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(Abstract)

The purpose of the present study was to demonstrate behavioral differences between high Machiavellians (MACHS) as described by Christie (1970a) and those exhibiting the aberrant self-promotion pattern proposed by Gustafson and Ritzer (1995). The aberrant self-promoter (ASP) was defined as having a high degree of narcissism, combined with a low need to appear conventionally "nice" along with pronounced antisocial behavior. The Machiavellian was described as one who is capable of manipulating others to obtain some advantage. The situation that was proposed differentiate the two groups is a legislature game which involves bargaining and forming alliances. ASPs and Machiavellians were identified by the same procedures used by Gustafson and Ritzer (1995). In Condition 1, the issues being voted upon were value laden in the sense that they were designed to elicit an affective response. In Condition 2, the issues were value and affect neutral. The experimental subjects were undergraduates enrolled in psychology courses. It was predicted that because Machiavellians are better at
separating affect from rational thought than are either ASPs or non-Mach non-ASPs, Machiavellians would perform better than either of the other groups in the value laden issues condition. It was also predicted that participants would rate aberrant self-promoters less favorably than other players on trust, respect, and likability due to the ASPs ineffectiveness in bargaining and forming alliances.

Two repeated measures ANOVAs were performed to test the hypotheses. Results supported only the last prediction regarding likability. Reasons for these findings and implications were discussed.
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Aberrant Self-Promotion vs Machiavellianism

It is important to try to demonstrate the differences between the characteristics of a new construct and those of existing constructs. The purpose of the present study is to differentiate the construct of Aberrant Self-Promotion (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995) from Machiavellianism (Christie, 1970a). In order to better understand these constructs, an introduction to each will follow.

Aberrant Self-Promotion

Gustafson and Ritzer (1995) define ASPs as individuals who, "like psychopaths, exhibit such characteristics as exploitativeness, entitlement, grandiosity, superficial charm, manipulativeness, need for dominance, lack of empathy, and lack of guilt and who, in addition, violate accepted social norms" (1995, p. 4). They assert that "the difference between the ASP and the psychopath is one of degree, not kind" (1995, p. 4) in that the ASP is a subclinical counterpart of the psychopath. Thus, the aberrant self-promotion construct closely mirrors the description of psychopathy described by Hare (1993). Hare (1993) proposed a two factor view of psychopathy. Factor 1 is described as the emotional and interpersonal side of the construct whereas Factor 2 taps behavioral social deviance (Hare, 1993). Further, applying this model of psychopathy to
organizational life, Babiak (1994) has presented a case study of what he termed the "industrial" psychopath. He warns that industrial psychopaths are exploitative and hurtful of others and, because they seek only personal gain, their counterproductive activities will inevitably lead to negative organizational consequences. As supported by past studies on aberrant self-promotion, Babiak's observations of industrial psychopaths are likely to apply to ASPs as well.

In the initial research on aberrant self-promotion, participants were administered a screening instrument; then, using three analytic techniques (cluster analysis, item factor analysis, and factor analysis of persons), individuals who possessed the hypothesized ASP characteristics were identified. ASPs were identified on the basis of a pattern of personality domains and antisocial behavior (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995).

Participants fitting the pattern and a randomly selected group of controls were then interviewed using the Psychopathy Checklist -Revised (PCL-R) (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995; Holloway, 1994). Targeted ASPs scored significantly higher than comparison participants on the PCL-R but did not meet the overall PCL-R criterion for psychopathy; nor did they exhibit the extreme violent or criminal behaviors often found in psychopaths (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995; Holloway,
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1994).

With respect to personality, a "narcissistic configuration" (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995, p. 6) that emphasizes the positive relation among narcissism, grandiosity, hostility, and self-esteem (Raskin, Novacek, & Hogan, 1991b) and the negative relation between narcissism and social desirability (Watson & Morris, 1991) is the key personality aspect of this pattern. Narcissism includes a lack of empathy, an exploitative nature, and feelings of entitlement (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995).

Paulhus (1989) proposed an impression management social desirability that is marked by appearing friendly or nice only to gain social approval. Gustafson and Ritzer (1995) explain that the narcissistic ASP would not engage to a great extent in impression management social desirability because ASPs already assume that others like or admire them and that they do not need to gain the respect of others. This assumption is consistent with Aabiak's (1994) finding that the subject of his case study allowed himself to be seen as the destructive person he was by coworkers for whom he had no need and finally by superiors who opposed him.

However, the narcissist will impression manage to gain admiration, not approval, from others (Raskin, et al., 1991a), as will the ASP. Leary and Kowalski's (1990)
two-component model for impression management helps to explain this finding further. They state that for one to be motivated to impression manage, three factors must be met to some degree: "goal-relevance of impressions, value of desired goals, and discrepancy between desired and current image" (p. 36). As noted in Babiak's (1994) case study, the industrial psychopath will not impression manage for social desirability if there is nothing to gain from the target, that is, if there is no valued goal. In that study, the subject engaged in socially desirable impression management only long enough to gain favor with higher levels of management. Because of their similarities to psychopaths, ASPs, for the same reason, do not impression manage for social desirability unless there is some goal to be reached.

On the other hand, the ASP may engage in a process similar to what Paulhus (1989) calls self-deception. Paulhus (1989) describes self-deception as impression management that "taps an honest positivistic bias that contributes to good psychological adjustment" (p. 203). In a related vein, Raskin et al. (1991b) define narcissism as a method to regulate self-esteem. Returning to Leary and Kowalski's (1990) two-component model, the narcissist, holding grandiose self-descriptions, will consciously or unconsciously perceive a difference between the real and the
idealized self (Raskin, et al., 1991a). The narcissist is motivated by this discrepancy to engage in a process like self-deceptive impression management. However, it cannot be said that this process "contributes to good psychological adjustment" (Paulhus, 1989, p. 203) in narcissists or in ASPs. Because their idealized self is grandiose and maladaptive, their self-deceptive impression management reflects a maladaptive process.

Therefore, whereas self-deception is healthy for normal populations, in the narcissist it is an overreactive means to regulate self-esteem. Another difference between these processes is that narcissists are motivated to impression manage not only to regulate their self-esteem, but also to dominate and overpower others. The ASP follows this narcissistic model. Thus, we can assume that the ASP engages in what might be called narcissistic impression management.

Leary and Kowalski's two-component model of impression management instructs that we must next focus on the kind of impression the subject wishes to make. According to Raskin, et al. (1991a), the narcissist will use competition and dominance to obtain the desired impression. Leary and Kowalski suggest that the subject motivated to impression manage will consider the values of the target and the
constraints of the role in order to successfully engage in impression management. Therefore, through manipulation, the ASP would be expected to discover the weakness of the target person and to determine how to win admiration or instill fear. However, ASPs will not carefully consider role constraints because they often exaggerate their experiences beyond any realistic interpretation of the situation.

Machiavellianism

Inspired by the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli, such as The Prince, in which Machiavelli advocates that leaders consider the good of the state to be more important than personal values and commitments, Richard Christie (1970a) began to explore a construct he called Machiavellianism. Persons agreeing with the ideas that are presented in works like The Prince and The Discourses are termed Machiavellians. Christie developed a questionnaire to identify Machiavellians, individuals who are able and willing to manipulate others to obtain outcomes they feel are necessary. Subsequent studies have demonstrated that Machiavellians believe, in general, that humans are basically dishonest, selfish, conformist, and lacking in self-control (Christie, 1970b). Correlational studies have shown the construct to be unrelated to intellectual ability, authoritarianism, political preference, need for
achievement, anxiety, and psychopathology (Christie, 1970b). Further, Holloway (1994) suggests that high Machiavellians are skeptical that ideal moral solutions can exist without negative consequences and believe in relative moral standards.

In a summary of the results of much of the early Machiavellian (Mach) literature, Geis and Christie (1970), who used only male subjects, identified three factors that strongly moderated the finding of differences between high and low Machs. These are: face-to-face interaction, latitude for improvisation, and irrelevant affect. These differences are also relevant to the differences between the ASP and Mach constructs.

Face-to-face interaction was defined as "physical confrontation" (Geis & Christie, 1970, p. 286). A study in encounter analysis by Durkin (1970) has suggested that low Machs were emotionally distracted in a social exchange but that high Machs were not so distracted. Other studies (e.g., Geis, Christie, & Nelson, 1970) have suggested that high Machs are better at evaluating social cues than are low Machs.

Latitude for improvisation was defined as a participant's having to choose "both the content and the timing of his responses" (Geis & Christie, 1970). The
response could not be simply a choice of predetermined responses given when asked. Through later research (Durkin, 1970), it was suggested that this factor be limited to cognitive improvisation. A study by Exline, Thibaut, Hicky, and Gumpert (1970) have demonstrated that high Machs exhibited a greater ability than low Machs to make decisions quickly under pressure.

The third factor, irrelevant affect, is defined as the presence of an affective state that could interfere with participant's concentration on the task (Geis & Christie, 1970). Studies supporting this theory suggest that "affect" actually connotes strong opinion (Geis, Weinheimer, & Berger, 1970), concern for others (Christie, 1970a), and perceived seriousness of the situation (Christie & Geis, 1970) rather than an emotional state such as sadness, anger, or happiness. In all of these cases, high Machs were shown to be better than low Machs at ignoring irrelevant affect, the result being that low Machs lost concentration and performed worse than highs.

The Present Study

The present study will focus on demonstrating differences between ASPs, high Mach non-ASPs, and below average Mach non-ASPs (i.e., controls) relative to the three factors moderating the manifestation of Mach behavior.
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Because all three of the factors named above are important in allowing high Machs to demonstrate their prowess in interpersonal manipulation, a situation entailing all three traits must be selected. The Legislature Game by Geis, Weinheimer, and Berger (1970) entails all three factors and thus provides an opportunity to demonstrate differences between ASPs and Machs in a relatively realistic setting. The game entails participants' lobbying for other participants' votes on issues that are important to their political futures. Participants will have face-to-face interaction as they bargain with other players for support on the various issues. There will be a great deal of latitude for participants to improvise as they engage in presenting issues, bargaining with one another, and subsequently voting on "bills." Irrelevant affect is in the form of personal opinions about the bills being proposed.

**Face-to-Face Interaction.** High Machs are more adept than low Machs at impression management (Geis & Christie, 1970). Geis and Christie suggest that "low Machs, but not highs, get caught up and carried away in a social response process which emerges in the action components of face-to-face interaction" (Geis & Christie, 1970, p. 286). High Machs use cues from the situation to tailor their style of impression management to be the most effective. In contrast,
because of the ASPs' high narcissism, they will engage in a
different type of impression management than that which
characterizes the high Mach. The ASP will not pick up on
and adjust to social cues as the high Mach will to gain
favor among the players. Instead, the ASPs will use only
one type of impression management technique:
self-aggrandizement. Although the ASP can demonstrate a
certain charm, this charm is superficial and can easily be
detected (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995; Hare, 1993). Also, ASPs
often get involved in talking about themselves, whereas the
high Mach will not.

**Latitude for Improvisation.** This opportunity will come
mainly in the bargaining for votes that will take place
during the game. Bargaining theory, as explained in Forsyth
(1983), predicts that reward allocations will be as equal as
possible. When working with normal populations, or possibly
with homogeneous groups, this rule would apply. However,
due to the manipulative prowess that both of these groups
demonstrate, it is expected that the bargaining theory will
not be followed. Participants may try to take advantage of
the reciprocative process by volunteering to support a
position which has little cost for them and then asking for
support on a bill that may cost the exchange partner a great
deal. Exline, et al. (1970) report that high Machs are more
resistant than lows to manipulation by others. Because of the ASP's impulsivity and lack of empathy, they will have trouble devising strategies that require understanding others' needs and feelings. Therefore, ASPs may be more prone than Machs to being manipulated, especially by a Mach who "plays" to the ASP's vanity. Moreover, Machiavellians have been shown to be quite good at this process (Geis & Christie, 1970).

Irrelevant Affect. High Machs do much better than lows on ignoring irrelevant affective distractors (Geis & Christie, 1970). They do not allow their emotions or opinions to become involved with the other participants or with the issues that are addressed during the experiments (Geis, 1970; Christie & Geis, 1970; Bogart, et al., 1970). As mentioned before, irrelevant affect in this study will take the form of strong opinions about the topics of legislation. These opinions are expected to be more distractive for the ASPs than for the Machs because ASPs exhibit less behavioral control and are more impulsive.

Although Gustafson and Ritzer (1995) describe the ASP as having shallow affect, like the psychopath, shallow affect in reference to this context is a range of short-lived emotional states largely limited to "primitive responses to immediate needs" (Hare, 1993, p. 53) (i.e.,
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shallow anger, lust, and frustration). Such a definition of short-lived anger and shallow affect does not preclude strong opinions. In fact, due to their grandiosity, ASPs are very likely to hold strong opinions which may be wholly unsupported by outside evidence. In contrast, high Machs will be able to remain unaffected by their opinions on issues where they might have to take an opposing view.

In a recent article, Greenwald and Banaji (1995) have proposed that implicit social cognitions could have a detrimental effect on decision making. They show that automatic activation of inferences including attitudes, biases, and stereotypes often lead to nonoptimal performance when making judgments. Implicit social cognitions of this sort are distracters from the relevant information needed for accurate decision making. In interpersonal exchanges, stereotypes and biases can have a strong distracting effect for the individuals involved. In addition, when dealing with issues that are especially affect-laden, attitudes and opinions may cause an individual to miss important divergent information that is vital to successful performance. These types of processes are said to occur "when an actor (a) notices some aspect of an automatic effect caused by one stimulus and (b) mislabels it in a way that influences the judgment of either that stimulus or some other stimulus"
Aberrant Self-Promotion vs Machiavellianism (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995, p. 6). In light of previous Machiavellian research regarding high-Machs' abilities to disregard irrelevant affect, it is suspected that they are better at inhibiting these implicit processes that can distract from proper decision making.

High Machs are also reported to be more resistant to cognitive dissonance than are low Machs (Bogart, K., Geis, F. L., Levy, M., & Zimbardo, P., 1970). Cooper and Fazio (1984) have suggested conditions that are essential for cognitive dissonance to take place. These are: 1) a feeling of personal responsibility that entails a free choice decision and the foreseeability of outcomes and 2) aversive outcomes as a result of the choice. Machiavellians will discount the amount of freedom present to decide which issues to support. The obvious choices will be those which hold the greatest point values. Also, the aversive consequences will be less aversive to the Machiavellian who is less interested in maintaining an image than in winning the game. Therefore, for Machs, the issue of separating their behaviors in the game from their true beliefs is not likely to arise.

Interpersonal Impression. Because ASPs engage in narcissistic impression management that has as its goal domination and overpowering as well as eliciting admiration
or fear from others, it is expected that ASPs will be viewed less favorably than Machs or controls by other players. They will be perceived as less likeable, less respected, and less trustworthy than other players on measures of interpersonal affect.

Decrement of Performance over Time. In so far as ASPs show similarities to psychopaths, they will exhibit a need for stimulation, proneness to boredom, intolerance of frustration, failure to assess long-term consequences, failure to accept responsibility for their own actions, and poor behavioral controls. Given ASPs' inability to maintain diligence on the task, high Machs will be likely to outperform ASPs in the second trial of the game. In addition, ASPs will show a decrement in second trial performance because they fail to understand that continued effort in the game would likely result in positive outcomes. Moreover, ASPs will not learn from the mistakes made in previous trials because they will attribute these errors to other players' behavior, rather than their own. Finally, even if the appropriate attributions were made, ASPs would still lack the behavioral control to correct these mistakes in the second trial.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. High Machs will be more successful than ASPs
in the Legislature Game in the irrelevant affect condition, across games.

**Hypothesis 2.** High Machs will be more successful than ASPs in the Legislature Game in the second trials regardless of condition.

**Hypothesis 3.** ASPs will be rated less favorably overall by Machs and controls than these participants will rate one another.

**Exploratory Hypothesis.** On the likability measure, ratings of ASPs will change more from game 1 to game 2 (in a negative direction) than will the ratings of high-Machs or control subjects.

**Method**

**Subjects**

The initial 438 participants in the study came from a pool of undergraduate psychology students completing the 180 item instrument used by Gustafson and Ritzer (1995) and Holloway (1994). The Mach IV was added to the item pool as in the Holloway (1994) study. The Wonderlic Personnel Test (WPT; Wonderlic, 1983) was also administered so that cognitive ability could be used as a covariate in the analyses of the results of the games.

From this screening sample of 438 participants, 70 subjects were selected to participate in the game phase of
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the study. Ten complete games, with seven players per game, were conducted. These groups were composed of two ASPs, two Machs, and three comparison subjects. The selection of these subjects is described in the following sections.

Selection of ASPs. ASPs were selected on the basis of exhibition of the pattern described by Gustafson and Ritzer (1995). The Ward's agglomerative clustering method, using the squared Euclidian distance measure, was used to group individuals into homogeneous clusters. A nine cluster solution was selected based on the improvement of this solution over the eight cluster solution. The eight cluster solution produced a sizable increase in error sums of squares, a decrease in the explained variance, and increases in the homogeneity coefficients for the eight clusters. Previous studies (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995) have found eight and ten cluster solutions using these scales. A graphical depiction of the cluster solution can be seen in Figure 1.

__________________________

Insert Figure 1 about here.

__________________________

Two groups of interest emerged from the analysis:
Cluster D (n = 20) could described as a "strong ASP" cluster and Cluster C (n = 57) could be described as a "weak ASP" cluster. Previous research (Gustafson and Ritzer, 1995) had
also found ASPs divided into an extreme and moderate group. However, in the previous study, both groups were found to possess psychopathic traits and behaviors (as measured by the PCL-R), as compared with non-ASPss. Therefore, ASP subjects were chosen first from Cluster D and then from C. Seventeen participants were chosen from Cluster D and three from Cluster C.

**Selection of Machs.** High Machs were also selected from the pool of participants taking the screening instrument. High-Machs were selected in a top-down process excluding those who were grouped into Clusters C and D. All players selected for this group scored over one-half of one standard deviation above the mean for the Mach IV and did not fit the ASP pattern. Twenty participants meeting the criterion for inclusion as a high Mach were thus identified.

**Selection of comparisons.** Thirty participants who neither exhibited the ASP pattern nor fulfilled the criterion for high Machiavellianism were also be selected as comparisons. These comparisons were first selected from clusters with a flat pattern (e.g., Cluster I, \( n = 47 \)) and then from a cluster with a pattern opposite that of the ASPs (e.g., Cluster A, \( n = 82 \)).

**Player differences.** At the completion of the study, the patterns of the 70 participants chosen to play the game
were reclustered. Players were clustered using the same methods as before with scores on the MACH IV added as a fifth indicator. This reclustering yielded a three cluster solution with almost every player being clustered back into his or her original classification. Cluster A (n = 30), which demonstrated a pattern nearly opposite the ASP pattern and low MACH IV scores, contained the 30 comparison players. Cluster B (n = 18), which conformed to the hypothesized ASP pattern, contained 18 players including almost all of the ASPs. Finally, Cluster C (n = 22) contained all of the Machs and two ASPs with very high scores on the MACH IV as well as less extreme patterns on the other indicators of aberrant self-promotion. The Mach pattern was nearly flat with the exceptions of high MACH IV scores and low narcissism scores. These results are presented graphically in Figure 2.

The means and standard deviations for the indicators for the entire sample and for the original classification (that used when selecting players and in later analyses) are shown in Table 1. Judging from Figure 2 and the means reported in Table 1, it is apparent that ASPs often score high on the MACH IV. In fact, 13 ASPs scored above one standard deviation on the MACH IV. However, the range for ASPs' MACH IV scores was more extreme (51 to 78) than that
of the players selected as high-Machs (60 to 77).

Finally, discriminant analyses were performed to further demonstrate and describe the differences between groups. Three analyses comparing each subgroup to the remainder of the interpretive sample were performed and yielded significant discrimination functions (p<.05, for each). The discriminant loadings that describe each group are included in Table 1.

__________________________________________________________________________________

Insert Figure 2 and Table 1 about here.

__________________________________________________________________________________

Procedure

The procedures involved in this study were essentially a replication of the study by Geis, Weinheimer, and Berger (1970) with only the screening of participants added to fit the present hypotheses. Experimental groups were made up of seven subjects each, all of the same sex. Six all-female and four all-male groups were used. Based on pilot work and the very limited number of ASPs available, a composition including two ASPs, two Machs, and three non-Mach non-ASPs was used.

All sessions were videotaped so that they could be scored by raters for purposes of assessing differences in individuals' reactions to players. Videotaping was necessary due to the size of the group. These tapes served primarily
as a line of defense against lost data and to make corrections for mis-scoring. They were not used for this study.

Participants were informally seated in a classroom with the experimenter. As participants arrived, they were first asked to fill out a questionnaire regarding their opinions on the issues to be used in each condition. This questionnaire served as a manipulation check to ascertain that the non-emotional issues actually elicited less emotion than the emotion-laden issues. The manipulation check on opinions can be seen in Appendix A. After the questionnaire was completed, instructions were read to the group. Instructions are included in Appendix B. Participants' questions were then answered and each was given his or her constituency's wishes for the first game.

Each player's constituency had a position on five of seven issues. Two of these positions had high value to the player - 50,000 votes for the player if the group passed an issue supported by the player and 50,000 votes if the group defeated an issue not supported by the player. Two issues had moderate value for the player - 30,000 votes each for the group's passage or defeat of an issue. The fifth issue was an item of lower value - 20,000 for the passage of a "pork barrel" item. Each participant received a sheet
containing the positions of the constituency on all five issues and their value. Players were also asked to wear a tag identifying them as the representative of one of the seven states used in this study.

Players were given no information about the distribution of issues among the group. However, for each issue, four players held positions. Two players held the issue in high value (one opposing and one supporting), and two players held the issue in moderate value (again, one opposing and one supporting). The remaining three players held no position on the issue. For the purposes of this game, they were considered uncommitted. Effective bargaining and manipulation entailed the players' finding those who were uncommitted on the issue and eliciting their support.

A different constituency was designated for each of the seven players. A constituency was defined as a set of issue positions. The specific issues assigned to a player were determined by his or her state designation (Iowa, Oregon, Montana, North Dakota, Missouri, Utah, Kansas). These designations were randomly assigned. Each player was assigned the constituency corresponding to his or her state designation. These designations were randomly assigned to players. The assignment of issues and payoffs to
constituencies can be seen in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about Here.

Table 2 shows that for each of the contested issues, there were three uncommitted players. For each player of the seven players in the game, two other players were uncommitted on three of his or her four items with constituency value. Two other players were uncommitted on two of these issues. The remaining two were uncommitted on one issue each. Thus, no matter which of the other players was approached for negotiation, the pair could agree to trade support on at least one issue, in addition to their pork barrel items.

The issues and values were assigned the same way in the neutral condition. The seven contested issues in the neutral condition are shown in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here.

After players received their constituency assignments, they were each allowed to make a 30 second statement to the group, if they wished. After all players had a chance to speak, the group recessed for a ten minute bargaining
session. This was the player's opportunity to find those who were uncommitted on his or her issues and trade his or her support for one of their issues. In this session, players were allowed to roam freely and speak to whomever they could in the allotted time. Monitoring and enforcement of the agreements made in the game was left entirely to the players.

After the ten minute bargaining session, the group reconvened, and each player was called upon to propose a bill for voting. When a player proposed a bill, he or she was allowed 15 seconds to argue his or her position. Then, one 15 second argument in rebuttal was allowed, and a vote was taken. No abstentions were allowed. Voting was by a show of hands so that all players could see how each of the others voted. Decision to pass or defeat an issue was determined by a simple majority vote. This procedure was repeated until all of the issues had been voted on by the group. Votes and scores were maintained by two trained observers. A session usually lasted between 20 and 30 minutes. After all bills for the first session had been voted on, the constituencies for the second session were distributed, and the process was repeated. In half of the trials, the emotional issues were used in the first session and the neutral issues in the second. In the other half of
the trials, the order of sessions was reversed.

After each session, players were given a brief manipulation check (see Appendices C and D) regarding the extent to which they understood the value of each issue in terms of their winning the game. They were also given a measure of interpersonal affect (liking) to assess their feelings toward each of the other players.

Measures

Three additional measures were taken. The manipulation check to assure the difference in affect conditions was adapted from that used in the original Geis, et al. (1970) study and is shown in Appendix C. The scale used to assess liking was adopted from the interpersonal affect measure described by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, and Snoek (1964). An alpha reliability of .78 among peers had been reported for the liking measure by Tsui in 1986. A copy of this three-item likability scale is presented in Appendix E. The Wonderlic Personnel Test (Wonderlic, 1983) was given to participants during the initial targeting stage. Dodrill (1981) found that scores on the WPT strongly correlated (.93) with the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale Full-Scale IQ and that the test-retest reliability of the WPT was .94 (Dodrill, 1983). Wonderlic (1983) reports that the split-half reliability measure of internal consistency ranges from .88 to .94.
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Results

Manipulation Checks. The manipulation check on the degree of affect generated by the issues in each condition was scored by collapsing over agreement and disagreement. Specifically, strong agreement, as well as strong disagreement, was scored as 3. Moderate agreement or disagreement was scored as 2 and neutral affect was a 1. These scores were averaged for each set of issues and over the entire questionnaire.

Finally, these scores were analyzed using a repeated measures ANOVA. Affect condition served as the within-subject factor and the three personality groups was the between-subjects factor. Significant main effects were found for affect (laden vs. neutral; $F(1,59) = 772.89, p < .05$), but not for personality ($F(2,59) = 2.22, p > .05$). Nor was the personality by affect interaction significant ($F(2,59) = .118, p > .05$). The means and standard deviations of affect-laden and affect-neutral issues overall and by personality group can be seen in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here.

Moreover, using a paired comparisons $t$ test, the magnitude of agreement/disagreement for the affect-laden
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issues (M = 2.7959) was shown to be significantly greater
than that generated by the affect-neutral issues (M =
1.5837, t(34) = 22.4, p < .05). The results from the ANOVA
for the personality main effect and interaction demonstrated
that there were no significant differences between ASPs and
Machs in how these issues generated affect. Six subjects
did not complete the manipulation check questionnaire.

The check on all participants' level of understanding
regarding the importance of the issues was examined by
looking at the correlations between the rated importance of
that issue to winning the game and the number of votes
gained for the issue. All of these correlations, depicted
in Table 5, were significant at the p < .05 level. Although
all correlations were significant, some of them were rather
modest because several participants rated issues on which
they had traded support as important, in addition to the
high ratings given to those issues which had a value to
them. Therefore, it is safe to assume that players
understood not only the values assigned to their issues but
also the value of trading support on issues.

Insert Table 5 about here.

EXACON (Bergman & El-Khoury, 1987) was used to perform
exact cellwise analyses on the representation of personality type in constituency. EXACON produces a contingency table for two categorical variables and analyzes it with a focus on cell-wise analysis of types (over-representations) or antitypes (under-representations) based on exact tests (Bergman & El-Khoury, 1995). The hypergeometric probability is the most often used statistic comparing the observed and expected representations within each cell. Bergman and El-Khoury (1987) explain that it is assumed under the null hypothesis that each cell constitutes an independent trial of a Bernoulli experiment. However, if the contingency table is large and the tests are conducted at a .05 alpha level, Bergman and El-Khoury (1987) suggest that the results be corrected for the possibility of Type I error. Therefore, in the following results the Bonferroni correction was used and these values were considered significant if they were less than .05 divided by the number of tests (e.g., .05/21).

The results of the EXACON analysis revealed that none of the personality types were significantly over- or under-represented by any of the constituencies. Results from this analysis can be seen in Table 6. EXACON also calculates the overall Chi-square for the contingency table, which in this case was nonsignificant, thus reflecting
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independence ($X^2 = 17.9667, p > .05$).

---

Insert Table 6 about here.

---

Another EXACON was conducted to test the effect of constituency assignment on wins and losses in the affect-laden condition. The assignment of issues to state was constant throughout the game and could have caused an advantage to one set of issues over another. Only the affect-laden condition was examined because it is the only condition relevant to the hypotheses. The EXACON results yielded non-significant Chi-square values for each cell and an overall nonsignificant Chi-square ($X^2 = 9.4540, p > .05$). The hyper geometric probabilities are displayed in Table 7.

---

Insert Table 7 about here.

---

Finally, the effects of gender interacting with personality type were examined using EXACON to see if these factors affected outcome in the affect-laden condition. None of these analyses produced significant types or antitypes with respect to winners versus losers. For male versus female ASPs, the hypergeometric probability for wins/losses was .3439. The same comparison for Machs
yielded a probability of .6084. (For a 2 x 2 table, Fisher's exact test yields the same probability for all four cells, Bergman & El-Khoury, 1987.) These results were in accord with previous findings that had shown no gender differences within each of these personality types (ASP: Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995; Machiavellianism: Wilson, Near, & Miller, 1996).

In summary, no differential effects for assignment of subjects to constituencies, wins by constituency, or wins by gender within personality were found. Thus, subjects will be treated independently in subsequent analyses and analyses were conducted at the individual, rather than the group, level.

Tests of Hypotheses. A repeated measures ANOVA, using scores on the Wonderlic as a covariate, was conducted with game results (scores) as the dependent variable to test for Hypotheses 1 and 2. Affect (neutral or laden) was used as the within-subjects factor; personality (ASP or Mach) and order of presentation (neutral- or affect-laden first) were used as the between-subjects factors. The covariate was found not to have a significant effect on scores (β = -.01896, t = -.153, p > .05). The analysis revealed no within-subjects main effects for affect (F(1,36) = .5, p > .05), for personality (F(1,35) = 1.31, p > .05), or for
order ($F(1,35) = .11, \ p > .05$).

In addition, no significant interactions were found. These interaction values were as follows: order by personality $F(1,35) = .29$, order by affect $F(1,36) = 1.34$, personality by affect $F(1,36) = 1.83$, and order by personality by affect $F(1,36) = 2.39$. However, the hypothesized interactions of order by personality and affect by personality approached significance more closely than did other effects. Therefore, these effects are presented graphically in Figures 3 and 4. In addition, the means and standard deviations are reported in Table 8.

Insert Table 8 and Figures 3 and 4 about here.

Because the strongest effects were those hypothesized and because of the low power of these tests, post hoc repeated measures ANOVAs were performed to explore the effects of affect and order, individually. The first analysis used game scores as the dependent variable, affect condition as the within-subjects factor and personality as the between-subjects factor. The ANOVA using affect alone as the within-subjects variable yielded no main effects ($F(1,38) = .48, \ p > .05$). Nor was the personality by affect interaction significant ($F(1,38) = 1.75, \ p > .05$). The
second ANOVA used order as the only within-subjects factor and personality as the between-subjects factor. Similarly, this ANOVA did not show a significant main effect ($F(1,38) = 1.33, p > .05$), nor did the interaction of order with personality ($F(1,37) = 2.37, p > .05$). In fact, the trends for this effect were in the opposite direction from that hypothesized. Therefore, hypotheses one and two were not supported by these post hoc analyses nor were they supported by the omnibus test which included all three factors simultaneously.

The third hypothesis, as well as the exploratory hypothesis, was tested using the same repeated measures ANOVA, with likability ratings aggregated for each player within a single condition. As can be seen in Appendix E, items on the interpersonal affect scale range from "a very great extent" (coded as 1) to "not at all" (coded as 5). Scores were aggregated across the three items into a total score ranging from 3 (very positive liking) to 15 (no liking at all). (Obviously, because of the wording of the questions, no score indicates dislike.) Next, the six ratings (one from each of the other players) of a single player were aggregated within a session. These total scores provided the within-subjects factor; personality provided the between-subjects factor. As hypothesized, the main
effect on likability due to ASPs versus non-ASPs was significant ($F(61,1) = 6.0886, p < .05$). This finding supported the hypothesis that ASPs were seen by others as less helpful, less respectful, and less generally likable than others.

The interaction between group membership and trial order was examined to test for the exploratory hypothesis that ratings for ASPs would significantly decrease in the second session. The personality by session interaction was significant ($F(61,1) = 4.0692, p < .05$). This effect was produced by a decrease in affect scores for non-ASPs (Machs and comparisons) from 6.32 in the first session to 5.533 in the second, with a possible range of 3 to 15. In this scale, lower scores reflected more liking. This decrease is contrasted with the ASPs' stable scores with 6.48 in the first session and 6.40 in the second. Although this result does not directly support the exploratory hypothesis, it does provide indirect support, in that liking of the ASP did not increase significantly whereas liking of the other players did.

Discussion

This study sought to differentiate the aberrant self-promotion construct (Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995) from the Machiavellianism construct (Christie, 1970b). Although no
group received ratings of dislike, the findings from the interpersonal measures were supportive of an overall bias against ASPs. This difference was driven by the increase in likability ratings between the first and second sessions for Machs and comparisons.

In the first session, likability ratings were relatively positive and very similar for ASPs (M = 6.48) and non-ASPs (Machs, M = 6.511 and comparisons, M = 6.187). Apparently, the ASPs' superficial charm caused initially prevented them from being disliked. However, this initial similarity became a significant difference when ASPs were given a chance to behave characteristically for an extended period of time.

At the end of the second session the non-ASPs were significantly more liked than the ASPs. Liking means for these groups in the second session were: ASPs, 6.4; Machs, 5.511; and comparisons, 5.55 (N.B., lower ratings reflect more liking). The stability in ASPs' ratings might well have been due to contrast effects experienced by participants, whose liking for one another increased as the game progressed but whose feelings toward ASPs remained stable. However, it is important to note that the ratings of all groups over all sessions are below the midpoint and equivalent to "a considerable extent" of liking.
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Considering the well known effect of familiarity on liking (Zajonc, in Schneider, 1988), it was, perhaps, natural for interpersonal ratings to become more positive in the second session. However, the stability in players' ratings on ASPs does not reflect a possible familiarity effect. Thus, ASPs can be characterized as aberrant with respect to likability.

The differences in standard deviations between sessions was a particularly interesting occurrence. ASPs' ratings in the first session included more variance (SD = 1.2) than in the second session (SD = .87). In contrast, ratings of non-ASP players displayed an opposite trend (Machs, .94 to 1.26 and comparisons, .69 to 1.15). This result suggests that there was more disagreement among the players in ASPs' ratings in the first session than in the second. Conversely, players agreed more on non-ASP in the first session. This pattern may be attributed to ASPs' differential treatment of players due to ASPs' perceptions of different players' utility in the first session. If non-ASP players remembered maltreatment from ASPs in the first session and used this memory to make ratings in the second session, their ratings showed agreement with those of other non-ASP players who were maltreated by ASPs in the second session. Thus, the overall variance was observed to
decrease in ratings gathered at the end of the second session.

As expected, the ASPs' narcissistic impression management seemed to cause them to engage in impression management for the express purposes of gaining admiration from and dominating others. However, this behavior was not effective in gaining the respect and liking of the other players, compared with the ratings given to Machs and comparisons. As opposed to self-deceptive impression management, which can be an adaptive mechanism (Paulhus, 1989), narcissistic impression management, as demonstrated in this study by the ASP, is neither useful in building relationships nor effective in gaining favor from others.

This finding was not surprising considering the previous documentation of differences between Machs and ASPs using Psychopathy Checklist-Revised interview scores (Holloway, 1994). The present research adds to the differential validity information concerning ASPs by demonstrating a salient interpersonal component to the construct that is manifest in interactions with others.

Anecdotal evidence from watching the games supports and illuminates the factors influencing this finding. Although ASPs frequently won the initial support of others through
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their outward confidence and superficial charm, they often reneged on deals made with other players. Additionally, deals made by ASPs often demanded more concessions from others than they themselves made. Naturally, other players' reactions to this behavior would be manifested in their interpersonal ratings.

For example, one ASP actually bargained with the experimenter for more compensation, by asking for ten dollars of compensation instead of the agreed upon five dollars. Further, ASPs were often late to or missed multiple sessions. In addition, several ASPs were "lost" between the two phases of the study because their phones were disconnected or they never showed up for games.

The results from the outcomes of the Legislature Games did not support the hypothesized differences between Machs and ASPs. However, there are several issues to consider with respect to this lack of support. First, acceptance of the null hypothesis of no differences between aberrant self-promotion and Machiavellianism should be accepted advisedly. A conclusion of no differences seems unlikely considering the contrasts in interpersonal ratings and behaviors exhibited by ASPs and Machs in the games. Further, the trends exhibited in the data suggest that other conclusions might legitimately be considered.
One of these considerations is that the game manipulation was not strong enough to elicit the hypothesized effects. However, this explanation also seems unlikely with regard to the manipulation of affect. The affect manipulation check demonstrated significant differences in the affect generated by the affect-laden versus the affect-neutral issues in the game. Further, the manipulation check on the score values attributed to issues reflected a clear understanding by the players of the contingencies involved in winning the game. Finally, the trend for the affect data shows divergence between ASPs and Machs in the hypothesized direction.

Perhaps, a better explanation regarding the null finding for the prediction of greater scores by Machiavellians versus ASPs in the affect-laden condition is the low power of the study caused by the small number of subjects in each condition. The results of power analyses on the omnibus ANOVA, with order and personality as between factors and affect as the within factor, are shown in Table 9. These low values are evidence of the difficulty in rejecting the null hypothesis when true differences do exist. True effects could not have been detected more than 50% of the time; most had less than a 20% probability of being observed.
The trend of differences is evident from the graph of affect effects by personality (Figure 3). The graph depicts similarities in scores in the neutral condition but clear divergence in the affect-laden condition. If the study had included more participants, this trend would, in all likelihood, have been significant. Unfortunately, the low occurrence of aberrant self-promoters in the undergraduate population, compounded by difficulties in convincing participants to return to play the game, made gaining a larger sample problematic. Future research should use greater incentives to reduce the attrition rate.

Conversely, the hypothesis regarding order effects must be rejected. The significant differences observed for this effect were the reverse of that hypothesized. It is both interesting and confusing that ASP performance in the game actually increased in the second session. Possibly, ASPs found the game interesting because it was an opportunity to manipulate, deceive, and dominate others. The ASPs' prolonged interest in the game for these reasons was a stronger effect than their proneness to boredom, which was
the basis of this prediction. Although a measure of interest was not taken after each session, anecdotal evidence would tend to support such an explanation, in that ASPs were more likely than others to wait for the winner of the game to be announced.

Despite the trend shown in Figure 4, ASPs have been shown to be stimulation seekers with a high proneness to boredom (Holloway, 1994). This characteristic may have been demonstrated had the study lasted for a longer time. However, Figure 4 presents evidence that Machs and comparisons were actually the ones who experienced a decrement in performance in second sessions. Therefore, it seems that ASPs' level of interest in the game was greater than that of Machs and comparisons in addition to being high enough to overcome their proneness to boredom. This differential interest, perhaps due to the ASPs' enjoyment of manipulating others, is enlightening considering that it may have some value in exploring which organizations and situations ASPs may choose to join. As Babiak (1994) mentions, industrial psychopaths and, by extension, ASPs, seek out fast-paced organizations and, oftentimes, those undergoing major organizational restructuring. Additionally, concerning future research in this area, the order effects found here imply that another task would be
better at demonstrating ASPs' proneness to boredom.

Given the results of the present study, the conclusion that Machiavellianism and aberrant self-promotion are separable constructs is based exclusively on the differences in interpersonal affect measures. However, such a finding is not inconsequential. First, it is interesting that there are differences in two constructs characterized by manipulative behaviors. Second, it is noteworthy that the Machiavellian can manipulate while maintaining, and possibly even improving, positive affect with others. One important factor contributing to this finding is, perhaps, the absence of narcissism in the Mach. Because ASPs use narcissistic impression management rather than the traditional impression management employed by Machs and others, they do not improve relations with those with whom they have bargained. This finding supports Christie's (1970a) characterization of the Mach as a cool manipulator who is able to inhibit interpersonal distractors and manipulate people without regard to the dominance and intimidation of others.

Another important variable relevant to this difference might be the ASPs' lack of empathy. Because Machs can empathize with those being manipulated, they will be less offensive and thus more successful than ASPs. In addition, the ASPs' tendencies toward antisocial behavior (e.g.,
reneging on deals and demanding greater concessions from other players) were elicited by the game and were viewed with disapproval by the other players.

The conclusion of the present study is that there are salient differences between the manipulative tactics of ASPs and Machs. Aberrant self-promoters might be analogous to "cons" who, after they have swindled their victim, return to flaunt their gain or even to try their ploy again. In contrast, Machs might be more likely either to cut an even deal or at least to make a deal in which they would not appear to be conning their victim.

All other things being equal, one might argue that this distinction makes the Mach more dangerous than the ASP. Fortunately, however, Machs do not exhibit the same antisocial and self-serving tendencies as ASPs, as demonstrated by Holloway's (1994) finding that Machiavellians scored significantly lower than ASPs on psychopathy. The Machs' lower scores could be attributed to their more reserved use of manipulative and destructive tactics, compared to those exhibited by aberrant self-promoters.

Future research in this area might focus on the interpersonal dimensions of aberrant self-promotion. The idea of narcissistic impression management was introduced
here and appeared to play an integral role in the finding of differences in likability ratings between ASPs and Machs. Additional research might investigate the breakdown of the ASPs' superficial charm and the subsequent discovery of an unethical and malicious individual. The situational variables that might moderate such an unveiling would certainly be of interest to organizations and would be useful to include in role playing scenarios used for selection and promotion decisions.

It seems reasonable that organizational life would be negatively affected by the presence of an aberrant self-promoter just as it is by the presence of a psychopath (Babiak, 1994). In contrast, because the Machiavellian does not exhibit such narcissistic and antisocial tendencies as the ASP it is also reasonable to suggest that he or she would be less likely to engage in organizationally destructive behavior. Therefore, Machiavellians who are committed to organizational goals and rewarded for their accomplishments might be an organizational asset.
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Figure 1: Graph of Personality Patterns of the Nine Clusters

Note. All scores have been standardized. Cluster sizes were as follows: A $n=82$, B $n=47$, C $n=57$, D $n=20$, E $n=45$, F $n=55$, G $n=48$, H $n=85$, I $n=47$. 
Figure 2: Graph of Players’ Patterns

Note. All scores have been standardized. Cluster sizes were as follows: ASPs $n=18$, Machs $n=22$, and Comparisons $n=30$. 
Figure 3: Graph of Affect Session Scores by Personality

Note. Group sizes were as follows: ASP \( n=20 \), Mach \( n=20 \), and Comparison \( n=30 \).
Figure 4: Effects by Order by Personality

Note. Group sizes were as follows: ASP n=20, Mach n=20, and Comparison n=30.
Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Discriminant Loadings for Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>DES</th>
<th>SRP</th>
<th>NPI</th>
<th>MACH IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Players</td>
<td>31.35 (6.94)</td>
<td>3.43 (1.65)</td>
<td>190.42 (26.88)</td>
<td>19.04 (8.14)</td>
<td>60.90 (8.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPs</td>
<td>24.2 (4.63)</td>
<td>2.5 (-.65)</td>
<td>215.55 (21.39)</td>
<td>27.6 (.557)</td>
<td>53.54 (.337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machs</td>
<td>30.45 (5.18)</td>
<td>3.4 (-.128)</td>
<td>190.65 (16.21)</td>
<td>16.2 (.088)</td>
<td>65.65 (-.380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>36.9 (3.922)</td>
<td>4.10 (.735)</td>
<td>170.86 (20.26)</td>
<td>15.1 (-.595)</td>
<td>53.5357 (-.791)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CPI - CPI Socialization scale.
DES - Social Desirability Scale.
SRP - Self-Report Psychopathy
NPI - Narcissistic Personality Inventory

Note. Standard Deviations are in parentheses.

Note. Discriminant function loadings are in brackets. If the loading is positive, the subgroup mean was higher than the mean of the remaining sample on that indicator. If the loading is negative, the subgroup mean was lower than the mean of the remaining sample.
Table 2: Assignment of Issues and Payoff Positions for the Affect Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bills before Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revoke previous affirmative action legislation, and pass no more of it</td>
<td>Hi-</td>
<td>Hi+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lo-</td>
<td>Lo+</td>
<td>Hi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US will implement universal health care coverage supported by higher income taxes</td>
<td>Hi-</td>
<td>Hi+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lo-</td>
<td>Lo+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolish the minimum age requirement for driver's license</td>
<td>Lo+</td>
<td>Hi-</td>
<td>Hi+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose a constitutional amendment outlawing abortion</td>
<td>Lo-</td>
<td>Lo+</td>
<td>Hi-</td>
<td>Hi+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise the minimum drinking age to 25 years of age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lo-</td>
<td>Lo+</td>
<td>Hi-</td>
<td>Hi+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish universal, compulsory military conscription for both sexes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lo-</td>
<td>Lo+</td>
<td>Hi-</td>
<td>Hi+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise the minimum voting age to 25 years of age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lo-</td>
<td>Lo+</td>
<td>Hi-</td>
<td>Hi+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven different pork barrel issues</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>P7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Each subject is assigned one of the seven constituencies listed.

Note. "Hi+" indicates that the player will receive 50,000 votes from the constituency if the issue passes the group. "Hi-" indicates that the player will receive 50,000 votes if the issue is defeated. "Lo+" and "Lo-" indicate that the player will receive 30,000 votes if the issue is passed or defeated the group, respectively. Each constituency has a position on four of the bill and no position on three of them. The pork barrel items are worth 20,000 votes if passed.
Table 3: **Issues used in the Neutral Affect Condition**

1. Approve the appointment of the newly selected ambassador to Guatemala.

2. Issue a new postage stamp.

3. Change the reporting procedure for reporting committee actions.

4. Change fiscal deadlines from the 10th to the 15th of the month.

5. Change the specifications for sewer pipes.

6. Relocate the National Bureau of Standards.

7. Approve the proposed set of job descriptions for civil service employees.

---

**Note.** These issues will be replaced for the first seven issues listed in Table 1 for the neutral affect session.
Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations of Affect Generated by Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affect-Laden</th>
<th>Affect-Neutral</th>
<th>All Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>2.8134 (.2095)</td>
<td>1.6198 (.2797)</td>
<td>2.2166 (.1838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPs</td>
<td>2.7731 (.2318)</td>
<td>1.5042 (.2028)</td>
<td>2.1381 (.1626)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machs</td>
<td>2.8175 (.2009)</td>
<td>1.6587 (.2599)</td>
<td>2.2381 (.1550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>2.8360 (.2047)</td>
<td>1.6667 (.4194)</td>
<td>2.2513 (.2043)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Standard deviations are in parentheses.
Table 5: Correlations of Ratings of Importance by Value of Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laden</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Issue numbers refer to the two previous tables.
Table 6: EXACON Results: Representation of Personality by Constituency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>ASP</th>
<th>Mach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>.3036</td>
<td>.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>.3036</td>
<td>.5907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>.0259</td>
<td>.4093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>.5907</td>
<td>.5907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>.4093</td>
<td>.1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>.4093</td>
<td>.1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>.1095</td>
<td>.4093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** All values are hyper geometric probabilities comparing the observed and expected probabilities. **Note.** None of the values are significant.
Table 7: **EXACON Results: Wins/Losses by Constituency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>.2274</td>
<td>.2274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>.1315</td>
<td>.1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>.4537</td>
<td>.4537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>.1315</td>
<td>.1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>.5463</td>
<td>.5463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>.0607</td>
<td>.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>.5463</td>
<td>.5463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** All values are hyper geometric probabilities comparing the observed and expected probabilities.  
**Note.** None of the values are significant.
Table 8: Means and Standard Deviations of Game Results by Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affect-Laden</th>
<th>Affect-Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All players</td>
<td>100285.714</td>
<td>100857.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40143.6345)</td>
<td>(45579.7710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPs</td>
<td>95500</td>
<td>100500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42977.9625)</td>
<td>(47995.5715)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machs</td>
<td>119500</td>
<td>103500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35463.1017)</td>
<td>(47047.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>90666.6667</td>
<td>99333.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37868.496)</td>
<td>(44484.2733)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Standard deviations are in parentheses.
### Table 9: Results from Power Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order by Personality</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order by Affect</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality by Affect</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order by Personality by Affect</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Manipulation Check for Emotional Value of Issues

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following issues:

1) Establish universal compulsory military conscription for both sexes.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

2) Relocate the National Bureau of Standards.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

3) Propose a Constitutional amendment outlawing abortion.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

4) Raise the minimum voting age to 25 years.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

5) Approve the appointment of the newly selected ambassador to Guatemala.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree
6) Abolish the minimum age requirement for driver's license.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

7) The US will implement universal health care coverage supported by higher income taxes.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

8) Raise the drinking age to 25 years of age.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

9) Issue a new postage stamp.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

10) Change the reporting procedure for reporting committee actions.
    a. strongly agree
    b. moderately agree
    c. neutral
    d. moderately disagree
    e. strongly disagree
11) Change the specifications for sewer pipes.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

12) Approve the proposed set of job descriptions for civil service employees.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

13) Revoke previous Affirmative Action legislation and pass no more of it.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree

14) Change fiscal deadlines from the 10th to the 15th of the month.
   a. strongly agree
   b. moderately agree
   c. neutral
   d. moderately disagree
   e. strongly disagree
Appendix B: Player Instructions

This is a study of the interpersonal aspects of the legislative process. Specifically, we are interested in studying (1) how a representative responds to his constituency and (2) in particular, the bargaining process that occurs among the representatives themselves. Your behavior will be evaluated by how successful you are as a representative. You will be asked to play a game called Legislature which is designed to simulate the actual legislative process. Each of you will play the part of a representative. It is important to follow carefully all instructions given you. As you know, procedural rules are important in debate in actual legislatures. Here are the rules of the game.

Imagine that you are a newly elected representative. Your goal in the game is to keep getting yourself elected by the biggest margin of votes you can obtain. Each of you wants to be your party's next candidate for president. According to the rules of this game, the representative who manages to win the most votes from his or her constituency will be the party's next presidential candidate. The people back home, your constituents, will decide whether or not to vote for you depending on whether or not you succeed in getting certain issues passed or defeated in Congress.

To begin the game, each of you will be given a sheet which will state your constituency's position on five issues. Each card will also tell you the net number of votes you will get from your constituency if you succeed in getting Congress to act on the issue in accord with their wishes. You will note that sometimes your constituents want bills passed and sometimes they want bills defeated. If you succeed in getting Congress to adopt the position stated on your sheet, you will automatically receive the number of votes listed on the sheet.

After you have received the sheet reporting your constituency's wishes, each of you, if you wish, will have a chance to make a 30 second statement to address your fellow representatives. You may use this opportunity to make whatever remarks seem to you to be most likely to help win votes from the other representatives, or you may decide to make no statement at all. When these opening remarks have been completed, Congress will adjourn for 10 minutes. This is your opportunity to make contacts with your fellow representatives and to bargain with them for votes. During this open bargaining period, you will be free to circulate around the room engaging in whatever activities seem most advantageous to you.
After the bargaining period, Congress will reconvene. Then you will all vote on the issues as they are brought up. The experimenter will call on one representative at a time. That representative will name an issue that has not yet been voted on. Then, if he or she wishes, will have 15 seconds to urge Congress to vote his or her way. In addition, one speaker for the opposite point of view will be recognized and have 15 seconds to argue for the opposing view. Then, all of you will vote on the issue. Voting will be by a show of hands. Unlike real legislators, however, everyone must vote on every issue.

In all, we will hold two complete sessions. Your performance in the game will be evaluated by the number of votes you get from your constituency. Remember, your goal in the game is to get as many votes from your constituency as possible - in each session and over both of the sessions. At the end of the second session, your total votes will be added. The representative with the greatest number of votes wins the presidential nomination. If you have any questions, be sure to ask them now. Once the game has begun, no questions, other than those dealing strictly with procedure, will be permitted.
Appendix C: Manipulation Check for Irrelevant Affect Condition
To what extent was this issue important to your winning the game:

1) Revoke previous Affirmative Action legislation and pass no more of it.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

2) The US will implement universal health care coverage supported by higher income taxes.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

3) Abolish the minimum age requirement for driver's license.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

4) Propose a Constitutional amendment outlawing abortion.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

5) Raise the drinking age to 25 years of age.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant
6) Establish universal compulsory military conscription for both sexes.

1. very important
2. moderately important
3. neutral
4. moderately unimportant
5. very unimportant

7) Raise the minimum voting age to 25 years.

1. very important
2. moderately important
3. neutral
4. moderately unimportant
5. very unimportant
Appendix D: Manipulation Check for the Neutral Affect Condition

To what extent was this issue important to your winning the game:

1) Approve the appointment of the newly selected ambassador to Guatemala.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

2) Issue a new postage stamp.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

3) Change the reporting procedure for reporting committee actions.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

4) Change fiscal deadlines from the 10th to the 15th of the month.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant
5) Change the specifications for sewer pipes.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

6) Relocate the National Bureau of Standards.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant

7) Approve the proposed set of job descriptions for civil service employees.
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. neutral
   4. moderately unimportant
   5. very unimportant
Appendix E: Interpersonal Affect Scale

Please respond to the following questions regarding the other players on the group.

1) Suppose you were having some sort of difficulty in your job. To what extent do you feel the representative from ____ would be willing to go out of his way to help you if you asked for it?

   a. to a very great extent
   b. to a considerable extent
   c. to some extent
   d. to a very little extent
   e. not at all

2) We all respect the knowledge and judgment of some people more than others. To what extent do you have this kind of respect for the representative from ____?

   a. to a very great extent
   b. to a considerable extent
   c. to some extent
   d. to a very little extent
   e. not at all

3) How well do you like the representative from ____ personally?

   a. to a very great extent
   b. to a considerable extent
   c. to some extent
   d. to a very little extent
   e. not at all
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