The Dark Side of Politics: Participation and the Dark Triad

Philip Chen[1] , **Scott Pruysers[2]**
and Julie Blais[3]

Abstract

Personality traits are one piece in the larger puzzle of political participation, but most studies focus on the Five-Factor Model of personality. We argue that the normative implications of the influence of personality on politics are increased when the personality traits being studied correlate with negative social behaviors. We investigate the role of the Dark Triad on political participation as mediated through political beliefs such as interest and knowledge. We find that Psychopathy and Narcissism are positively associated with political interest, but Narcissism is also negatively associated with political knowledge. In addition, both Psychopathy and Narcissism exert a direct, positive influence on participation. Our results imply that individuals exhibiting higher levels of Narcissism are not only less knowledgeable but also more interested in politics and more likely to participate when given the opportunity.

Introduction

Widespread electoral participation is fundamental to the functioning and legitimacy of a democratic system (Barber, 1984; Dryzek and List, 2003; Putnam, 2000), yet a focus on understanding what predicts participation can lead scholars to avoid normative questions about the *quality* of that participation. Nowhere is this deficit more obvious than in the study of personality and politics (see, for example, Gerber et al., 2011b; Mondak, 2010). While numerous scholars have documented the general personality traits that predict political behavior, little work has been done to determine whether reliance on certain traits is ultimately beneficial to democracy.

[1]Department of Political Science, Beloit College, Beloit, WI, USA
[2]Department of Political Science, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada
[3]Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada

Corresponding author:
Philip Chen, Department of Political Science, Beloit College, 700 College Street, Beloit, WI 53511, USA.
Email: chenp@beloit.edu

A significant reason for this omission rests on the dominant personality structure currently used in political science, the Big Five traits of Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism (Goldberg, 1990; McCrae and Costa, 2003). While the labels used for the tails of these personality traits (Extraversion vs Introversion, for example) carry affective judgment, the underlying psychological traits are generally seen by academics as normatively equivalent. That is, while the general public may prefer to see themselves as extraverted rather than introverted, the academic literature tends to treat these as normatively equivalent personality traits.[1]

While we are sympathetic to these approaches to the study of personality and politics, we believe the next steps in our field must address questions about the quality of political participation. Some work on the Big Five has begun this quest, finding, for example, that the effects of the Big Five traits on group-based policy positions are mediated both through party identification and stereotyping behavior (Chen and Palmer, 2018). We take a different approach in this article, however, and examine a set of personality traits that often convey certain negative interpersonal behaviors.[2]

In this study, we turn our attention to the Dark Triad of Machiavellianism, Psychopathy, and Narcissism (Paulhus and Williams, 2002). We stress here that while both the Big Five and Dark Triad have preferred endpoints in the general public (e.g. people would rather see themselves as conscientious instead of not, just as they would rather not see themselves as narcissistic), our argument rests on the *political consequences* of certain individuals participating in politics, rather than the social labels attached to these personality traits. In this sense, the focus on the Big Five in most of the personality and politics literature misses an opportunity to examine the darker, less socially desirable traits (the Dark Triad) that may alter political outcomes in a normatively undesirable way.

In particular, we assess whether these three traits influence political participation and, if so, whether the effect is mediated through commonly known pathways such as political knowledge or interest. We demonstrate that the Dark Triad, and the trait of Narcissism in particular, presents a normatively troubling portrait of political participation. Interestingly, while Psychopathy and Machiavellianism exhibit few participatory effects, Narcissism is associated with higher levels of political interest and is also associated with lower levels of political knowledge. Thus, individuals scoring higher in Narcissism are not only more likely to be interested and involved in politics, but they are also less knowledgeable about politics in general. At times, the effect of Narcissism is mediated through interest, while at other times, the trait exerts a direct effect on participation.

Given these results, we are likely to see individuals higher in Narcissism be overrepresented among the most active participants in politics. While we may be less concerned if extraverted individuals are more likely to participate than introverted individuals, we should be somewhat more concerned about these darker traits. Thinking about the Dark Triad, if individuals higher in Narcissism participate at higher rates, we are likely to see downstream effects on who gets elected. As Hart et al. (2018) note, individuals who score higher on the Dark Triad traits are more likely to support candidates who share these same traits. Thus, if these individuals are participating at higher rates, we are likely to see individuals higher in Narcissism overrepresented in the voting public and, by extension, in the ranks of elected officials. While research shows both positive and negative effects of narcissism in political leaders (Furtner et al., 2017; Wilhelm et al., 2013), Watts et al. (2013) highlight negative outcomes of narcissistic leaders in the United

States, linking these presidents to congressional impeachment and ethics inquiries. The connection between Narcissism, interest, and participation, therefore, raises some potentially normatively troubling concerns about the representativeness and performance of elected officials.

Political Participation

While previous work has examined the Dark Triad as it relates to political outcomes such as ambition (Blais et al., 2019), political orientation (Gay et al., 2019), and civic duty (Pruysers et al., 2019), our focus is on common, everyday acts of political participation. We begin by noting that we take no issue with the bulk of research on participation that finds a strong influence from socio-demographic factors. Education, age, and gender as well as the distribution of socio-economic and political resources are just some of the many variables that we believe explain participation (Brady et al., 1995; Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980). In addition, engagement in civic life (Verba et al., 1995) and campaign mobilization (Rosenstone and Hansen, 2003) clearly also play a role in convincing citizens to vote or engage with politics.

The simplest form of political participation for many citizens is voting, and we begin our assessment here. We understand, however, that voting is not the sole means of political participation available to citizens. Therefore, we also examine a range of alternative participatory acts, such as donating money, attending political meetings, or signing petitions. In addition, we examine forms of political consumerism and other less traditional forms of participation, such as engaging in economic boycotts or civil disobedience (Gidengil et al., 2004; Stolle and Micheletti, 2013).

We enter the conversation by examining additional factors that lead to various forms of participation. We focus first on the effect of political knowledge, interest, and efficacy. Delli-Carpini and Keeter (1996) convincingly argue for the importance of political knowledge as a determinant of consistency in issue attitudes as well as likelihood of voting. Likewise, scholars have long asserted the importance of political interest in predicting turnout (Campbell et al., 1960; Lewis-Beck et al., 2008). Similarly, political efficacy, or the degree to which one believes they are capable of understanding politics (internal efficacy) and are listened to (external efficacy), is strongly associated with participation (Craig et al., 1990; Craig and Maggiotto, 1982; Niemi et al., 1991).

Like these models, we believe that political participation is an additive function both of individual socio-economic factors (e.g. age, education, income) and of political factors (e.g. efficacy, knowledge, interest). That is, socio-economic and political factors work as individual factors to alter the likelihood of participation. Recent work, however, suggests a role for a third factor that functions in an additive manner: pre-political personality traits. This work primarily focuses on the Big Five traits, with evidence emerging that Openness to Experience and Extraversion positively predict turnout, while Agreeableness and Neuroticism are negatively related to turnout (Gerber et al., 2011a; Mondak, 2010; Mondak and Halperin, 2008). These results are not limited to voting, as various forms of campaign participation are also correlated with general personality traits (Gerber et al., 2013; Mondak et al., 2010). Nor is the predictive power of personality limited to behavior. Differences in personality also help explain political attitudes such as vote choice (Schoen and Schumann, 2007), political ideology (Chirumbolo and Leone, 2010), political ambition (Blais et al., 2019; Peterson and Palmer, 2019), civic duty (Blais and Labbé St. Vincent, 2011; Pruysers et al., 2019), and trust (Mondak, 2010).

We note, however, that the nature of personality as a long-standing and stable set of characteristics allows for the possibility that the effect of personality on political outcomes is not simply direct or additive. Personality traits affect many of the attitudes and decisions made in our daily lives and, as such, they can potentially exert an influence on behaviors such as political participation by altering known predictors of participation. Prior work (Chen and Palmer, 2018), for example, has demonstrated the value of this approach, finding that the Big Five personality traits exert an influence on attitudes about racialized policies both directly (as in an additive model) and indirectly (as in a mediation model) by altering party identification, authoritarianism, and stereotyping.

We build on the extensive personality research while extending the analysis in two directions. First, we move beyond the Big Five framework to examine the Dark Triad personality traits (detailed below). Second, we examine a two-step process of personality influence, testing for both direct and mediated effects of personality on participation through known political influences (a la Chen and Palmer, 2018).

The Dark Triad as Political Traits

While a great deal of scholarly attention has been paid to the Big Five and the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality in politics, relatively little work examines the negative "dark" personality traits of Machiavellianism, Psychopathy, and Narcissism (Paulhus and Williams, 2002). On the whole, the Dark Triad personality traits are associated with aggressiveness, impulsivity, and callousness, and have been described as "short-term, agentic, [and] exploitative" (Jonason and Webster, 2010: 420).

Some may wonder whether there is incremental value in studying the Dark Triad when more universal models (such as the FFM) are thought to capture most of the variation in human personality (Goldberg, 1990; McCrae and Costa, 2003). There are several reasons to study the Dark Triad. First, there is still debate regarding the extent to which the FFM does indeed adequately capture the underlying dimensions of general personality (see Ashton et al., 2014). The HEXACO model of personality, for instance, is critical of the FFM and adds a sixth general personality trait (Honesty–Humility) which many argue is missing from the Big Five (Lee and Ashton, 2004). Second, while components of the Dark Triad are captured by facets or aspects of the FFM, evidence suggests that the dark traits themselves are not adequately captured and predicted by the FFM/Big Five (Lee and Ashton, 2005). Lee and Ashton (2005) do, however, find that their sixth factor (Honesty–Humility) is strongly and negatively correlated with the Dark Triad and may be a component of general personality that underlies the construct. Third, recent research reveals that the dark traits are in fact related to a variety of political outcomes (Gay et al., 2019; Peterson and Palmer, 2019; Pruysers et al., 2019), and can yield explanatory power even after controlling for general personality traits (Blais and Pruysers, 2017; Pruysers and Blais, 2019).

Given the findings of Lee and Ashton (2005), the almost exclusive focus in political science on the Big Five/FFM (Gerber et al., 2011a, 2011b; Mondak, 2010; Mondak and Halperin, 2008), and the extensive literature on the Dark Triad in organizational and leadership behavior (DeShong et al., 2015; Furtner et al., 2017; Jonason et al., 2012; O'Boyle et al., 2012), we believe there is value in extending personality and politics research to include the Dark Triad.

Furthermore, Sniderman's (1975) work provides convergent evidence on a similar personality construct. While Sniderman focuses on the positively framed trait of self-esteem,

much of his work dovetails closely with the Dark Triad trait of Narcissism. Indeed, pieces of his tripartite definition of self-esteem (personal unworthiness, interpersonal competence, and status inferiority) are mimicked in part by the theoretical foundations identified by Jones and Paulhus (2014) for Narcissism (exhibitionism, leadership/grandiosity, and entitlement/grandiosity). While self-esteem and narcissism do not perfectly match, Sniderman's results demonstrating lower levels of participation and efficacy as self-esteem decreases suggests a potential role for Narcissism as well.

We begin by describing each of the Dark Triad traits and outline our expectations for their influence on political beliefs and participation. Machiavellianism is best understood as a tendency toward manipulation and calculation in behavior (Goldberg, 1990; Lee and Ashton, 2004; McCrae and Costa, 2003). Machiavellians are therefore characterized as being cunning, self-beneficial, less intrinsically motivated, and power oriented (Barker, 1994; Judge et al., 2009; McHoskey, 1999). As measured by Christie and Geis (1970), for instance, Machiavellianism is characterized by a lack of affect in interpersonal relationships (i.e. a willingness to exploit and manipulate), a lack of concern with conventional morality (i.e. a willingness to cheat or lie), and a general lack of trust in others.

Of the three components of the Dark Triad, we are most ambivalent about the potential effects of Machiavellianism. While Machiavellianism may be seen as prima facie linked to politics, after all the trait is named after Machiavelli's the Prince, we see no strong theoretical reason to expect higher or lower levels of interest, knowledge, or efficacy among individuals scoring higher on this trait. While we might expect those high in Machiavellianism to engage in specific political activities (i.e. engaging in strategic voting, running for office, or seeking out opportunities for patronage politics), we might also expect Machiavellians to avoid other forms of participation like ethical political consumerism or other acts of participation that are unlikely to have an influence on political outcomes (i.e. casting a ballot in an election with a clear front-runner). As such, it is not clear that individuals who are cold, manipulating, and calculating should exhibit a greater likelihood of participating in politics in general. Thus, for Machiavellianism, we simply assess the research question of what is the effect of Machiavellianism on political beliefs and participation?

Psychopathy is generally characterized by high levels of interpersonal manipulation, impulsiveness, antisocial behaviors, and callousness toward others (Hare, 2003).[3] Indeed, those scoring higher in Psychopathy are typically described as being "destructive for themselves and others" (Rauthmann and Kolar, 2012: 885; see also Williams et al., 2007). As Porter et al. (2018: 612) write, "psychopathic individuals are typically adept con artists, often with long histories of frauds and scams. Some may even become cult leaders, corrupt politicians, or successful corporate leaders" (see also Babiak and Hare, 2006; Black et al., 2014; Blais et al., 2014).[4]

That is not to say that all aspects of Psychopathy are necessarily negative. Recently, aspects of Psychopathy (viz. fearless-dominance) have been linked to presidential achievement and performance (Lilienfeld et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2013), and Nai (2019) finds that politicians scoring higher in Psychopathy achieve better results at the ballot box (i.e. electoral success). Furthermore, in an experimental context, Hart et al. (2018) demonstrate that individuals who share dark personality traits with politicians are generally more supportive of those politicians.

To the extent that individuals high in Psychopathy embody these characteristics, the desire for interpersonal manipulation could lead to higher levels of interest in the competitive world of politics. In addition, if certain aspects of Psychopathy are overrepresented

among some politicians as previous research implies, this could lead to greater levels of support and interest in the process. We expect, therefore, that individuals high in Psychopathy will be more interested in politics than those low in Psychopathy (H1). In contrast, however, we expect that the tendency toward antisocial behavior should produce a decrease in political participation among those high in Psychopathy, relative to those low in Psychopathy (H2).[5] Thus, while congruence between an individual's own personality and that of a politician's should increase interest in politics, the antisocial nature of Psychopathy should reduce actual participation in the social aspects of politics. This would be consistent with recent research that reveals a negative relationship between Psychopathy and civic duty (Pruysers et al., 2019).

The third trait, Narcissism, is best understood as arrogance and entitlement, as well as possessing grand visions about one's own abilities (Rhodewalt and Peterson, 2009). Rauthmann and Kolar (2012: 884), for example, describe narcissists as possessing "extreme vanity, self-absorption, arrogance, and entitlement." In line with this description, we expect individuals high in Narcissism to have an inflated view of their own importance and abilities, resulting in higher levels of both efficacy and political interest. If narcissistic individuals view themselves through the lens of self-importance and arrogance, they should be more confident that they can understand and influence politics (efficacy) to a greater extent than those who are more modest about themselves.

While the narcissism–efficacy link is fairly straightforward, we recognize that increased efficacy does not necessarily translate into increased interest in politics. We believe, however, that examining a facet of Narcissism (viz. Jones and Paulhus, 2014, leadership/authority facet) provides some justification for this hypothesis. Indeed, examining the items tapping this facet in the Short Dark Triad scale (SD3; which assesses whether people see themselves as a natural leader and exhibitionism, or the belief that one should not hide their abilities) as well as Sniderman's (1975) work showing higher self-esteem among elites indicates that individuals high in Narcissism should have a tendency toward greater interest and involvement in politics.

Similar to Psychopathy, there is good evidence that Narcissism is related to success among politicians (Sniderman, 1975; Watts et al., 2013) and, thus, support for politicians who share narcissistic traits should also increase, consistent with Hart et al. (2018). Blais and Pruysers (2017) find that Narcissism is associated with perceptions of qualifications for office and likelihood of success, suggesting that those high in Narcissism likely perceive a stronger connection between themselves and politicians than those low in Narcissism. Therefore, to the extent that Narcissism is overrepresented in politicians, individuals high in Narcissism see themselves reflected in these politicians, and increase their support for these politicians, we should also see an increase in interest and engagement with the political process. We expect that individuals high in Narcissism will demonstrate higher levels of political interest and efficacy compared to those low in Narcissism (H3). While we have no theoretical reason to expect that Narcissism relates to political knowledge, we do investigate whether increased confidence in one's political acumen is justified by assessing whether Narcissism also correlates with increased political knowledge.

In line with decades of research on interest and participation (Campbell et al., 1960; Lewis-Beck et al., 2008), we believe that Narcissism should indirectly increase political participation through increased political interest (H4). That is, because Narcissism is likely to increase interest, this increased interest should affect participation. The effect of Narcissism, therefore, may be indirectly carried through increased interest. Finally, a

direct, positive effect of Narcissism on participation should also exist, as individuals with an inflated view of their abilities should be more inclined to participate in activities, ceteris paribus (H5).

Methods

Sample

We test these hypotheses and research questions using a sample of 371 Canadian citizens over the age of 18. While we note this is a relatively small sample size, we made a conscious decision to utilize a smaller sample to allow for a more extensive battery of personality tests. The limitations of shorter personality scales (the "dirty dozen" or the 10-Item Personality Inventory) are well documented and we opted for more extensive measures to fully capture the depth of personality. While short measures are useful for inclusion on omnibus surveys, when given the opportunity to use a more fulsome measure, we decided to trade sample size for improvements in the measurement of personality.

Examining the demographics of our sample, the majority of participants were women (58%), the average age of the participants was 49, and roughly one-third had completed a University degree (34%). Subjects were recruited from all provinces, with the plurality coming from Ontario (47%) followed by Québec (18%), Alberta (10%), British Columbia (6%), Nova Scotia (6%), Manitoba (5%), Saskatchewan (4%), Newfoundland and Labrador (3%), New Brunswick (2%), and Prince Edward Island (<1%). The median income range was between $30,000 and $60,000. The sample was purchased through the Qualtrics online panel. Respondents are selected from the Qualtrics pool using a quota system, which used age, gender, and education to screen and select participants that reflected the population of Canada. For a comparison table of our sample to general population characteristics, readers should refer to Appendix 1.

Measures

The Dark Triad. We measure the Dark Triad using the SD3 (Jones and Paulhus, 2014), which is a 27-item measure of sub-clinical Machiavellianism, Psychopathy, and Narcissism. Jones and Paulhus validated the SD3 with community and student samples and find high levels of reliability. In our analysis, we find high levels of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.76 to 0.80). All three measures were scaled to run from 0 to 1. In our sample, Machiavellianism had a mean of 0.48 with a standard deviation of 0.16. Narcissism had a mean of 0.42 with a standard deviation of 0.15 while Psychopathy had the lowest mean at 0.26 with a standard deviation of 0.16. The full SD3 scale can be found in Appendix 1.

Political Beliefs. In addition to the SD3, we measure our three political beliefs (political knowledge, political interest, and efficacy) with a range of questions. Political knowledge is measured with a five-question battery.[6] The knowledge scale runs from 0 to 1, with a mean of 0.59 (approximately three correct answers) and a standard deviation of 0.34. Political interest is measured with a single-item, 11-point Likert-type scale ranging from *no interest at all* to *a great deal of interest*: How interested are you in politics, generally? Once scaled to run from 0 to 1, interest had a mean of 0.60 and a standard deviation of 0.29. Efficacy is measured with a five-item scale where respondents were asked to agree

or disagree with five statements about their relationship to politics. These five statements were "Generally, those elected to Parliament in Ottawa soon lose touch with people like me"; "I don't think that the federal government cares much what people like me think"; "Federal political parties are only interested in people's votes, but not in their opinions"; "People like me don't have any say about what the federal government does"; and "Sometimes, politics and government in Ottawa seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on." Scaled to run from 0 to 1, efficacy had a mean of 0.39 and a standard deviation of 0.22.

Political Behavior. Finally, our two primary outcome variables were voting, measured as whether or not the respondent voted in the 2015 Canadian general election, and a 14-item participation index. Respondents were asked how often, in the last 12 months, they had engaged in the 14 different political activities, with response options being *never, once or twice, three to five times*, or *more than five times*.[7] The majority (82.5%) of our sample reported voting in the 2015 federal election. The mean of our participation scale, which ran from 0 to 1, was low, as expected, at 0.18 with a standard deviation of 0.17.

The Cronbach's alpha for the full participation scale was 0.88, indicating a high level of reliability. However, we recognize that we could be tapping multiple forms of participation with these questions. Therefore, in addition to analyzing the full 14-item scale, we also ran a principal components factor analysis to determine the number of factors in the scale. After varimax rotation, we were left with three retained factors (see Appendix 1). The first factor (which consisted of the six items attended a political meeting, contacted a Member of Parliament or other elected official, taken part in a protest or demonstration, joined a political party, volunteered during an election, and engaged in civil disobedience) can broadly be termed *active political participation*. We term the second factor (consisting of signed a petition, encouraged others to take action on a political or social issue that is important to you, boycotted or bought products for environmental reasons, boycotted or bought products for political or ethical reasons, and persuaded others on a political or social issue) as *active social participation*. Finally, the third factor (donated money to a political or societal cause, donated money to charity, volunteered for a charitable cause) encompasses the remaining three items and is called *charity and donations*. The first participation factor had a mean of 0.07 (standard deviation = 0.13), the second factor had a mean of 0.24 (standard deviation = 0.25) and the third factor had a mean of 0.30 (standard deviation = 0.26).

Control Variables. In addition to our independent variables, we control for basic demographics in our models. In particular, we include controls for sex, age, education, and income. In addition to these socio-demographic variables, we include a control for left–right ideology (mean of 0.45, falling just to the left of the moderate position) as well as political party identification. The excluded partisan category is no party identification (15% of respondents), while the dummy categories are for the Liberals (39%), Conservatives (23%), New Democrats (14%), and other party identifications (8%).

Statistical Models

We utilize a two-part test, beginning by assessing the direct influence of the Dark Triad on our measures of political beliefs, controlling for the demographic and political variables discussed above. We do this using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. Following this,

we test for the direct and indirect effect of the Dark Triad on political participation using mediation analysis under the Sobel–Goodman framework (Sobel, 1982, 1986). In addition, we estimate confidence intervals with bootstrapping techniques to assess the statistical significance of our direct and indirect effects, as recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2004, 2008).[8] Data and replication materials are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Results

The Dark Triad and Political Beliefs

Looking first at the effect of the Dark Triad on political beliefs, we see that Machiavellianism exerts no effect on political beliefs in any of the three models. Therefore, consistent with our (lack) of theoretical expectations, we find no evidence that Machiavellianism is an important personality trait for understanding political beliefs, at least as it relates to knowledge, interest, and efficacy (Table 1).

A similar finding emerges when we turn to psychopathy, where we see no evidence that individuals high in Psychopathy exhibit higher levels of political interest compared to other individuals. This finding leads us to reject our first hypothesis, as a tendency toward interpersonal manipulation and viewing political leaders with similar traits does not seem to draw these individuals toward an interest in politics.

When we examine Narcissism, however, we see results in line with H3. Individuals with higher levels of Narcissism do, in fact, express higher levels of political interest, potentially driven by a feeling of importance or qualification for engagement with politics. Interestingly (and perhaps troubling from a normative standpoint), this self-confidence appears to be unfounded. While we had no theoretical reason to expect it, Narcissism is associated with lower levels of political knowledge. The issue for individuals high in Narcissism, it seems, is that they are simultaneously interested in politics and uninformed about the political world. Surprisingly, however, narcissism is not related to political efficacy. Despite the tendency toward arrogance and an enhanced self-image, these individuals do not have a greater sense of their ability to understand or influence politics.[9]

While the association of Narcissism with measures of political beliefs is potentially interesting on its own, we believe the more important questions rest on whether this trait directly or indirectly influences political participation, which in turn affects representation and elections. If the Dark Triad were influential for beliefs but not for actions, we might think of them as a not particularly problematic novelty. As we show in the following section, however, the Dark Triad also affects the actions that citizens take.

The Dark Triad and Political Participation

Table 2 presents the results from an OLS regression (for the entire 14-item participation index) and a logistic regression (for voting in the 2015 general election) with the Dark Triad personality traits and controls. The first model for each dependent variable presents the results without political beliefs, while the second model includes political beliefs. Looking first at participation, we see that, for Psychopathy, the null results in these models lead us to reject our second hypothesis, as there appears to be no direct effect of psychopathy on participation. As we saw before, however, Narcissism is a positive predictor of participation, regardless of whether political beliefs are included or not.

Table 1. Dark Triad and Political Beliefs.

	Political knowledge	Political interest	Efficacy
Machiavellianism	0.12	0.09	−0.14
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.11)
Narcissism	−0.30*	0.32*	0.08
	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Psychopathy	−0.16	0.05	−0.10
	(0.14)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Sex (male)	0.09*	0.03	0.01
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Age	0.00	0.00*	−0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education	0.22*	0.04	0.04
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)
Income	0.17*	0.01	0.01
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Ideology	−0.10	−0.05	−0.10
	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Party (Liberals)	0.06	0.21*	0.06[†]
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.03)
Party (Conservatives)	0.14*	0.23*	−0.02
	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.04)
Party (New Democratic Party)	0.02	0.24*	−0.02
	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.04)
Party (Other)	0.07	0.19*	−0.01
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.05)
Political knowledge	–	0.23*	0.04
	–	(0.05)	(0.04)
Political interest	0.30*	–	0.04
	(0.07)	–	(0.06)
Efficacy	0.08	0.05	–
	(0.08)	(0.08)	–
Constant	0.11	−0.12	0.45*
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.08)
N	338	338	338
R^2	0.318	0.309	0.104

Standard errors in parentheses.
[†]$p < 0.10$, *$p < 0.05$.

For Narcissism, we find support for our fifth hypothesis, with a direct effect of Narcissism on political participation. This result, more than any others, is troubling, as it suggests that individuals high in Narcissism are willing to participate in politics despite the correlation between their personality trait and lower levels of political knowledge. It is possible, however, that this total effect is attenuated by a negative indirect effect through political knowledge. We see some evidence for this, as the direct effect of Narcissism is slightly reduced with the addition of the political belief variables.

Table 2. Dark Triad and Political Participation.

	Participation		Voted (2015)	
Machiavellianism	−0.06	−0.08	−2.68*	−3.16*
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(1.31)	(1.35)
Narcissism	0.32*	0.28*	1.65	0.81
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(1.20)	(1.37)
Psychopathy	0.11	0.10	−0.41	−0.78
	(0.08)	(0.07)	(1.38)	(1.49)
Sex (male)	−0.03†	−0.05*	0.52	0.40
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.38)	(0.40)
Age	−0.00	−0.00	0.02†	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Education	0.06*	0.04	1.31*	1.08†
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.60)	(0.64)
Income	0.04†	0.03	1.50*	1.32*
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.51)	(0.54)
Ideology	−0.05	−0.03	0.85	1.20
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.85)	(0.94)
Party (Liberals)	0.05*	0.01	2.02*	1.44*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.44)	(0.49)
Party (Conservatives)	0.03	−0.03	1.92*	1.22*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.52)	(0.56)
Party (New Democratic Party)	0.09*	0.04	2.09*	1.37*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.59)	(0.62)
Party (Other)	0.10*	0.05	1.51*	1.03
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.63)	(0.67)
Political knowledge		0.18*		2.98*
		(0.03)		(0.67)
Political interest		0.04		0.29
		(0.03)		(0.60)
Efficacy		−0.03		−0.33
		(0.04)		(0.88)
Constant	−0.04	−0.01	−2.27*	−2.10†
	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.98)	(1.11)
n	338	335	336	333
(Pseudo) R^2	0.191	0.279	0.222	0.302

Standard errors in parentheses.
†$p < 0.10$, *$p < 0.05$.

Interestingly, while we find effects for participation, we see no evidence that Narcissism is a significant predictor of having voted in the 2015 general election, either with or without the political belief variables. While we had no expectations for Machiavellianism, we do see that individuals who are high in Machiavellianism are less likely to vote, regardless of model specification. While these results are interesting, we have no theoretical reason to expect this pattern. In addition, none of the expected patterns hold for Psychopathy or Narcissism in relation to voting. Without a significant coefficient in either

Table 3. Effects of Narcissism through Political Beliefs on Participation.

	Narcissism	
	Interest	Knowledge
Indirect effect	0.06*	−0.01
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Direct effect	0.28*	0.28*
	(0.06)	(0.06)
Total effect	0.34*	0.27*
	(0.06)	(0.06)

Standard errors in parentheses.
*$p < 0.05$.

model (pre- or post-addition of political belief variables), we focus the rest of the analysis on the participation index.

To test for the presence of direct and indirect effects, the next step is to conduct separate Sobel–Goodman tests with bootstrapped confidence intervals to determine the scope of influence of the Dark Triad on participation. What we see is that, for Narcissism, the direct effect remains strong when looking at mediation through knowledge or interest. However, the effect of Narcissism is not mediated through knowledge, but rather only through interest, leading to partial mediation of the effect. Thus, any attenuation of the direct effect of Narcissism on participation is driven not through a lack of political knowledge, but rather through the mediation of the positive effect through political interest (Table 3).

It is possible, of course, that we are missing an important relationship by grouping all participatory acts together. Therefore, Table 4 presents the indirect and direct effects from a series of Sobel–Goodman mediation tests for our three participation factors that emerged from the exploratory factor analysis.

What we see in Table 4 is that, for Narcissism, the effect is similar across all three types of participation. While the effect is primarily direct, we see a significant indirect effect through interest for the first two factors and a marginally significant effect for the final factor. Once again, we see no evidence that the effect of Narcissism is mediated in any way through political knowledge.

As a final test of our hypotheses, we recognize one of the potential critiques of the mediation approach. Green, Bullock, and Ha (Bullock and Ha, 2011; Green et al., 2010) are especially critical of the use of mediation on nonexperimental data, especially if scholars rely on the Baron–Kenny method (Baron and Kenny, 1986). A key component of this critique is the inability to include or conceive of all potential mediators in the analysis. While we do not deny this possibility, we attempt to assuage concerns by conducting a multiple mediation test of the effect of the Dark Triad through the four measured political beliefs outlined earlier.

Utilizing a structural equation modeling approach and constructing non-linear combinations for the indirect and total effects, we present the results of the multiple mediation model in Table 5. Under the multiple mediation framework, we see that the primary effect, again, is a direct, positive effect of Narcissism on political participation. Consistent with prior results, the only significant mediator of Narcissism is political interest, which partially mediates the effect.

Table 4. Effects of Narcissism through Political Beliefs on Participation (Three Factors).

	Narcissism	
	Interest	Knowledge
Factor 1: Active political participation		
Indirect effect	0.04*	−0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Direct effect	0.14*	0.14*
	(0.04)	(0.05)
Total effect	0.18*	0.14*
	(0.05)	(0.05)
Factor 2: Active social participation		
Indirect effect	0.09*	−0.02
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Direct effect	0.33*	0.33*
	(0.10)	(0.10)
Total effect	0.42*	0.31*
	(0.10)	(0.09)
Factor 3: Charity and donations		
Indirect effect	0.04[†]	−0.02
	(0.02)	(0.02)
Direct effect	0.50*	0.50*
	(0.09)	(0.09)
Total effect	0.53*	0.47*
	(0.09)	(0.09)

Standard errors in parentheses.
[†]$p < 0.10$, *$p < 0.05$.

Table 5. Multiple Mediation Test on Political Participation.

	Narcissism
Indirect effect (interest)	0.05*
	(0.02)
Indirect effect (knowledge)	−0.01
	(0.01)
Indirect effect (efficacy)	−0.00
	(0.00)
Direct effect	0.28*
	(0.05)
Total effect	0.32*
	(0.06)

Standard errors in parentheses.
*$p < 0.05$.

Discussion and Conclusion

Taken as a whole, these results suggest that an important connection exists between dark personality traits, especially the trait of Narcissism, and political participation. Narcissism, or a tendency toward self-centeredness, arrogance, entitlement, and a belief in one's abilities, is directly correlated with participation in politics. Surprisingly, we find no connection between narcissism and political efficacy. In other words, the self-importance and grandiosity that characterizes narcissism does not appear to translate into higher ratings of one's own ability to understand and influence politics. We do, however, find that Narcissism has a positive relationship with political interest and participation and a negative relationship with political knowledge, demonstrating that the confidence expressed by those high in Narcissism in the political realm is perhaps unfounded, at least as measured by traditional knowledge questions.

This conflicting relationship would not be terribly troubling if the effect of Narcissism on political participation was mediated through both variables. In that (hypothetical) case, higher levels of interest would produce more participation while lower levels of knowledge would produce less participation. This, however, is not the case. The effect of Narcissism on political participation is partially mediated by political beliefs, but only through political interest. This, combined with the direct, positive effect of Narcissism on participation, produces a large, positive total effect of Narcissism on political participation.

In addition, one potential salve for the influence of these traits could come through negative associations with political beliefs. Lower levels of political knowledge (Narcissism) is associated with Dark Triad traits, but this negative association does not mediate the effects of personality. Instead, when the effects are mediated, it is almost exclusively through positive associations with political interest.

We do note that, as footnote 8 and Appendix 1 show, including measures of other personality traits (viz. the HEXACO) reduces the effect size of the Dark Triad measures, however the significance of the Dark Triad generally remains. One area where we should exercise caution is in potentially overinterpreting the results related to political interest. When accounting for the HEXACO, none of the Dark Triad traits reach statistical significance. However, in this model, only Openness to Experience predicts interest, which suggests that some of this may come from multicollinearity between the HEXACO and the Dark Triad. Future research should work to further decompose the HEXACO, Big Five, and Dark Triad to understand the relationship with political interest. Unfortunately, this is beyond the scope of this study.[10]

To the extent that political representatives are most responsive to the individuals who turn out and, especially, those who participate in politics (as suggested by Fenno, 1978, constituency spheres), these results should raise some important concerns. Self-centered, egotistical, and unknowledgeable (Narcissistic) individuals are more likely to make up the volunteers and donors to political campaigns. If politicians listen to the volunteers and donors, we may be especially troubled by the characteristics of these groups. Admittedly, other personality traits also predict political participation, but we would be wrong to characterize the "participatory personality" are purely consisting of personality traits like the Big Five.

Our results are therefore in contrast to the more commonly presented participatory personality, which emphasizes the personality traits of Openness and Extraversion. These traits describe people with intellectual curiosity and an appreciation for art and emotion,

and who are generally outgoing, assertive, and energetic. Our results, however, present a darker second participatory personality, painting a fairly bleak portrait of the Dark Triad's association with participation. In general, individuals scoring higher in Narcissism are more likely to participate in politics. This effect, when it is mediated, is partially mediated through a positive relationship with interest and not mediated through the negative relationship with political knowledge. The results presented here add more evidence demonstrating that participation is driven not only by socio-economic variables but also by personality. In this case, the dark participatory personality is defined by grandiose beliefs, arrogance, and self-entitlement.

The next step for researchers, therefore, is to assess whether there are, in fact, negative externalities that result from an overrepresentation of narcissists among political activists. It is well-established that politicians are largely concerned with constituencies that help them win re-election (Fenno, 1978; Mayhew, 1974); what remains to be determined is if Narcissism produces differential policy preferences. One possible path forward is to rely on surveys of party activists and donors to assess levels of Narcissism and policy preferences compared to surveys of the general public—similar to the approach employed by Gilens and Page (2014) in their study of elites, interest groups, and average citizens. Scholars could also adopt an experimental approach using mock elections, such as with the Dynamic Process Tracing Environment (Lau and Redlawsk, 2006). By assessing Narcissism and blocking treatment assignment based on levels of the trait, researchers could approximate elections with more or less participation from narcissists. By tracing information search patterns and mock election outcomes, researchers could identify the informational and political effects of participation by narcissists.

As we continue to explore the influence of personality traits on political beliefs and behaviors, we would be wise to consider traits that hold negative connotations and associations such as the Dark Triad. While models like the Big Five/Five-Factor and HEXACO (Ashton et al., 2004) are useful general descriptions of personality, a set of traits like the Dark Triad are potentially more important for politics because of the asymmetry in desirable qualities across the range of these traits. That is, at high levels of Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy, individuals exhibit behaviors and beliefs that are troubling if translated into political action, a claim that is unlikely to hold for traits such as Extraversion or Openness to Experience.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

ORCID iD

Philip Chen https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3479-3662

Notes

1. For example, we can look to the literature on extraversion, introversion, and cognition to see that the work focuses on the differential learning styles of introverts and extraverts (Furnham and Bradley, 1997; Schmeck and Lockhart, 1983) or on the effects of certain types of rewards and punishment (Boddy et al., 1986) rather than on differentiating introversion or extraversion as normatively superior.

2.   Note, however, that aspects of the Dark Triad have been associated with positive outcomes and behaviors such as enhanced leadership abilities, persuasiveness, and crisis management (Lilienfeld et al., 2012; Watts et al., 2013).

3.   We note here that all three of the Dark Triad personality traits are measured at the sub-clinical level. Thus, individuals high in Psychopathy, for example, are not considered psychopathic in the sense of a clinical diagnosis.

4.   Although the estimation for the prevalence of psychopathic traits in the general population is relatively small, these individuals are thought to cost society billions of dollars each year, leading some to classify Psychopathy as a pervasive and serious public health issue (Reidy et al., 2015).

5.   This would be consistent with the results of Blais and Pruysers (2017) regarding political ambition.

6.   Respondents were asked to identify the Premier of their Province (open-ended) as well as select the federal Minister of Finance, governor-general, leader of the official opposition, and current British Prime Minister from a list provided for each office.

7.   The 14 participation items were signed a petition, encouraged others to take action on a political or social issue that is important to you, boycotted or bought products for environmental reasons, boycotted or bought products for political or ethical reasons, attended a political meeting, persuaded others on a political or social issue, donated money to a political or societal cause, taken part in a protest or demonstration, joined a political party, contacted a Member of Parliament or other elected official, engaged in civil disobedience, donated money to charity, volunteered during an election, and volunteered for a charitable cause.

8.   While we believe there is value in studying the Dark Triad in isolation from other personality traits, as noted above, we recognize the value in demonstrating incremental validity of the Dark Triad over other models of personality. Our models here look at the Dark Triad in isolation, but we replicated all of these analyses while also including the HEXACO personality traits. These models can be found in Appendix 1 as Tables 8 to 12. Including the HEXACO, which contains the Honesty–Humility trait which is negatively correlated with the Dark Triad, does reduce the strength of our findings; however, the statistical significance of our findings remains in all other cases except for one. The only major divergence in results is that including the HEXACO leads to a null finding on the relationship between Narcissism and political interest. This will be discussed at greater length in the conclusion.

9.   Interestingly, there is no significant interaction between Narcissism and political knowledge when predicting political interest or efficacy. This suggests that, while Narcissism exerts a main effect on both political knowledge and political interest, it is not, in fact, less informed individuals high in Narcissism who are interested in politics, but rather that Narcissism exerts independent effects on interest and knowledge.

10. We also note with curiosity the emerging literature on Collective Narcissism, which connotes an affective belief in the superiority of one's in-group rather than the individual-level Narcissism of the Dark Triad, and its connection to politics (De Zavala et al., 2009). This work shows interesting connections between support for Donald Trump in the 2016 US presidential election and Collective Narcissism (Federico and De Zavala, 2018; Marchlewska et al., 2018). To the extent that De Zavala and colleagues propose that Collective Narcissism is often irrational, we might expect to find similar mediational pathways on support for certain candidates and, potentially, political participation. To the extent that Narcissism is driven by unfounded faith in one's abilities (shown by the interest and knowledge results here), Collective Narcissism may produce unfounded faith in one's in-group's abilities to govern and succeed. While the mediational pathway may not be through individual-level political interest and knowledge, it may be that individuals overestimate their in-group's contributions while underestimating the drawbacks of those approaches. We did not measure Collective Narcissism in our study and, as such, we defer these questions to future research.

References

Ashton MC, Lee K and de Vries RE (2014) The HEXACO Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality Factors: A Review of Research and Theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 18: 139–152.

Ashton MC, Lee K and Goldberg LR (2004) A Hierarchical Analysis of 1,710 English Personality-Descriptive Adjectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87: 707–721.

Babiak P and Hare RD (2006) *Snakes in Suits: When Psychopaths Go to Work*. New York: Regan Books; HarperCollins.

Barber B (1984) *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Barker RA (1994) The Rethinking of Leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 1: 46–54.

Baron RM and Kenny DA (1986) The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51 (6): 1173–1182.

Black PJ, Woodworth M and Porter S (2014) The Big Bad Wolf? The Relation Between the Dark Triad and the Interpersonal Assessment of Vulnerability. *Personality and Individual Differences* 67: 52–56.

Blais J and Pruysers S (2017) The Power of the Dark Side: Personality, the Dark Triad, and Political Ambition. *Personality and Individual Differences* 113: 167–172.

Blais J, Pruysers S and Chen P (2019) Why Do They Run? The Psychological Underpinnings of Political Ambition. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 52 (4): 1–19.

Blais A and St-Vincent SL (2011) Personality Traits, Political Attitudes and the Propensity to Vote. *European Journal of Political Research* 50 (3): 395–417.

Blais J, Solodukhin E and Forth AE (2014) A Meta-analysis Exploring the Relationship Between Psychopathy and Instrumental Versus Reactive Violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 41 (7): 797–821.

Boddy J, Carver A and Rowley K (1986) Effects of Positive and Negative Verbal Reinforcement on Performance as a Function of Extraversion-Introversion: Some Tests of Gray's Theory. *Personality and Individual Differences* 7 (1): 81–88.

Brady HE, Verba S and Schlozman KL (1995) Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation. *American Political Science Review* 89 (2): 271–294.

Bullock JG and Ha SE (2011) Mediation Analysis Is Harder Than It Looks. In: Druckman JN, Green DP, Kuklinski JH, et al. (eds) *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.508–522.

Campbell A, Converse P, Miller W, et al. (1960) *The American Voter*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Chen PG and Palmer CL (2018) The Prejudiced Personality? Using the Big Five to Predict Susceptibility to Stereotyping Behavior. *American Politics Research* 46 (2): 276–307.

Chirumbolo A and Leone L (2010) Personality and Politics: The Role of the HEXACO Model of Personality in Predicting Ideology and Voting. *Personality and Individual Differences* 49 (1): 43–48.

Christie R and Geis FL (1970) *Studies in Machiavellianism*. Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Craig SC and Maggiotto MA (1982) Measuring Political Efficacy. *Political Methodology* 8: 85–109.

Craig SC, Niemi RG and Silver GE (1990) Political Efficacy and Trust: A Report on the NES Pilot Study Items. *Political Behavior* 12 (3): 289–314.

de Zavala AG, Cichocka A, Eidelson R, et al. (2009) Collective Narcissism and Its Social Consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 97 (6): 1074–1096.

Delli-Carpini M and Keeter S (1996) *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

DeShong HL, Grant DM and Mullins-Sweatt SN (2015) Comparing Models of Counterproductive Workplace Behaviors: The Five-Factor Model and the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences* 74: 55–60.

Dryzek JS and List C (2003) Social Choice Theory and Deliberative Democracy: A Reconciliation. *British Journal of Political Science* 33 (1): 1–28.

Federico CM and de Zavala AG (2018) Collective Narcissism and the 2016 US Presidential Vote. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82 (1): 110–121.

Fenno R (1978) *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Furnham A and Bradley A (1997) Music While You Work: The Differential Distraction of Background Music on the Cognitive Test Performance of Introverts and Extraverts. *Applied Cognitive Psychology: The Official Journal of the Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition* 11 (5): 445–455.

Furtner MR, Maran T and Rauthmann JF (2017) Dark Leadership: The Role of Leaders' Dark Triad Personality Traits. In: Clark M and Gruber C (eds) *Leader Development Deconstructed*. Cham: Springer, pp.75–99.

Gay JG, Lishner DA, Vitacco MJ, et al. (2019) Deconstructing the Association Between Psychopathy and Political Orientation: Is it Attributable to Moral Intuitions or Moral Competency? *Personality and Individual Differences* 149: 128–134.

Gerber AS, Huber G, Doherty D, et al. (2011a) Personality Traits and Participation in Political Processes. *Journal of Politics* 73 (3): 692–706.

Gerber AS, Huber G, Doherty D, et al. (2011b) The Big Five Personality Traits in the Political Arena. *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: 265–287.

Gerber AS, Huber G, Doherty D, et al. (2013) Big Five Personality Traits and Responses to Persuasive Appeals: Results from Voter Turnout Experiments. *Political Behavior* 35 (4): 687–728.

Gidengil E, Blais A, Nevitte N, et al. (2004) *Citizens*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Gilens M and Page BI (2014) Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens. *Perspectives on Politics* 12 (3): 564–581.

Goldberg L (1990) An Alternative "Description of Personality": The Big-Five Factor Structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59: 1216–1229.

Green DP, Ha SE and Bullock JG (2010) Enough Already about "Black Box" Experiments: Studying Mediation Is More Difficult Than Most Scholars Suppose. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 628 (1): 200–208.

Hare RD (2003) *The Psychopathy Checklist—Revised*. Toronto, ON, Canada: Springer.

Hart W, Richardson K and Tortoriello GK (2018) Dark Personality Voters Find Dark Politicians More Relatable and Fit for Office. *Journal of Research in Personality* 75: 59–68.

Jonason PK, Slomski S and Partyka J (2012) The Dark Triad at Work: How Toxic Employees Get Their Way. *Personality and Individual Differences* 52 (3): 449–453.

Jonason PK and Webster GD (2010) The Dirty Dozen: A Concise Measure of the Dark Triad. *Psychological Assessment* 22 (2): 420.

Jones DN and Paulhus DL (2014) Introducing the Short Dark Triad (SD3): A Brief Measure of Dark Personality Traits. *Assessment* 21 (1): 28–41.

Judge TA, Piccolo RF and Kosalka T (2009) The Bright and Dark Sides of Leader Traits: A Review and Theoretical Extension of the Leader Trait Paradigm. *The Leadership Quarterly* 20 (6): 855–875.

Lau RR and Redlawsk DP (2006) *How Voters Decide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee K and Ashton MC (2004) Psychometric Properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 39 (2): 329–358.

Lee K and Ashton MC (2005) Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism in the Five-Factor Model and the HEXACO Model of Personality Structure. *Personality and Individual Differences* 38 (7): 1571–1582.

Lewis-Beck M, Jacoby W, Norpoth H, et al. (2008) *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Lilienfeld SO, Waldman ID, Landfield K, et al. (2012) Fearless Dominance and the U.S. Presidency: Implications of Psychopathic Personality Traits for Successful and Unsuccessful Political Leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 103 (3): 489–505.

McCrae R and Costa P (2003) *Personality in Adulthood: A Five-Factor Theory Perspective*. New York: Guilford Press.

McHoskey JW (1999) Machiavellianism, Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic Goals, and Social Interest: A Self-Determination Theory Analysis. *Motivation and Emotion* 23 (4): 267–283.

Marchlewska M, Cichocka A, Panayiotou O, et al. (2018) Populism as Identity Politics: Perceived In-Group Disadvantage, Collective Narcissism, and Support for Populism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 9 (2): 151–162.

Mayhew D (1974) *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Mondak J (2010) *Personality and the Foundations of Political Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mondak J and Halperin K (2008) A Framework for the Study of Personality and Political Behavior. *British Journal of Political Science* 38: 335–362.

Mondak J, Hibbing M, Canache D, et al. (2010) Personality and Civic Engagement: An Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior. *American Political Science Review* 104: 85–110.

Nai A (2019) Disagreeable Narcissists, Extroverted Psychopaths, and Elections: A New Dataset to Measure the Personality of Candidates Worldwide. *European Political Science* 18 (2): 309–334.

Niemi RG, Craig SC and Mattei F (1991) Measuring Internal Political Efficacy in the 1988 National Election Study. *American Political Science Review* 85 (4): 1407–1413.

O'Boyle EH Jr, Forsyth DR, Banks GC, et al. (2012) A Meta-Analysis of the Dark Triad and Work Behavior: A Social Exchange Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 97 (3): 557–579.

Paulhus DL and Williams KM (2002) The Dark Triad of Personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality* 36 (6): 556–563.

Peterson RD and Palmer CL (2019) The Dark Triad and Nascent Political Ambition. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*. Epub ahead of print 29 August. DOI: 10.1080/17457289.2019.1660354.

Porter S, Woodworth M and Black PJ (2018) Psychopathy and Aggression. In: Patrick C (ed.) *The Handbook of Psychopathy*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Preacher KJ and Hayes AF (2004) SPSS and SAS Procedures for Estimating Indirect Effects in Simple Mediation Models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers* 36 (4): 717–731.

Preacher KJ and Hayes AF (2008) Asymptotic and Resampling Strategies for Assessing and Comparing Indirect Effects in Multiple Mediator Models. *Behavior Research Methods* 40 (3): 879–891.

Pruysers S and Blais J (2019) Narcissistic Women and Cash-Strapped Men: Who Can Be Encouraged to Consider Running for Political Office, and Who Should Do the Encouraging? *Political Research Quarterly* 72 (1): 229–242.

Pruysers S, Blais J and Chen PG (2019) Who Makes a Good Citizen? The Role of Personality. *Personality and Individual Differences* 146: 99–104.

Putnam RD (2000) Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. In: *Culture and Politics*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Rauthmann JF and Kolar GP (2012) How "Dark" are the Dark Triad Traits? Examining the Perceived Darkness of Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences* 53 (7): 884–889.

Reidy DE, Kearns MC, DeGue S, et al. (2015) Why Psychopathy Matters: Implications for Public Health and Violence Prevention. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 24: 214–225.

Rhodewalt F and Peterson B (2009) Narcissism. In: Leary MR and Hoyle RH (eds) *Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior*. New York: Guilford Press, pp.547–560.

Rosenstone S and Hansen JM (2003) *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. London: Pearson.

Schmeck RR and Lockhart D (1983) Introverts and Extraverts Require Different Learning Environments. *Educational Leadership* 40 (5): 54–55.

Schoen H and Schumann S (2007) Personality Traits, Partisan Attitudes, and Voting Behavior. Evidence from Germany. *Political Psychology* 28 (4): 471–498.

Smith SF, Lilienfeld SO, Coffey K, et al. (2013) Are Psychopaths and Heroes Twigs off the Same Branch? Evidence from College, Community, and Presidential Samples. *Journal of Research in Personality* 47 (5): 634–646.

Sniderman P (1975) *Personality and Democratic Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sobel ME (1982) Asymptotic Confidence Intervals for Indirect Effects in Structural Equation Models. *Sociological Methodology* 13: 290–312.

Sobel ME (1986) Some New Results on Indirect Effects and Their Standard Errors in Covariance Structure Models. *Sociological Methodology* 16: 159–186.

Stolle D and Micheletti M (2013) *Political Consumerism: Global Responsibility in Action*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Verba S, Schlozman KL and Brady H (1995) *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watts AL, Lilienfeld SO, Smith SF, et al. (2013) The Double-Edged Sword of Grandiose Narcissism: Implications for Successful and Unsuccessful Leadership among US Presidents. *Psychological Science* 24 (12): 2379–2389.

Wilhelm PG, Wilhelm JP and Wilhelm TG (2013) Testing Maccoby's Theory of Productive Narcissism with US Presidents: Global Competitiveness and Dark Triad Implications. *Competition Forum* 11: 289–296.

Williams KM, Paulhus DL and Hare RD (2007) Capturing the Four-factor Structure of Psychopathy in College Students via Self-report. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 88 (2): 205–219.

Wolfinger R and Rosenstone S (1980) *Who Votes?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Author Biographies

Philip Chen is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Beloit College. His research examines gender and racial stereotyping, personality, and political behavior, primarily through the lens of political psychology. His work has appeared in numerous political science and psychology journals.

Scott Pruysers is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Dalhousie University. Prior to this, he was a Postdoctoral Fellow at Ryerson University and an Adjunct Research Professor at Carleton University. His research interests include party organization, intra-party democracy, and political psychology. His research has appeared in journals such as *Political Research Quarterly, Party Politics, Canadian Journal of*

Political Science, and *Politics & Gender*. He is the co-author of *The Promise and Challenge of Party Primary Elections: A Comparative Perspective* (McGill-Queens University Press, 2016) and the co-editor of *The Personalization of Democratic Politics and the Challenge for Political Parties* (ECPR Press, 2018).

Julie Blais is an Assistant Professor in the Psychology Department at Carleton University. She is an emerging scholar with expertise in experimental methods, personality, scale development, and assessment. She has 20 peer-reviewed publications in high-caliber journals in the areas of forensic psychology, personality, and political psychology.

Appendix 1

Table 6. Factor Analysis of Political Participation.

	Active political participation	Active social participation	Charity and donations
Taken part in a protest or demonstration	**0.732**	0.389	0.049
Attended a political meeting	**0.768**	0.142	0.285
Joined a political party	**0.729**	0.057	0.316
Contacted a MP/elected official	**0.585**	0.352	0.154
Engaged in civil disobedience	**0.678**	0.221	−0.145
Volunteered during an election	**0.628**	0.035	0.357
Signed a petition	0.272	**0.603**	0.238
Encouraged others to take action on an issue	0.388	**0.703**	0.150
Boycotted or bought products (environmental)	0.041	**0.811**	0.289
Boycotted or bought products (political/ethical)	0.091	**0.867**	0.149
Persuaded others on a political or social issue	0.377	**0.587**	0.257
Donated money to a political or societal cause	0.309	0.317	**0.656**
Donated money to charity	0.017	0.259	**0.755**
Volunteered for a charitable cause	0.236	0.209	**0.727**
Eigenvalues	6.0	1.6	1.1
Variance explained (%)	43	11	8

Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) = 0.882.
Note: Bolded values represent the three factor structure political participation.

Table 7. Sample versus Canadian Population.

	Study sample	Canada (2016)
Mean age	51	41
Average income	34% of respondents report an income between $60,000 and $110,000	$75,700
Education of working-age population (University degree)	34.4%	24.7%
Education of working-age population (College degree)	21.1%	31.6%
Education of working-age population (College or University)	55.5	56.3
Region (Ontario)	47%	38%

Source: Author Data and Statistics Canada (2017).

Table 8. Dark Triad and Political Beliefs, Controlling for HEXACO.

	Political knowledge	Political interest	Efficacy
Machiavellianism	0.17	0.07	−0.11
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
Narcissism	−0.32*	0.11	−0.05
	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.13)
Psychopathy	−0.17	0.09	−0.05
	(0.19)	(0.13)	(0.12)
Honesty–Humility	0.17	−0.08	−0.04
	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.11)
Emotionality	−0.02	0.13	−0.07
	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Extraversion	−0.06	0.08	0.13
	(0.16)	(0.13)	(0.12)
Agreeableness	−0.13	−0.03	0.12
	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.11)
Conscientiousness	−0.02	0.12	0.13
	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.11)
Openness to experience	0.18	0.48*	0.12
	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.09)
Sex (male)	0.11*	0.08*	0.01
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Age	0.00	0.00*	−0.00*
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education	0.22*	0.03	0.03
	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.04)
Income	0.21*	0.04	0.00
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Ideology	−0.10	0.04	−0.07
	(0.09)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Party (Liberals)	0.08	0.22*	0.08*
	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.04)
Party (Conservatives)	0.15*	0.24*	−0.01
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.04)
Party (New Democratic Party)	0.04	0.21*	0.02
	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Party (Other)	0.08	0.18*	0.01
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)
Political knowledge	–	0.15*	0.05
	–	(0.06)	(0.04)
Political interest	0.21*	–	0.00
	(0.08)	–	(0.06)
Efficacy	0.09	0.01	–
	(0.08)	(0.08)	–
Constant	−0.02	−0.46*	0.27
	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.20)
n	308	308	308
R^2	0.344	0.366	0.154

Standard errors in parentheses.
*$p < 0.05$.

Table 9. Dark Triad and Political Participation, controlling for HEXACO.

	Participation		Voted (2015)	
Machiavellianism	−0.02	−0.03	−1.54	−1.58
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(1.53)	(1.58)
Narcissism	0.21*	0.19*	−1.07	−2.75
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(1.88)	(2.06)
Psychopathy	0.19†	0.19†	1.27	1.49
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(1.75)	(1.90)
Honesty–Humility	0.06	0.07	3.45*	4.26*
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(1.62)	(1.76)
Emotionality	0.13†	0.12†	1.47	0.89
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(1.49)	(1.60)
Extraversion	0.10	0.10	4.96*	6.26*
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(1.79)	(1.97)
Agreeableness	−0.02	−0.00	−3.88*	−4.03*
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(1.65)	(1.78)
Conscientiousness	0.07	0.06	1.64	1.60
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(1.67)	(1.82)
Openness to experience	0.18*	0.09	0.02	−2.20
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(1.33)	(1.57)
Sex (male)	−0.01	−0.03	0.72†	0.33
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.44)	(0.49)
Age	−0.00	−0.00	0.01	−0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Education	0.06*	0.04	1.59*	1.59*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.67)	(0.75)
Income	0.05†	0.03	1.46*	1.21†
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.56)	(0.62)
Ideology	−0.01	−0.02	0.54	0.12
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.94)	(1.06)
Party (Liberals)	0.04	−0.01	2.10*	1.43*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.52)	(0.57)
Party (Conservatives)	0.01	−0.04	2.17*	1.65*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.60)	(0.66)
Party (New Democratic Party)	0.07*	0.03	2.63*	2.02*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.69)	(0.74)
Party (Other)	0.08†	0.05	1.63*	1.32†
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.71)	(0.76)
Political knowledge		0.04		0.16
		(0.03)		(0.68)
Political interest		0.16*		3.59*
		(0.04)		(0.83)
Efficacy		−0.03		−0.55
		(0.04)		(0.96)
Constant	−0.34*	−0.28*	−6.43*	−5.20†
	(0.15)	(0.14)	(2.63)	(2.84)
n	307	305	306	304
(Pseudo) R^2	0.243	0.303	0.293	0.372

Standard errors in parentheses.
†$p < 0.10$, *$p < 0.05$.

Table 10. Effects of Narcissism through Political Beliefs on Participation, Controlling for HEXACO.

	Narcissism	
	Interest	Knowledge
Indirect effect	0.02	−0.01
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Direct effect	0.19*	0.19*
	(0.08)	(0.08)
Total effect	0.21*	0.18*
	(0.08)	(0.08)

Standard errors in parentheses.
*p < 0.05.

Table 11. Effects of Narcissism through Political Beliefs on Participation (Three Factors), Controlling for HEXACO.

	Narcissism	
	Interest	Knowledge
Factor 1: Active political participation		
Indirect effect	0.01	−0.00
	(0.02)	(0.01)
Direct effect	0.10†	0.10†
	(0.06)	(0.06)
Total effect	0.12†	0.10†
	(0.06)	(0.06)
Factor 2: Active social participation		
Indirect effect	0.03	−0.01
	(0.03)	(0.02)
Direct effect	0.20†	0.20†
	(0.12)	(0.11)
Total effect	0.24†	0.19†
	(0.12)	(0.11)
Factor 3: Charity and donations		
Indirect effect	0.01	−0.03
	(0.01)	(0.02)
Direct effect	0.37*	0.37*
	(0.13)	(0.13)
Total effect	0.38*	0.34*
	(0.13)	(0.13)

Standard errors in parentheses.
†p < 0.10, *p < 0.05.

Table 12. Multiple Mediation Test on Political Participation, Controlling for HEXACO.

	Narcissism
Indirect effect (interest)	0.01
	(0.02)
Indirect effect (knowledge)	−0.01
	(0.01)
Indirect effect (efficacy)	0.00
	(0.00)
Direct effect	0.19*
	(0.08)
Total effect	0.20*
	(0.08)

Standard errors in parentheses.
*$p < 0.05$.

Short Dark Triad Scale

Please rate your agreement or disagreement with each item using the following guidelines.

5 = Strongly Agree
4 = Agree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

1. It's not wise to tell your secrets.
2. I like to use clever manipulation to get my way.
3. Whatever it takes, you must get the important people on your side.
4. Avoid direct conflict with others because they may be useful in the future.
5. It's wise to keep track of information that you can use against people later.
6. You should wait for the right time to get back at people.
7. There are things you should hide from other people because they don't need to know.
8. Make sure your plans benefit you, not others.
9. Most people can be manipulated.

1. People see me as a natural leader.
2. I hate being the center of attention.
3. Many group activities tend to be dull without me.
4. I know that I am special because everyone keeps telling me so.
5. I like to get acquainted with important people.
6. I feel embarrassed if someone compliments me.
7. I have been compared to famous people.
8. I am an average person.
9. I insist on getting the respect I deserve.

1. I like to get revenge on authorities.
2. I avoid dangerous situations.
3. Payback needs to be quick and nasty.
4. People often say I'm out of control.
5. It's true that I can be mean to others.
6. People who mess with me always regret it.
7. I have never gotten into trouble with the law.
8. I enjoy having sex with people I hardly know.
9. I'll say anything to get what I want.