-Aluja Personality Questionnaire in four French-speaking countries. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *94*(4), 358-365. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.657024

Rossier, J., Ouedraogo, A., & Dahourou, D. (2017). Personality structure and assessment in French-speaking African Cultures. In A. T. Church (Eds.), *The Praeger handbook of personality across cultures* (Vol. 1, pp. 73-103), Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Publisher.

Rossier, J., Rigozzi, C., & Personality Across Culture Research Group (2008). Personality disorders and the Five-Factor Model among French speakers in Africa and Europe. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *53*, 534-544. http://doi.org/10.1177/070674370805300808

Severance, L., Bui-Wrzosinska, L., Gelfand, M. J., Lyons, S., Nowak, A., Borkowski, W., ... & Lin, C. C. (2013). The psychological structure of aggression across cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*, 835-865. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1873

Thalmayer, A. G., & Rossier, J. (2019). Agreeableness, antagonism, and mental health across cultures. In J. D. Miller & D. R. Lynam (Eds.). *The handbook of antagonism: Conceptualizations, assessment, consequences, and treatment of the low end of agreeableness* (pp. 97-111). London, UK: Academic Press.

Timmerman, M. E., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2011). Dimensionality Assessment of Ordered Polytomous Items with Parallel Analysis. Psychological Methods, 16, 209-220. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023353

Torgersen, S., Kringlen, E., & Cramer, V. (2001). The prevalence of personality disorders in a community sample. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 58,* 590–596. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.58.6.590

Turner, C. F., & Martínez, D. C. (1977). Socioeconomic achievement and the Machiavellian personality. *Sociometry*, *40*, 325-336. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033481

Tyagi, P., & Ranga, B. S. (2018). An examination of the correlation between socioeconomic status and mental health. *International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering*, *8*, 252-262.

Vernon, P.A., Villani, V.C., Vickers, L.C., & Harris, J.A. (2008). A behavioral genetic investigation of the Dark Triad and the Big 5. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44,* 445–452. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.09.007

Vize, C. E., Collison, K. L., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2018a). Examining the effects of controlling for shared variance among the dark triad using meta-analytic structural equation modelling. *European Journal of Personality*, *32*, 46-61. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2137

Vize, C. E., Collison, K. L., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2019). The "core" of the dark triad: A test of competing hypotheses. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 11*, 91-99. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000386

Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., Collison, K. L., & Miller, J. D. (2018b). Differences among dark triad components: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *9*, 101-111. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000222

Walsh, Z., Shea, M. T., Yen, S., Ansell, E. B., Grilo, C. M., McGlashan, T. H., ... & Morey, L. C. (2013). Socioeconomic-status and mental health in a personality disorder sample: The importance of neighborhood factors. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *27*, 820-831. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2012_26_061

Watts, A. L., Waldman, I. D., Smith, S. F., Poore, H. E., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2017). The nature and correlates of the Dark Triad: The answers depend on the questions. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 126*, 951-968. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000296

Welzel, C., Brunkert, L., Kruse, S., & Inglehart, R. F. (2021). Non-invariance? An overstated problem with misconceived causes. *Sociological Methods & Research*. Advanced online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124121995521

Włodarska, K. A., Zyskowska, E., Terebus, M. K., & Rogoza, R. (2019). The Dark Triad and BIS/BAS: A Meta-Analysis. *Current Psychology*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00467-8

Zuckerman, M., & Aluja, A. (2015). Measures of sensation seeking. In *Measures of personality and social psychological constructs* (pp. 352-380). Academic Press. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-386915-9.00013-9

Zuckerman, M., & Glicksohn, J. (2016). Hans Eysenck's personality model and the constructs of sensation seeking and impulsivity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 103*, 48-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.003

Zuckerman, M., Kuhlman, D. M., Joireman, J., Teta, P., & Kraft, M. (1993). A comparison of three structural models for personality: The big three, the big five, and the alternative five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65,* 757-768. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.4.7

Table 1. *Means, Standard Deviations, and Internal Reliabilities for Women and Men by Culture and SD3 scale.*

	Culture	Language	*Age*		*N*		Machiavellianism						Narcissism						Psychopathy					
					Gender		Men		Women				Men		Women				Men		Women			
			M	*SD*	♂	♀	*M*	*SD*	M	*SD*	*d*	α	*M*	*SD*	*M*	SD	*d*	α	*M*	SD	*M*	*SD*	*d*	*α*
Europe/US/Israel	Switz.	French	38.86	15.99	183	139	2.84	.60	2.67	.58	.29	.73	2.81	.56	2.58	.52	.42	.77	2.17	.57	1.91	.52	.47	.74
	Switz.	German	36.41	17.15	237	372	2.93	.61	2.68	.58	.42	.75	2.93	.54	2.66	.54	**.50**	.67	2.25	.53	1.87	.49	.75	.75
	Gernany	German	45.22	18.70	344	356	2.94	.63	2.71	.57	.38	.81	2.82	.56	2.67	.54	.27	.78	2.17	.55	1.84	.51	.62	.83
	US	English	44.65	15.08	216	222	2.98	.80	2.79	.70	.25	.85	2.59	.72	2.46	.69	.18	.80	2.30	.80	1.87	.71	.57	.84
	Belgium	French	45.16	17.09	169	168	2.94	.52	2.90	.55	.08	.72	2.71	.44	2.51	.46	.04	.71	2.23	.55	1.91	.49	.06	.75
	Italy	Italian	40.54	14.85	205	209	3.04	.63	2.77	.56	.45	.73	2.87	.59	2.66	.56	.36	.75	2.43	.56	2.11	.54	.58	.78
	Israel	Hebrew	43.43	17.46	136	143	3.02	.61	2.71	.66	.49	.77	2.90	.59	2.79	.59	.18	.76	2.07	.67	1.78	.55	.47	.75
	Catalonia	Catalan	41.66	17.78	338	335	2.96	.65	2.73	.65	.35	.73	2.73	.55	2.60	.54	.24	.76	2.14	.66	1.84	.62	.47	.75
	Spain	Spanish	40.44	20.71	409	468	2.93	.63	2.71	.61	.35	.77	2.81	.52	2.69	.58	.22	.74	2.11	.60	1.89	.59	.37	.79
	Poland	Polish	37.80	13.31	178	332	3.12	.64	2.70	.59	.69	.73	2.99	.68	2.71	.58	.45	.75	2.19	.59	1.96	.59	.39	.71
	Hungary	Hungarian	40.20	16.91	200	380	3.27	.66	3.00	.69	.40	.79	3.05	.67	2.84	.60	.34	.77	2.05	.63	1.77	.53	.50	.77
	Bosnia H	B-C-S	45.73	16.88	229	217	2.75	.62	2.67	.61	.13	.78	2.66	.66	2.65	.55	.02	.70	2.11	.66	1.95	.59	.26	.72
	Average		*46.68*	*16.83*	*2844*	*3341*	*2.98*	*.63*	*2.75*	*.61*	*.36*	*.76*	*2.82*	*.59*	*2.65*	*.56*	*.27*	*.75*	*2.19*	*.61*	*1.89*	*.56*	*.46*	*.77*
Other cultures	Qatar	Arabic	44.40	16.91	401	398	2.99	.57	2.97	.54	.03	.56	2.98	.54	2.92	.51	.11	.57	2.56	.57	2.47	.59	.15	.58
	Chile	Spanish	43.31	17.41	200	200	2.68	.67	2.59	.70	.13	.75	2.74	.50	2.70	.50	.08	.72	2.05	.60	1.93	.56	.21	.76
	China	Mandarin	24.75	7.85	296	313	3.24	.69	3.12	.64	.18	.79	2.71	.57	2.63	.53	.15	.76	1.99	.61	1.71	.49	.51	.71
	Tunisia	Arabic	44.13	16.63	196	196	2.94	.60	2.85	.61	.15	.61	3.02	.60	3.02	.61	.00	.65	2.52	.50	2.40	.52	.23	.53
	Senegal	French	--	--	797	762	3.09	.51	3.09	.54	.00	.52	3.30	.47	3.37	.48	-.15	.58	2.41	.59	2.44	.66	-.05	.68
	Togo	French	30.03	9.74	154	200	3.27	.55	3.20	.55	.13	.63	3.17	.46	3.16	.46	.02	.69	2.22	.48	2.11	.50	.22	.66
	Average		*37.32*	*13.71*	*2044*	*2969*	*3.04*	*.60*	*2.97*	*.60*	*.10*	*.64*	*2.99*	*.52*	*2.97*	*.52*	*.04*	*.66*	*2.29*	*.56*	*2.18*	*.55*	*.21*	*.65*

Note: M: Mean; *SD*; Standard deviation; *Bosnia H.: Bosnia-Herz*egovina; *B-C-S: Bosinan- Croatian-Serbian; Switz.: Switzerland; US: United States of America. Cohen's d equal to or higher than .50 in boldface. Cohen's d: .10: very small, .20: small, .50: medium, .80: large, 1.20: very large. The cultures are arranged According to the Gross Domestic Product Purchasing Power.* https://www.gfmag.com/global-data/economic-data/richest-countries-in-the-world. *(S-1 supplementary material).*

Table 2. *Correlations with Age and Gender Differences for each Personality Scales (SD3) and each Sub-sample.*

		Partial correlations with age controlling for gender						Correlations with SPI controlling for gender						Gender differences controlling for age (partial η^2)					
	Sub-sample	MA		NA		PS		MA		NA		PS		MA		NA		PS	
														η^2	$p <$	η^2	$p <$	η^2	$p <$
Europe/US/Israel	Switz. (F)	-.15	***	-.05		-.17	***	.05		-.15	*	.27	***	.024	<.006	.047	<.001	**.063**	<.001
	Switz. (G)	-.19	***	-.01		-.27	***	.08		-.14	*	.07		.047	<.001	**.055**	<.001	**.137**	<.001
	Germany	-.10	**	-.07		-.29		.07		-.13	**	.08		.036	<.001	.019	<.001	**.095**	<.001
	US	-.23	***	-.07		-.29	***	-.01		-.18	***	-.04		.016	<.009	.008	<.056	**.078**	<.001
	Belgium	-.10		-.03		-.24	***	-.11		-.13	*	-.03		.001	<.542	.050	<.001	**.088**	<.001
	Italy	-.20	***	-.12	**	-.22	***	-.04		-.18	**	-.04		**.057**	<.001	.037	<.001	**.089**	<.001
	Israel	-.08		-.06		-.02		.14	*	-.01		.13		**.057**	<.001	.010	<.105	.053	<.001
	Catalonia	.02		.14	***	-.23	***	.08		.02		.17	***	.030	<.001	.013	<.003	**.055**	<.001
	Spain	.05		-.18	***	-.23	***	.13	**	-.07		.11	*	.031	<.001	.015	<.001	.040	<.001
	Poland	-.21	***	-.13	**	-.09	*	.04		-.06		.10	*	.116	<.001	.053	<.001	.038	<.001
	Hungary	-.21	***	-.08		-.26	***	.01		-.15	**	.11	*	.038	<.001	.026	<.001	**.061**	<.001
	Bosnia H.	-.17	***	.04		.08		.06		-.07		.03		.005	<.141	.000	<.910	.015	<.009
	Average	*-.13*		*-.05*		*-.19*		*.04*		*-.10*		*.08*		*.038*	*<.059*	*.028*	*<.090*	*.068*	*<.002*
Other cultures	Qatar	-.16	***	-.08	*	-.13	***	.09		-.12	*	.09	*	.000	<.752	.003	<.109	.007	<.021
	Chile	-.01		.11	**	-.03		-.11		-.03		.10		.004	<.183	.002	<.430	.011	<.037
	China	-.04		-.00		-.15	***	-.16	*	-.06		.04		.009	<.023	.005	<.081	**.063**	<.001
	Tunisia	-.12	*	-.13	*	-.15	**	.02		-.10		-.02		.008	<.211	.002	<.615	.015	<.054
	Senegal	-.01		-.04		-.03		.04		-.02		-.01		.000	<.756	.006	<.002	.001	<.237
	Togo	-.16	***	-.15	***	-.23	***	.05		-.06		.06		.008	<.100	.003	<.326	.023	<.004
	Average	*-.08*		*-.05*		*-.12*		*-.01*		*-.07*		*.04*		*.005*	*<.338*	*.004*	*<.261*	*.020*	*<.059*

*Note: MA: Machiavellianism; NA: Narcissism; PS: Psychopathy; SPI: Social Position Index; (F): French; (G) German. * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001. η^2 equal to or above .055 are given in boldface type. η^2 < 0.0099 = negligible; η^2 > 0.01: small; $\eta^2 \geq 0.0588$ medium; $\eta^2 \geq 0.1379$: large effect size (Cohen, 1988, pp. 274–288). The cultures are arranged according to the Gross Domestic Product Purchasing Power.* https://www.gfmag.com/global-data/economic-data/richest-countries-in-the-world. *(S-1 supplementary material).*



Figure 1: *Estimates mean comparison between high income and other cultures (A) and Europe+US+Israel and other cultures (B) cultures controlling for age, gender and SPI. SPI: Social Position Index. Group differences were significant in all cases at p < .001.*

A



B

Figure 2. A. *Standardized z-scores of SD3 personality scales by culture controlling for age and gender.* B. *Standardized z-scores of SD3 personality scales by culture controlling for age, gender, Social Position Index, Honesty-Humility, Aggressiveness, Sensation Seeking and Extraversion.*



Figure 3. *Social Position Index range differences in SD3 adding all countries.* $p < 0.01$. *Upper: < 17; upper-middle: 18-31; middle: 32-47; low-middle: 48-63; and low: > 63.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	***10****	11	12	13	14	15	***16****	17	18
Machiavellianism	-.73	-.60	-.64	-.64	-.66	-.63	-.64	-.62	-.46	*-.56*	-.68	-.72	-.76	-.71	-.74	*-.40*	-.53	-.68
Narcissism	-.52	-.64	-.60	-.63	-.52	-.52	-.63	-.58	-.47	*-.58*	-.54	-.59	-.46	-.32	-.40	*-.77*	-.44	-.61
Psychopathy	-.53	-.60	-.62	-.69	-.54	-.38	-.51	-.52	-.57	*-.46*	-.63	-.57	-.59	-.40	-.54	*-.27*	-.48	-.56
Sincerity	.41	.34	.47	.33	.51	.49	.53	.62	.42	*.03*	.52	.51	.54	.21	.51	*.22*	.40	.47
Fairness	.50	.45	.57	.43	.46	.48	.54	.54	.50	*.16*	.57	.54	.54	.29	.63	*.12*	.49	.47
Greed-Avoidance	.50	.50	.54	.41	.54	.66	.61	.56	.28	*.20*	.56	.51	.48	.47	.55	*.33*	.50	.50
Modesty	.57	.62	.60	.53	.60	.74	.64	.61	.33	*.44*	.56	.55	.56	.37	.53	*.50*	.50	.64

1. Belgium; 2. Bosnia; 3. Catalonia; 4. Chile; 5. Germany; 6. Hungary; 7. Israel; 8. Italia; 9. Qatar; ***10****. Senegal; 11. Spain; 12. Switz.-F; 13. Switz.-G; 14. Tunisia; 15.US;* ***16****. Togo; 17. China; 18. Poland.*



Current study (N = 10,298) Hodson et al., 2018 (N = 1,402)

Figure 4. *Exploratory Factor analysis of the three scales of SD3 and the four facets of Honesty-Humility factor of the HEXACO-60 in a single factor, and meta-analytic test of latent-level relation between Dark Triad and Honesty-Humility.* Diagrams show comparison between current *and Hodson et al., (2018) study. Narc = Narcissism, Mach = Machiavellianism; Psy = Psychopathy; Sin = Sincerity; Fair = fairness; Gree = Greed avoidance; Mode = Modesty.*

Table 3. *Congruency coefficients for each SD3 factor by culture and average values.*

	Machiavellianism	*Machiavellianism*	*Machiavellianism*	*Average*
Belgium	.89	**.84**	**.84**	*.86*
Bosnia H.	.88	.90	**.70**	***.83***
Catalonia	.89	.86	**.82**	*.86*
Chile	.92	.90	**.63**	***.82***
China	.92	.95	**.86**	*.91*
Germany	.93	.94	.87	*.91*
Hungary	.93	.92	.89	*.91*
Israel	.91	.95	**.82**	*.89*
Italy	.93	.92	**.83**	*.89*
Poland	.93	.93	**.83**	*.90*
Qatar	**.82**	**.78**	**.67**	***.76***
Senegal	**.80**	**.63**	**.66**	***.70***
Spain	.93	.93	**.83**	*.90*
Switzerland (F)	.92	.96	.85	*.91*
Switzerland (G)	.90	.96	**.80**	*.89*
Togo	**.78**	.88	**.73**	***.80***
Tunisia	**.83**	.85	**.65**	***.78***
US	.90	.95	.90	*.92*
Average	*.89*	*.89*	.79	*.86*

Note: Values lower .85 in boldface.

S-1: *Hollingshead Index of Social Position (ISP) and Gross Domestic Product Purchasing Power.*

Education Scale (Weight of 4)	
Description	*Score*
Professional (MA, MS, ME, MD, PhD, LLD, and the like) .	1
Four-year college graduate (BA, BS, BM).	2
One to three years' college (also business schools).	3
High school graduate.	4
Ten to 11 years of school (part high school).	5
Seven to nine years of school.	6
Less than seven years of school.	7
Occupation Scale (Weight of 7)	
Description	*Score*
Higher executives of large concerns, proprietors, and major professionals	1
Business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals	2
Administrative, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals	3
Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses	4
Skilled manual employees	5
Machine operators and semiskilled employees	6
Unskilled employees	7
Classification System	
ISP score = (Occupation score X 7) + (Education score X 4)	
Description	*Range Scores*
Upper	11-17
Upper-middle	18-31
Middle	32-47
Lower-middle	48-63
Lower	64-77

GDP-PPP ($): Gross Domestic Product Purchasing Power**.** International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook April 2021. Values are expressed in current international dollars, reflecting the corresponding exchange rates and PPP adjustments. https://www.gfmag.com/global-data/economic-data/richest-countries-in-the-world.

	Culture	GDP-PPP ($)
Wealthier cultures	Qatar	93.51
	Suitz_French	72.87
	Suitz_German	72.87
	Gernany	65.08
	USA	63.42
	Belgium	51.10
	Italy	40.86
	Israel	40.55
	Catalonia	39.12
	Spain	39.12
	Average	*57.85*
Other cultures	Poland	34.10
	Hungary	33.03
	Chile	23.37
	China	17.19
	Bosnia H	15.05
	Tunis	10.12
	Senegal	3.48
	Togo	2.20
	Average	*17.32*

S-2. *Procrustes matrix of all sample in reference to original SD3 factor structure.*

	F-I	F-II	F-III
M1	**.30**	-.06	**-.36**
M2	**.41**	.08	-.24
M3	**.41**	.06	.03
M4	**.42**	.12	**-.32**
M5	**.51**	.02	.08
M6	**.49**	-.07	.01
M7	**.48**	-.06	**.89**
M8	**.31**	.20	.16
M9	**.40**	-.02	-.03
N1	-.07	**.57**	.04
N2	-.20	**.43**	.18
N3	.09	**.36**	.18
N4	.09	**.54**	.02
N5	.24	**.37**	-.09
N6	-.18	**.36**	.08
N7	.06	**.41**	.11
N8	-.14	**.44**	.07
N9	.27	.23	**-.33**
P1	.24	-.10	**.54**
P2	.05	-.01	**.44**
P3	**.31**	-.17	**.58**
P4	.20	.07	**.38**
P5	**.30**	-.18	**.52**
P6	**.33**	.20	.16
P7	-.06	-.03	**.53**
P8	.10	-.02	**.50**
P9	.28	-.15	**.60**

Note: F-I: Machiavellianism; F-II: Narcissism; F-III: Psychopathy.

S-3. *Maximum Likelihood analysis, Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization of HEXACO facets and SD3 scales*.

	I	II	II	IV	V	VI
Machiavellianism	**-.65**	.00	-.04	-.11	-.05	-.03
Narcissism	**-.58**	-.05	**.52**	-.09	-.02	.10
Psychopathy	**-.55**	-.15	.01	**-.34**	**-.32**	-.04
Sincerity	**.37**	.00	.08	.07	.17	.08
Fairness	**.34**	.16	.18	.23	.23	.00
Greed-Avoidance	**.48**	.01	.00	.13	-.03	.04
Modesty	**.60**	-.09	-.15	.06	.10	.05
Fearfulness	-.08	**.55**	-.14	.03	.03	-.15
Anxiety	.04	**.47**	-.29	-.16	.10	.08
Dependence	-.01	**.56**	.01	-.03	-.11	-.05
Sentimentality	.10	**.59**	.10	.02	.04	.02
Social Self-Esteem	.10	-.22	**.48**	.15	.27	-.03
Social Boldness	-.11	-.10	**.60**	-.13	.03	.15
Sociability	-.03	.17	**.51**	.10	-.04	.07
Liveliness	.08	-.14	**.52**	.16	.15	.05
Forgiveness	.07	.06	.22	**.43**	-.01	.03
Gentleness	.12	.04	.02	**.58**	-.05	.01
Flexibility	.18	-.07	-.04	**.46**	.06	.01
Patience	.14	-.15	.02	**.50**	.14	.10
Organization	.08	.00	.04	.03	**.61**	-.09
Diligence	.11	.04	.24	.00	**.47**	.16
Perfectionism	.04	.06	.04	-.04	**.52**	.15
Prudence	.14	-.14	-.06	.14	**.57**	.06
Aesthetic Appreciation	.09	.04	-.01	.11	.07	**.60**
Inquisitiveness	.07	-.08	.09	.06	.15	**.50**
Creativity	-.04	.04	.13	.02	.01	**.60**
Unconventionality	.05	-.11	.01	-.03	-.01	**.56**

Note: I: SD3 + Honesty-Humility; II: Emotionality; III: Extraversion; IV: Agreeableness; V: Conscientiousness; VI; Openness. Loadings ≥ 0.30 in boldface.

S-4. *Maximum Likelihood analysis, Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization of ZKA-PQ facets and SD3 scales.*

	I	II	III	IV	V
Machiavellianism	**.33**	.27	.14	-.17	.08
Narcissism	.24	**.38**	**.32**	.08	-.14
Psychopathy	**.48**	**.49**	.05	-.25	.01
Physical Aggression	**.62**	.23	.06	-.18	.04
Verbal Aggression	**.54**	.10	-.26	.09	.10
Anger	**.72**	.04	.01	-.05	**.32**
Hostility	**.66**	.11	-.06	-.08	**.32**
Thrill and Adventure Seeking	.11	**.56**	.14	-.06	-.11
Experience Seeking	.00	**.57**	.09	.15	.03
Disinhibition	.19	**.66**	-.01	.23	.12
Boredom Susceptibility/Impulsivity	.11	**.48**	-.04	.07	.10
Work Compulsion	.00	.13	**.62**	-.10	.05
General Activity	-.05	.11	**.59**	.18	-.01
Restlessness	.29	.28	.36	.12	.18
Work Energy	-.09	-.07	**.68**	.20	-.08
Positive Emotions	-.13	.15	.28	**.58**	-.28
Social Warmth	-.17	-.07	-.08	**.50**	-.18
Exhibitionism	.10	**.34**	.17	**.48**	-.03
Sociability	-.07	.19	.18	**.65**	-.14
Anxiety	.29	.11	.09	-.16	**.60**
Depression	.18	.05	-.03	-.22	**.70**
Dependence	.14	.00	.07	.01	**.70**
Low Self-esteem	.05	-.03	-.18	-.23	**.71**

Note. I: Aggressiveness; II: Sensation Seeking; III: Activity; IV: Extraversion; V: Neuroticism. Loadings ≥ 0.30 in boldface.

S-5. *Maximum Likelihood analysis, Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization of SD3, ZKA-PQ and HEXACO in 3, 4, 5 and 6 factors extraction.*

	I	II	III
Psychopathy	**.77**	.05	-.03
Aggressiveness	**.63**	-.07	.21
Honesty-Humility	**-.57**	.05	.04
Machiavellianism	**.54**	.10	.06
Agreeableness	**-.47**	.16	.00
Sensation Seeking	**.42**	**.32**	-.01
Conscientiousness	**-.37**	.21	-.06
Extraversion (a)	-.15	**.75**	-.25
Extraversion (b)	-.16	**.64**	-.18
Narcissism	**.43**	**.54**	-.10
Activity	.11	**.40**	.06
Openness to Experience	-.14	.26	.06
Neuroticism	**.30**	-.18	**.94**
Emotionality	-.07	.00	**.51**

	I	II	III	IV
Psychopathy	**.71**	-.04	-.02	.27
Honesty-Humility	**-.57**	.14	.04	-.12
Machiavellianism	**.55**	.02	.07	.14
Narcissism	**.53**	**.47**	-.10	.04
Sensation Seeking	**.44**	.26	-.01	.15
Conscientiousness	**-.34**	.27	-.06	-.08
Extraversion (a)	-.06	**.79**	-.23	-.04
Extraversion (b)	-.04	**.64**	-.18	-.08
Activity	.18	**.36**	.06	-.03
Openness to Experience	-.08	.27	.06	-.07
Neuroticism	.23	-.22	**.94**	.12
Emotionality	-.11	.01	**.51**	.04
Aggressiveness	**.32**	-.07	.21	**.92**
Agreeableness	-.26	.17	-.02	**-.47**

	I	II	III	IV	V
Psychopathy	**.66**	-.02	.30	-.01	.19
Honesty-Humility	**-.58**	.12	-.14	.04	-.07
Machiavellianism	**.57**	.05	.16	.09	.01
Narcissism	**.55**	**.52**	.04	-.05	.02
Conscientiousness	-.29	.28	-.10	-.04	-.19
Extraversion (a)	-.07	**.79**	-.05	-.19	-.04
Extraversion (b)	-.09	**.63**	-.10	-.16	.09
Activity	.15	**.36**	-.03	.07	.13
Openness	-.14	**.25**	-.08	.05	.17
Aggressiveness	.28	-.06	**.93**	.20	.11
Agreeableness	-.27	.15	**-.48**	-.02	.00
Neuroticism	.20	-.25	.14	**.92**	.16
Emotionality	-.08	.00	.04	**.53**	-.11
Sensation Seeking	.27	.24	.13	-.10	**.92**

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Extraversion (b)	**.84**	-.01	-.12	-.02	.03	.12
Extraversion (a)	**.64**	.18	-.08	-.22	**.36**	.05
Narcissism	**.32**	**.69**	.06	-.08	.05	.10
Machiavellianism	-.07	**.55**	.19	.07	-.16	.03
Psychopathy	-.11	**.54**	**.34**	-.06	-.27	.22
Activity	.24	.27	-.04	.08	.14	.18
Aggressiveness	-.08	.19	**.95**	.18	-.10	.11
Agreeableness	.10	-.14	**-.50**	-.02	.22	.03
Neuroticism	**-.36**	.13	.19	**.78**	-.09	.14
Emotionality	.07	-.06	.03	**.64**	-.01	-.13
Conscientiousness	.11	-.04	-.12	-.07	**.54**	-.14
Honesty-Humility	.01	**-.40**	-.17	.01	**.54**	-.04
Openness	.10	.01	-.09	.01	**.31**	.23
Sensation Seeking	.16	.22	.14	-.10	-.13	**.87**

Note: a: HEXACO; b: ZKA-PQ. DS dimensions and Loadings ≥ 0.30 in boldface.

S-6 *Pearson (A) and partial correlations (B) controlling for age and gender for culture.*

Culture		Narcissism	Psychopathy	Narcissism	Psychopathy
		A		B	
Belgium	Machiavellianism	.29	.47	.29	.48
Bosnia		.35	.50	.34	.49
Catalonia		.33	.45	.32	.44
Chile		.37	.50	.37	.50
China		.18	.22	.18	.22
Germany		.31	.45	.29	.41
Hungary		.33	.42	.30	.36
Israel		.34	.50	.32	.47
Italy		.41	.53	.37	.48
Poland		.45	.57	.40	.54
Qatar		.24	.36	.23	.34
Senegal		.31	.38	.32	.38
Spain		.32	.47	.30	.45
Suitz_French		.39	.51	.37	.48
Suitz_German		.24	.49	.20	.43
Togo		.26	.34	.23	.32
Tunisia		.27	.34	.26	.32
USA		.32	.61	.31	.57
Average		*.32*	*.45*	*.30*	*43.*
Belgium	Narcissism		.35		.31
Bosnia			.45		.37
Catalonia			.44		.41
Chile			.35		.35
China			.34		.31
Gernany			.30		.26
Hungary			.30		.29
Israel			.38		.33
Italy			.28		.27
Poland			.22		.21
Qatar			.42		.38
Senegal			.39		.35
Spain			.31		.26
Suitz_French			.32		.31
Suitz_German			.38		.37
Togo			.18		.13
Tunisia			.24		.23
USA			.45		.42
Average			*.34*		*.31*

S-7. *Standardized z-scores of SD3 values for personality scales by culture controlling for age and gender (1) and age, gender, Social Position Index, Honesty-Humility, Aggressiveness, Sensation Seeking and Extraversion (2)*

	Machiavellianism-1	*Narcissism-1*	*Psychopathy-1*	*Machiavellianism-2*	*Narcissism-2*	*Psychopathy-2*
Belgium	-.07	-.38	-.16	.00	-.35	-.13
Bosnia H.	-.34	-.34	-.17	-.29	-.32	-.16
Catalonia	-.13	-.36	-.28	-.14	-.40	-.24
Chile	-.39	-.21	-.21	-.32	-.25	-.13
China	.31	-.37	-.21	.16	-.20	-.43
Gernany	-.18	-.18	-.27	-.11	-.10	-.17
Hungary	.24	.03	-.50	.35	.08	-.33
Israel	-.05	-.03	-.27	-.05	-.10	-.22
Italy	-.10	-.15	.18	-.11	-.08	.16
Poland	-.19	-.13	-.23	-.25	-.15	-.29
Qatar	.05	.18	.59	-.08	.05	.41
Senegal	.26	.77	.45	.21	.75	.38
Spain	-.15	-.29	-.31	-.05	-.27	-.16
Switz_Fr	-.39	-.35	-.28	-.30	-.32	-.22
Switz_Ge	-.31	-.15	-.22	-.22	-.12	-.11
Togo	.27	.20	-.23	.37	.20	-.08
Tunisia	-.09	.23	.47	-.21	.10	.30
USA	-.08	-.54	-.10	-.08	-.37	-.06

Note: Values exceeding + .30 are in boldface. Standardized values correspond to Figure 1 A and B. Positive and negative signs were marked in different colors.

S-8. *GLM Multivariate analysis for culture controlling for age and gender. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared η^2
Corrected Model	Machiavellianism	315.183(a)	19	16.589	44.676	.000	**.076**
	Narcissism	614.555(b)	19	32.345	105.734	.000	**.164**
	Psychopathy	603.222(c)	19	31.749	92.120	.000	**.146**
Intercept	Machiavellianism	7045.764	1	7045.764	18975.553	.000	**.649**
	Narcissism	6113.083	1	6113.083	19983.303	.000	**.660**
	Psychopathy	4270.400	1	4270.400	12390.862	.000	**.547**
Culture	Machiavellianism	221.525	17	13.031	35.095	.000	.057
	Narcissism	594.176	17	34.952	114.255	.000	**.159**
	Psychopathy	501.378	17	29.493	85.576	.000	**.124**
Age	Machiavellianism	28.135	1	28.135	75.774	.000	.007
	Narcissism	14.939	1	14.939	48.836	.000	.005
	Psychopathy	63.298	1	63.298	183.664	.000	.018
Gender	Machiavellianism	47.064	1	47.064	126.753	.000	.012
	Narcissism	13.174	1	13.174	43.066	.000	.004
	Psychopathy	67.272	1	67.272	195.193	.000	.019
Error	Machiavellianism	3815.926	10277	.371			
	Narcissism	3143.833	10277	.306			
	Psychopathy	3541.877	10277	.345			
Total	Machiavellianism	92161.308	10297				
	Narcissism	88041.590	10297				
	Psychopathy	50810.732	10297				
Corrected Total	Machiavellianism	4131.110	10296				
	Narcissism	3758.387	10296				
	Psychopathy	4145.098	10296				

Note: (a) R Squared = .076 (Adjusted R Squared = .075). (b) R Squared = .164 (Adjusted R Squared = .162). (c) R Squared = .146 (Adjusted R Squared = .144). Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Rang age = 2.21 (1-4), Gender of subject = 1.53 (1-2). Partial Eta Squared $\eta^2 < 0.0099$ = negligible; $\eta^2 > 0.01$: small; $\eta^2 \geq 0.0588$ medium; $\eta^2 \geq 0.1379$: large effect size (Cohen, 1988, pp. 274–288). $\eta^2 \geq 0.0588$ in boldface.

S-9. *GLM Multivariate analysis for culture controlling for age, gender, Social Position Index,* Honesty-Humility, *Aggressiveness, Sensation Seeking and Extraversion. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared η^2
Corrected Model	Machiavellianism	806.512(a)	24	33.605	118.359	.000	**.271**
	Narcissism	1090.676(b)	24	45.445	200.412	.000	**.387**
	Psychopathy	1528.099(c)	24	63.671	296.917	.000	**.483**
Intercept	Machiavellianism	542.975	1	542.975	1912.405	.000	**.200**
	Narcissism	166.121	1	166.121	732.596	.000	**.088**
	Psychopathy	183.136	1	183.136	854.020	.000	**.101**
Culture	Machiavellianism	115.015	17	6.766	23.829	.000	.057
	Narcissism	423.418	17	24.907	109.840	.000	**.197**
	Psychopathy	229.696	17	13.512	63.009	.000	**.123**
Honesty-Humility	Machiavellianism	310.506	1	310.506	1093.628	.000	**.125**
	Narcissism	159.925	1	159.925	705.269	.000	**.085**
	Psychopathy	230.886	1	230.886	1076.692	.000	**.124**
Aggressiveness	Machiavellianism	56.061	1	56.061	197.450	.000	.025
	Narcissism	11.163	1	11.163	49.228	.000	.006
	Psychopathy	202.524	1	202.524	944.433	.000	**.110**
Sensation Seeking	Machiavellianism	11.414	1	11.414	40.200	.000	.005
	Narcissism	46.495	1	46.495	205.045	.000	.026
	Psychopathy	110.839	1	110.839	516.879	.000	**.063**
Extraversion (ZKA-PQ +HEXACO)	Machiavellianism	.060	1	.060	.210	.647	.000
	Narcissism	181.241	1	181.241	799.272	.000	**.095**
	Psychopathy	14.288	1	14.288	66.628	.000	.009
Social Position Index	Machiavellianism	.021	1	.021	.074	.786	.000
	Narcissism	14.236	1	14.236	62.781	.000	.008
	Psychopathy	.375	1	.375	1.747	.186	.000
Age	Machiavellianism	.448	1	.448	1.579	.209	.000
	Narcissism	3.286	1	3.286	14.491	.000	.002
	Psychopathy	.049	1	.049	.230	.631	.000
Gender	Machiavellianism	11.304	1	11.304	39.813	.000	.005
	Narcissism	.775	1	.775	3.417	.065	.000
	Psychopathy	9.634	1	9.634	44.924	.000	.006
Error	Machiavellianism	2166.331	7630	.284			
	Narcissism	1730.158	7630	.227			
	Psychopathy	1636.177	7630	.214			
Total	Machiavellianism	67213.666	7655				
	Narcissism	65991.171	7655				
	Psychopathy	38043.661	7655				
Corrected Total	Machiavellianism	2972.843	7654				
	Narcissism	2820.834	7654				
	Psychopathy	3164.276	7654				

Note: (a) R Squared = .271 (Adjusted R Squared = .269). (b) R Squared = .387 (Adjusted R Squared = .385). (c) R Squared = .483 (Adjusted R Squared = .481). Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Honesty-Humility = 3.56, Aggressiveness factor = 33.38, Sensation Seeking factor = 37.68, Extraversion = 50.65, Social Position Index = 36.09, Rang age = 2.55 (1-4), Gender of subject = 1.51 (1-2). Partial Eta Squared $\eta^2 < 0.0099$ = negligible; $\eta^2 > 0.01$: small; $\eta^2 \geq 0.0588$ medium; $\eta^2 \geq 0.1379$: large effect size (Cohen, 1988, pp. 274–288). $\eta^2 \geq 0.0588$ in boldface.

S-10. *Gender differences by age groups in SD3 adding all countries. Age range differences for males and females together with p < .01 significance.*