# SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

# Table A. Gain vs. Loss Analysis in Study 3.

This table shows that an ancillary manipulation did not work. Nor did the manipulation interact with any personality variables. Inclusion in the text would simply add noise.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Predictors* | *r* | *rx.y* | *B* | *WALD* | *OR* | *95% CI* | *p* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gain condition | -.06 | ---- | -0.32 | 0.87 | 0.73 | 0.37, 1.42 | .350 |
| Machiavellianism | .24\* | .14\* | 1.01 | 4.98 | 2.05 | 1.09, 3.85 | .026 |
| Narcissism | .05 | -.08 | -0.60 | 1.86 | 0.68 | 0.39, 1.18 | .172 |
| Psychopathy | .24\* | .14\* | 1.08 | 5.46 | 2.11 | 1.13, 3.96 | .019 |
| Mach\*Gain | ---- | ---- | -0.05 | 0.02 | 0.95 | 0.51, 1.79 | .882 |
| Narcissism\*Gain | ---- | ---- | 0.34 | 1.47 | 1.41 | 0.81, 2.46 | .226 |
| Psychopathy\*Gain | ---- | ---- | -0.06 | 0.04 | 0.94 | 0.50, 1.75 | .846 |

**Note:** *\* p* < .05, two-tailed test, N = 254. Gain-Loss condition was coded as: 1 = *Gain (n = 129)*, -1 = *Loss (n = 134)*. Correlation between Gain-Loss and cheating is a Spearman correlation. Partial correlations control for Dark Triad overlap.

# Table B. Analysis of Video Type and Sample in Study 4.

This analysis shows that the two videos differed little in affecting cheating. There was no difference in means and the video variable did not interact with the personality variables.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Predictors* | *r* | *B* | *WALD* | *OR* | *95% CI* | *p* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Video | -.01 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 1.03 | 0.80, 1.32 | .825 |
| Machiavellianism | .13\* | 0.25 | 2.84 | 1.29 | 0.96, 1.73 | .092 |
| Narcissism | .15\* | 0.33 | 6.48 | 1.39 | 1.08, 1.78 | .011 |
| Psychopathy | .14\* | 0.11 | 0.59 | 1.12 | 0.84, 1.50 | .443 |
| Mach\*Video | ---- | -0.15 | 0.97 | 0.86 | 0.64, 1.16 | .326 |
| Narcissism\*Video | ---- | -0.16 | 1.45 | 0.86 | 0.67, 1.10 | .229 |
| Psychopathy\*Video | ---- | 0.04 | 0.05 | 1.04 | 0.77, 1.39 | .817 |

**Note:** *\* p* < .05, two-tailed test, N = 501. Video condition was coded as: 1 = *Borges (n = 331)*, -1 = *Cambodian Journalist (n = 170)*. Correlation between Video type and cheating is a Spearman correlation. The omnibus test for fit was significant for Block 1, which included main effects (*χ*2 = 17.46, *p* = .002), but not Block 2, which included interactions (*χ2* = 3.19, *p* = .364).

# Table C. Testing for Difference in the Two Control Conditions in Sample 1 of Study 4.

The two conditions differed in mean but did not interact with any personality predictor.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Predictors* | *r* | *B* | *WALD* | *OR* | *95% CI* | *p* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advice condition | .08 | -0.70 | 8.74 | 0.50 | 0.31, 0.79 | .003 |
| Machiavellianism | .13\* | -0.15 | 0.35 | 0.87 | 0.53, 1.40 | .554 |
| Narcissism | .15\* | 0.38 | 3.22 | 1.47 | 0.97, 2.22 | .073 |
| Psychopathy | .14\* | 0.31 | 2.04 | 1.37 | 0.89, 2.10 | .154 |
| Mach\*Advice | .08 | -0.13 | 0.28 | 0.88 | 0.54, 1.43 | .598 |
| Narcissism\*Advice | .02 | 0.29 | 1.92 | 1.33 | 0.89, 1.99 | .166 |
| Psychopathy\*Advice | .00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.04 | 0.68, 1.61 | .848 |

**Note:** *\* p* < .05, two-tailed test, N = 217. Advice was coded as: 1 *= Cautionary Advice (n = 107)*, -1 = *No Advice (n = 110)*. Correlation between Advice and cheating is a Phi coefficient.

# Table D. Overclaiming as a Function of the Dirty Dozen.

As before, the Dirty Dozen failed in predicting a relevant outcome. Inclusion in the text would (a) weaken the message that emerges clearly with traditional measures and the Short Dark Triad (SD3) and (b) unnecessarily turn the focus toward a critique of the Dirty Dozen.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *r* | *rx.y* | *β* | *95% CI*  | *p* |
| ***Standard SDT indices***  |
| ***d’*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Machiavellianism | -.14\* | -.12 | -.15 | -.24, .01 | .070 |
| Narcissism | -.08 | -.06 | -.06 | -.16, .07 | .415 |
| Psychopathy | -.07 | .04 | .05 | -.10, .17 | .608 |
| ***c*** |
| Machiavellianism | -.11 | -.09 | -.11 | -.15, .03 | .197 |
| Narcissism | -.03 | .00 | .00 | -.08, .08 | .999 |
| Psychopathy | -.07 | -.01 | -.01 | -.10, .09 | .924 |
| ***Commonsense indices******Accuracy*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Machiavellianism | -.03 | -.02 | .01 | -.03, .02 | .698 |
| Narcissism | .01 | .02 | .03 | -.02, .03 | .703 |
| Psychopathy | -.02 | -.01 | -.01 | -.03, .03 | .832 |
| ***Bias*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Machiavellianism | .11 | .09 | .11 | -.01, .06 | .162 |
| Narcissism | .06 | .03 | .04 | -.02, .04 | .595 |
| Psychopathy | .07 | -.01 | -.01 | -.04, .04 | .904 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Note.** \* *p* < .05, two-tailed.