Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal
Vol. 7, No. 3 (2015)

Examining the Impact of Machiavellianism on Psychological Withdrawal, Physical Withdrawal and Antagonistic Behavior

Aygül Turan *
Yildiz Technical University
** Economic and Administrative Programs, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey*
Email: ayturan@yildiz.edu.tr

Abstract
Purpose: Machiavellianism is investigated many times in order to explain different concepts in the literature. Similarly in previous research, we aim to investigate Machiavellianism and its relationship with behavioral outcome of individuals; psychological as well as physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior of individuals. Taking individuals' Machiavellianism level into account, we also purpose to delineate whether high and low Machiavellian individuals exhibit different level psychological withdrawal, physical withdrawal and antagonistic behavior. In addition, demographic variable differences in psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior fall into scope of this research.
Methodology: Sampling 360 MBA students, we conducted ordinal logistic regression analysis and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).
Findings: Results show that there is significant positive relationship between Machiavellianism and psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior as well as antagonistic behavior. Implications of the present research indicate that high Mach individuals are 3,37 times more likely to represent upper level psychological withdrawal behavior than low Mach individuals. Moreover, high Mach individuals are 1,56 times more likely to exhibit upper level physical withdrawal behavior than low Mach individuals. Furthermore, high Mach individuals are 2,47 times more likely to represent upper level antagonistic behavior than low Mach individuals. Analyses with demographic variables represent that individuals' Machiavellian personality, psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior differentiates in terms of individuals' ages, experience levels and genders. Results indicated that individuals younger than 30 years old incline to represent higher Machiavellian personality than those who are in the age group of 31-35 years as well as the ones older than 36. Likewise, individuals younger than 30 prone to exhibit higher psychological withdrawal behavior than those older than 36. In addition, individuals who have between 0-5 years of experience incline to represent higher Machiavellian personality than those have above 16 years of experience. Also, the tendency of males to exhibit physical withdrawal behavior is higher than of females.
Originality: Investigating the difference between high and low Mach individuals' psychological withdrawal, physical withdrawal and antagonistic behavior tendency in the work place, present research offers vital contributions to the literature.

Keywords: Machiavellianism, Psychological Withdrawal Behavior, Physical Withdrawal Behavior, Antagonistic Behavior, Ordinal Logistic Regression, MANOVA

1. Introduction

The concept of Machiavellianism emerged from Italy in 1513 with *Prince* by Machiavelli. Nevertheless, investigating the concept as a dark side of personality in psychology literature reached the end of the 1960 (Christie and Geis, 1970). In fact, the dark triad was defined on the basis of three overlapping yet different personality variables as Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism (Paulhus and Williams, 2002; Rauthmann, 2012; Rayburn and Rayburn, 1996). Jones and Figueredo (2013) gathered these concepts under the antagonistic traits heading. As various kinds of traits, they also defined Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism as *"manipulative, callous and strategic dispositions"*, *"manipulative and callous dispositions but of a more short-term and antisocial nature"* and *"manipulation and callousness but with an inflated sense of self",* respectively. In view of similarities those traits, McHoskey et al. (1998) argued that those three personality traits were the same. However, Paulhus and Williams (2002) refuted McHoskey et. al.'s (1998) claim by lying the fact that three concepts had different correlation coefficients between different outcomes. Up to now, the dark side of personality has evaluated these similar but distinct three concepts in psychology field. Following psychology literature, the dark triad, especially Machiavellianism was explored in organizational behavior literature not long afterwards. Actually, Machiavellianism gained its reputation after the scandals and corruptions in large scale corporation arose (Etzioni, 2002; Feiner, 2004), such as Enron, Worldcom, Volkswagen etc.

Machiavellianism generally investigated with negative behavior of individuals (Zagenczyk et al., 2014; Rayburn and Rayburn, 1996; Wu and Lebreton, 2011; Jones and Figueredo, 2013; Rauthmann, 2012) and positive as well as negative contribution to the firm (Sagie et al., 2002). Since cynical worldview and manipulative tactics are at center of the Machiavellianism, the concept has positive relationship between negative outcomes such as, unethical behavior (Tang and Chen, 2008; Mudrack, 1992; Zagenczyk et al., 2014; Rayburn and Rayburn, 1996), deviance behavior (Bennett and Robinson, 2000), counterproductive behavior (Wu and Lebreton, 2011), moral disengagement (Moore et al, 2012) etc.

Withdrawal behavior refers to attitudes and behaviors towards negligence behavior in the work place (Fuentes and Sawyer, 1989). Withdrawal behaviors have been investigated in order to obtain financial loss being based on the assumption that sort of withdrawal behaviors (lateness, absence, turnover etc.) are an extra-cost for organizations. In addition to financial aspect, behavioral aspect is considerably important for norm determination, reciprocal interpersonal effects in a work teams (Sagie et al., 2002). Furthermore, withdrawal behaviors could transform more severe form of behaviors, such as antagonistic behavior. On that point, antagonistic behavior refers to individuals' abuse of power in the work place (Parks et al., 2013). From psychological and physical withdrawal behavior to antagonistic behavior, so many negative behavioral outcomes could be explained the dark side of personality. On the basis of the literature review, psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior as negative behavioral outcome of individuals are explained with individuals' Machiavellian personality in present research.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1. Machiavellianism

Machiavellianism is a concept put forth by Machiavelli who was a Renaissance diplomat and writer of Prince in 1513 (Christie and Geis, 1970). However, the philosophy of Machiavellianism began to spread and very well-known after his death in 1530s (Gemmill and Heisler, 1972). Machiavelli advices princes how govern their country and manage citizens, indicating the successful dictators or princes in the European history from at the end of medieval

and beginning of the new era (Machiavelli, 2014). Nevertheless, Machiavellianism was heavily criticized in psychology and social psychology field in late 1960s (O'Boyle et al., 2012).

In modern psychology, Machiavellianism has been evaluated one of the dark side of personality. Dark triad is problematic behavior type of individuals that comprises of narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy (Paulhus and Williams, 2002). Three problematic personalities are investigated together in psychology literature, whereas single Machiavellian personality is relatively more investigated in the organizational behavior literature (Rayburn and Rayburn, 1996). This could be stem from nature of Machiavellianism because it is defined as organizing behaviors at the root of expediency, manipulation and deception and innocent of merit of trust, dignity and kindness (Christie and Geis, 1970). Explanation of Machiavellianism is differentiated from one author to another. For instance, Christie and Geis (1970) identify the concept on the basis of three dimensions as endorsement of deception and manipulation, cynical perspective on human nature and a disregard for conventional morality. Another research indicated that Machiavellianism could be explained with distrust of others, desire for status, desire for control and amoral manipulation dimensions (Dahling et al. 2009). Machiavellianism researches indicate that high Mach people have offensive and dishonest manner to accomplish their goal and they manipulate others to perform better, they also convince others but not have been convinced by others (Christie and Geis, 1970; Zagenczyk et al., 2014). In addition, a high Mach person tends to violate others' rights for their personal interest.

In the organizational behavior literature, some behavioral concept has been explained with individuals' Machiavellian personality, such as unethical behavior (Tang and Chen, 2008; Mudrack, 1992; Zagenczyk et al., 2014; Rayburn and Rayburn, 1996), deviance behavior (Bennett and Robinson, 2000), counterproductive behavior (Wu and Lebreton, 2011), antagonistic behavior (Jones and Figueredo, 2013; Rauthmann, 2012) moral disengagement (Moore et al, 2012); work disengagement (Den Hartog and Belschak, 2012), perceived organizational politics (Meisler and Vigoda-Gadot, 2014) etc.

One of the researches indicates that emotional exhaustion is related to withdrawal reactions (Cole et al., 2010). Sagie et al. (2002) also investigates the indirect effect of psychological and behavioral withdrawal on norm determination and interpersonal relation in work team and direct effect of withdrawal on cost of the firm, they have found significant negative relation with norm determination as well as interpersonal relation but positive relationship with the cost of the firm. On the other hand, Jones and Paulhus (2010) claim *"individuals having dark personalities (Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy) exhibit toxic as well as antagonistic behaviors and they incline to conducting exploitative behavior style for self-beneficial interests regardless of others' or communal welfare."* Furthermore, a research confirming the author assertion indicates that Machiavellians frequently conduct in an antagonistic manner in interpersonal relations (Rauthmann, 2012). Following these research, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant effect of Machiavellianism on (a) psychological withdrawal behavior, (b) physical withdrawal behavior, (c) antagonistic behavior.

2.2. Psychological and Physical Withdrawal Behavior

Withdrawal behavior is a sequence of attitudes and behaviors conducted by employees in their workplace. It is represented in return for some reason making employees conceive to be not much participating in their work (Kaplan et al., 2009; Shapira-Lishchinsky and Even-Zohar, 2011). This kind of behavior refers to employees' lateness, absenteeism, intention to leave work etc. Lateness has motivational basis (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Even-Zohar, 2011) and is defined as coming to work lately or going away from work before the end of the work day (Koslowsky et al., 1997). Blau (1995) explains the lateness in three dimensions as chronic,

unavoidable and avoidable lateness. In addition, he describes chronic lateness as a response of employees to bad work condition, avoidable lateness as having preferable or more essential things to do than coming to work and unavoidable lateness as factors not relating to employees like transport, whether condition. One more withdrawal behavior is absenteeism defined as *"the lack of physical presence at a behavior setting when and where one is expected to be"* (Harrison and Price, 2003: 204). Furthermore, Sagie et al. (2002) classifies two different absence types represented by employees; voluntary and involuntary absence. According to him, voluntarily absence is represented under employees control in order to found other work opportunities on the market. On the other hand, involuntary absence is represented beyond the employees' control. Intent to leave is another kind of withdrawal behavior conducted as a precursor of voluntarily turnover by employees. (Carraher and Buckley, 2008; Griffeth et al., 2000; Lambert and Hogan, 2009).

Theory of Reasoned Action claims that intention is an antecedent of the behaviors that individual exhibited (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). Following the theory, Lehman and Simpson (1992) developed two kinds of withdrawal behaviors as psychological withdrawal behavior and physical withdrawal behavior. Psychological withdrawal behavior comprises of attitudes towards negligence behavior in the work place (Fuentes and Sawyer, 1989). For instance, thinking of absenteeism, dreaming in work place, working for personal interest instead of organizations' and represent a little effort to accomplish tasks that is prescribed before are some of psychological withdrawal behaviors (Lehman and Simpson, 1992). On the other hand, physical withdrawal behavior is an act to represent negligence behavior, such as going to work lately, extending time for breaks, sleeping in working hours (Hirschman, 1970; Farrell, 1983; Lehman and Simpson, 1992). On the basis of Theory of Reasoned Action, psychological withdrawal behavior could be evaluated a precursor of the physical withdrawal behavior.

As mentioned before, Machiavellianism has been investigated to explain individual behaviors in the workplace. Sagie et al. (2002) indicates psychological and behavioral withdrawal effect the interpersonal relation. Furthermore, Pilch (2012) have found that Machiavellianism is positively correlated with tendency to use destructive strategies (escalation and withdrawal) and negatively correlated with the constructive strategies (loyalty and dialog). Emerging stream of works on Machiavellianism investigates high Mach individuals' behavior that they exhibit, so they put forward the differences between high and low Mach individuals (McHoskey, 1999; Wiggins and Broughton, 1985; Fehr et al., 1992; Mudrack 1990). On the basis of previous research, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2: High Machiavellian individuals exhibit higher level of psychological withdrawal behavior than low Machiavellian individuals.

Hypothesis 3: High Machiavellian individuals exhibit higher level of physical withdrawal behavior than low Machiavellian individuals.

2.3. Antagonistic Behavior

Antagonism has been evaluated the adverse meaning of agreeableness one of the element of big five personality trait as extroversion vs. introversion, agreeableness vs. antagonism, conscientiousness vs. lack of direction, neuroticism vs. emotional stability and openness vs. closeness to experience in psychology literature (John and Srivatava, 1999; Costa and McCrae, 1985). On the other hand, Parks et al. (2013) claimed antagonism is multi-faceted concept needed to be evaluated. One of facets is *power and its abuse use*. For instance, an individual can behave as if gatekeeper of collective goods or evaluate it as common-pool resource could be utilize for individual needs. So it is protected or harmed. Second facet is *desired to see an out-group be harmed.* Individuals could consider that only in-group members should represent achievement. Furthermore, they have positive feelings when learning an out-group individual

was harmed. The other facet of antagonism is about *emotions*. Antagonism is applied towards out-group members or in-group members who deviate, considering they accepted to be treated them badly. So, antagonistic behavior refers to *"aggressive forms of the voice dimension and included arguing with co-workers, disobeying supervisors, purposely spreading rumors or gossip, filling formal complaints and reporting others for wrongdoing."* (Lehman and Simpson, 1992)

Antagonistic behavior has been explained on the basis of drug usage (Lehman and Simpson, 1992), personality types (Muller and Plug, 2006; John and Srivatava, 1999) as well as dark personalities as narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy (Rauthmann, 2012). Much of the Machiavellianism researches investigate high and low Machiavellian personality differences, on the basis of these framework, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: High Machiavellian individuals exhibit higher level of antagonistic behavior than low Machiavellian individuals.

Psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior were explained on the basis of different concepts with distinct sample in psychology, sociology, social psychology as well as organizational behavior literature. For instance, they were investigated in students (Rauthmann, 2012; McCabe et al., 1991), spouses (Pilch, 2012), nurses (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Even-Zohar, 2011), teachers (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Tsemach, 2014), civil servants (Cole et al., 2010), etc. According to Shapira-Lishchinsky and Even-Zohar's (2011) research, males represent more withdrawal behavior than females, especially with respect to lateness. However, no differences in withdrawal behavior in terms of work experience of individuals. Another study relating to individual withdrawal behavior indicates that there is no relationship between withdrawal behavior and gender as well as superiority (Shapira-Lishchinsky and Tsemach, 2014). One of the researches indicates that antagonism is differentiates from male and female, according to the results males are more antagonistic than females (Mueller and Plug, 2006). So we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant difference in Machiavellian personality, psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior in terms of (a) age, (b) experience, (c) gender, (d) whether or not ethics course received, (e) college major.

In this study we aim to achieve the influence of Machiavellianism on behavior outcomes of individuals; psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior. On that framework, we examine the impact of being high and low Machiavellian personality on level of behaviors that individuals exhibit. In addition, demographic variables have been added in the present research to investigate whether or not individuals' psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior differentiates in terms of demographic characteristics.

3. Method

3.1. Participant and Procedures

Previous researches have indicated that different samples have different Machiavellianism level. According to their university education (etc. law and business) (McCabe et al., 1991; Tang, Chen, 2008) or their job/ profession (managers, MBA students and faculty colleagues) (Siegel, 1973), Machiavellianism inclination differentiates.

Following the previous researches, we carried out present research with MBA students graduated from different major, working in a job as well as taking MBA courses in a public university in Istanbul. We gathered 360 appropriate questionnaires for data analysis. First, we tested reliability and construct validity of the measurement instrument, then correlation and

linear regression analyses were done in order to find out the relations among variables by means of all data. After that, data was split in terms of some criteria, so certain group of individuals discriminated and logistic regression analysis was done with this sample. Finally, attaining whether or not demographic variables explain individuals' Machiavellianism personality, psychological as well as physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior, we applied logistic regression analyses.

3.2. Measurement Instrument

Measurement instrument comprises of Machiavellianism, psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior as well as six open ended questions in order to obtain demographic characteristics of participants (age, gender, profession, whether or not ethics course took and work experience).

Machiavellianism as Independent Variable

After Machiavelli put forward the Machiavellianism construct, Christie and Geis (1970) developed a measurement instrument for the construct for the first time. The instrument comprises of 71-item long version and 20-item short version scale. Following years, the instrument applied many different fields and then Valentine and Fleischman (2003) shortened this scale to 5 items conducting reliability and construct validity tests. Finally, Dahling et. al. (2009) defined the Machiavellianism scale with 4 dimensions and 16 items. Therefore, we adopted Valentine and Fleischman's (2003) and Dahling et. al.'s (2009) scales and measured the construct with 8 items in anchored at 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

Item total correlation analyses were done for Machiavellianism scale first and one item had under 0,20 correlation coefficients, so it was dropped. Then explanatory factor analysis was conducted. Results indicated that Machiavellianism items gather in a factor and 48,347 % variances was explained with 0,594 Crombach Alpha value. Reliability and validity results were illustrated in Table 1. We discriminated low Machiavellian and high Machiavellian participants according to their response to 7 items that measured Machiavellianism level. As discriminated low and high Mach by Drory and Glukinos (1980), we allocated those two personalities below %25 and above %75 of total Mach score as low Mach and high Mach, respectively. Machiavellianism was measured with 7 items and total scores differentiated 7 from 35 in this study. Taking these total scores into consideration, we entitled below the scores of 14 as "low Machiavellian" and above the scores of 28 as "high Machiavellian".

Behavioral Outcomes (Psychological and Physical Withdrawal Behavior and Antagonistic Behavior) as Dependent Variables

Behavioral outcomes consisted of psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior in this study. The instrument comprised of 8 items to measure psychological withdrawal behavior, 4 items psychological withdrawal behavior and 5 items to measure antagonistic behavior. All items anchored 5 point rated scale 1=never, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=most of the time and 5=always.

We used Lehman and Simpson's (1992) on-the-job behavior scale to measure psychological withdrawal behavior, psychological withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior. Item total correlation analyses were done scales of psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior. One item of psychological withdrawal behavior had under 0,20 correlation coefficients, so it was dropped and then explanatory factor analyses were done each scales separately. Factor analyses results indicated that psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior items gathered in single factor, as previous researches in the literature. On the other hand, antagonistic behavior divided into two factors,

different from the literature. We entitled antagonistic behavior factors as "stir up trouble" and "complaining". As a result, psychological withdrawal behavior scale explained 44,985 % variances with 0,768 Crombach Alpha value; physical withdrawal behavior 64,289 % with 0,814 and antagonistic behavior 70,973 % with 0,737 Crombach alpha value (see all values in Table 1). These results showed that the scales were consistent to measure the concept.

Table 1: Results of Factor Analyses and Reliability Tests

Variables	Factor Load.[a]	Variance Exp.(%)[b]	α[c]	Source
MACHIAVELLIANISM (7 Items)		**48,347**	**0,594**	**Valentine and Fleischman (2003) ; Dahling et. al. (2009)**
4. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.	,666			
6. I am willing to sabotage the efforts of other people if they threaten my own goals.	,652			
7. The only good reason to talk to others is to get information that I can use to my benefit.	,630			
1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.	,629			
8. If I show any weakness at work, other people will take advantage of it.	,606			
2. It is wise to flatter important people.	,595			
3. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.	,575			
PSYCHOLOGICAL WITHDRAWAL BEHAVIOR (7 Items)		**44,985**	**0,768**	**Lehman and Simpson (1992)**
5. I spent work time on personal matters	,786			
6. I put less effort into job than should have	,776			
8. I let others do your work	,693			
3. I leave work station from unnecessary reasons	,675			
4. I daydream in work	,674			
7. I think of leaving current job	,527			
1. I think of being absent	,509			
PHYSICAL WITHDRAWAL BEHAVIOR (4 Items)		**64,289**	**0,814**	**Lehman and Simpson (1992)**
1. I leave work early without permission	,864			
2. I take longer lunch or rest break than allowed	,793			
3. I take suppliers or equipment without permission	,786			
4. I fall asleep at work	,761			
ANTAGONISTIC BEHAVIOR		**70,973**	**0,737**	**Lehman and Simpson (1992)**
Factor 1: Stir up Trouble (3 Items)				
4. I disobey my supervisor's instruction	,878			
5. I spread rumors or gossip about co-workers	,818			
3. I argue with co-workers	,540			
Factor 2: Complaining (2 Items)				
1. I report others for breaking rules or policies	,903			
2. I fill formal complaints	,862			

Following the Drory and Glukinos's (1980) method discriminating low and high Mach individuals, we estimated all kinds of behaviors, used in this research, as low, middle and high degree. Total scores of behaviors were allocated below %25, from %25 to % 75 and above %75, and entitled low, medium and high degree of related behavior, respectively. For instance, psychological withdrawal behavior was measured 7 items and total scores changed between 7 and 35. We separated 0 to 14 scores as low level psychological withdrawal behavior, 15 to 27 scores as medium level psychological withdrawal behavior and 28 to 35 as high level psychological withdrawal behavior. Likewise, this procedure applied all behavioral outcomes.

3.3. Results

The Influence of Machiavellianism on Psychological Withdrawal, Physical Withdrawal and Antagonistic Behavior

Mean scores for Machiavellianism is 2,8214; psychological withdrawal behavior 2,0009; physical withdrawal behavior 1,4914 and antagonistic behavior 1,7614 (stir up trouble 1,6060; complaining 1,9169), as seen in Table 2. For all scores are under mean, we can interpret that our sample do not incline to Machiavellian personality and not to represent psychological and physical withdrawal as well as antagonistic behavior.

Investigating relationships among variables, we have conducted correlation and linear regression analysis. As seen in Table 2, there is significant relationship between Machiavellianism and psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior, overall antagonistic behavior and its sub-dimension of stir up trouble ($p<0,05$). Nevertheless, correlation coefficient between Machiavellianism and complaining is not significant ($p>0,05$). Furthermore, Machiavellianism explains approximately 8 % variances in psychological withdrawal behavior with 0,285 correlation coefficient ($p<0,01$), as seen in Table 3. In addition, Machiavellianism explains about 6 % variances in physical withdrawal behavior ($p<0,01$). Thus, being one unit increase in Machiavellianism score, physical withdrawal behavior increases 0,245(β). Moreover, Machiavellianism explains 1,4 % variances of antagonistic behavior ($r=0,118$, $p<0,05$). Taking those significant relationship results into consideration, hypotheses 1a, 1b and 1c were supported.

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations among Variables

Variables	**Mean**	**Std. D.[a]**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1. Machiavellianism	2,8214	0,70435	1					
2. Psychological Withdrawal B.	2,0009	0,65381	,285**	1				
3. Physical Withdrawal B.	1,4914	0,70462	,245**	,591**	1			
4. Antagonistic Behavior	1,7614	0,70781	,118*	,373**	,508**	1		
5. Stir up Trouble	1,6060	0,68253	,177**	,548**	,636**	,791**	1	
6. Complaining	1,9169	0,97069	,047	,159**	,294**	,903**	,450**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). [a] Standard Deviation

Table 3: Regression Analysis Results

Model	Dependent Variable	Predictors	R	Ad.R^{2a}	Beta	Std. (Beta)	t	Sig.	ANOVA/ Sig.
1	Psychological Withdrawal Behavior	Constant			1,25		9,11	,000	F= 31,37/ 0,000
		Machiavellianism	,285	,079	,265	,285	5,60	,000	
2	Physical Withdrawal Behavior	Constant			,800		5,33	,000	F= 22,58/ 0,000
		Machiavellianism	,245	,057	,245	,245	4,75	,000	
3	Antagonistic Behavior	Constant			1,42		5,33	,000	F= 4,99/ 0,026
		Machiavellianism	,118	,014	,118	,118	2,23	,026	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). [a] Adjusted R^2

The Effect of Level of Machiavellianism on Psychological Withdrawal, Physical Withdrawal and Antagonistic Behavior Level

Discriminating the data for analyses, we aim to investigate low and high Mach individuals' psychological as well as physical withdrawal behaviors and antagonistic behaviors that they conduct. Before running the ordinal logistic regression, the dependent variables psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior were divided into three categories one by one (high-medium-low); in addition, the independent variable Machiavellianism was grouped two categories (high-low), as mentioned before. So, Machiavellianism has ordinal nature (low-high), also type of behaviors have ordinal nature (low – medium - high). As a result, we use ordinal logistic regression analysis to test our hypotheses. (Özdamar, 2013; Hosmer and Lemeshow, 2004; Field, 2009; Norusis, 2005; Nilsson, 2008; Mendeş Pekdemir and Turan, 2015). Table 4 summarizes results of the analyses using logit link.

Model 1 in Table 4 shows a reasonable fit as it is significant (X^2 (1, N= 66) = 4,456; p= 0,035) and Cox & Snell R^2 is 0,066 and Nagelkerke R^2 is 0,086, so we can say overall model is significant and Machiavellianism explains approximately 9 % variances of psychological withdrawal behavior. The model assumption of parallel lines is not violated, as the test is non-significant (p= 0,06). In addition, high Mach individuals are 3,37 times more likely to exhibit high level psychological withdrawal behavior with regard to middle and low level psychological withdrawal behavior than low Mach individuals. Likewise, high Mach individuals are 3,37 times more likely to exhibit high and medium level psychological withdrawal behavior with regard to low level psychological withdrawal behavior than low Mach individuals (test of parallel lines supports this result). As a result, it can be said high Mach individuals are more likely to exhibit upper level psychological withdrawal behavior than low Mach individuals. So hypothesis 2 was supported.

Model 2 in Table 4, displays a good fit (X^2 (1, N= 66) = 13,591; p= 0,00) and Pseudo R^2 values are 0,186 and 0,255. Consequently, it can be claimed overall model is significant and Machiavellianism explains approximately 3 % variances of physical withdrawal behavior. Parallel lines test indicates non-significant results, so we can say one equation is valid for proportional odds tests. Table 2 indicates that for one unit increase in Machiavellianism (from low Mach to high Mach) the odds exhibiting high physical withdrawal behavior versus the combined middle and low physical withdrawal behavior categories are 1,56 times greater, given that all of other variables in the model are held constant. Similarly, the odds exhibiting

combined high and middle physical withdrawal behavior categories versus low is 1,56 times greater (test of parallel lines support this result). So, it can be said high Mach individuals are more likely to exhibit upper level physical withdrawal behavior than low Mach individuals. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was supported.

Table 4: Results of Ordinal Logistic regression (Used Logit Link Function)

		Variable	**Estimate**	**Odds = EXP(Est)[b]**	**Sig.**	**Test Parallel L.(Chi.Sq/Sg)[c]**
	Threshold	Psychological Withd.B.				4,009 / *p*= 0,06
MODEL 1		Low – Medium	,073		0,02	
Mach[d] ->		Medium – High	2,313		0,00	
Psycho[e]. Withd[f]. Behavior	Location	Mach (High)	- 1,217	**3,37**	0,03	
		Mach (Low)	0[a]			
	Result	Cox. R^2/ Nag. R^2 [g]				0,066 / 0,086
		X^2 (Model Fit)				4,456; *p*=0,035
	Threshold	Physical Withd. B.				2,946 / *p*= 0,86
MODEL 2		Low – Medium	- 0,005		0,01	
Mach ->		Medium – High	1,399		0,04	
Physical Withd. Behavior	Location	Mach (High)	- 0,358	**1,56**	0,00	
		Mach (Low)	0[a]			
	Result	Cox.R^2/ Nag. R^2				0,186 / 0,255
		X^2 (Model Fit)				13,591; *p*=0,00
	Threshold	Antagonistic Behavior				4,015/ *p*= 0,055
MODEL 3		Low – Medium	0,267		0,04	
Mach ->		Medium – High	2,462		0,00	
Antag[h]. Behavior	Location	Mach (High)	- 0,906	**2,47**	0,01	
		Mach (Low)	0[a]			
	Result	Cox. R^2/ Nag. R^2				0,059 / 0,078
		X^2 (Model Fit)				2,447; *p* = 0,04

[a] This parameter is set zero because it is redundant. [b] EXP: Exponent, Est.: Estimate [c] Test of Parallel L: Test of Parallel Lines, Chi.Sq/Sg: Chi-Square/ Significance [d] Mach: Machiavellianism, [e] Psycho: Psychological. [f] Withd. B: Withdrawal Behavior, [g] Cox.R^2/ Nag. R^2: Cox & Snell R^2/Nagelkerke R^2; [h] Antag: Antagonistic.

Table 4 summarizes the Model 3 ordinal logistic regression results. A moderate overall fit is stated (X^2 (1, N= 66) = 2,447; p= 0,04) and Cox & Snell R^2 is 0,059 and Nagelkerke R^2 is 0,078, so we can say general model is significant and Machiavellianism explains approximately 8 % variances of antagonistic behavior. The model assumption of parallel lines is not violated because the test is non-significant (*p*= 0,06). In addition, high Mach individuals 2,47 times more likely to exhibit high level antagonistic behavior with regard to middle and low level antagonistic behavior than low Mach individuals. Similarly, high Mach individuals are 2,47 times more likely to exhibit high and medium level antagonistic behavior with regard to low level antagonistic behavior than low Mach individuals (test of parallel lines support this result). Briefly, it could be said high Mach individuals are more likely to exhibit upper level antagonistic behavior than low Mach individuals. As a consequence, the fourth hypothesis was supported.

Demographic Variable Differences in Machiavellianism, Psychological Withdrawal, Physical Withdrawal and Antagonistic behavior

Examining differences in Machiavellian personality, psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior of individuals in terms of their demographic characteristics, we have conducted one-way between groups MANOVA to test hypothesis 5. Individuals' age, gender, college major, work experience, whether they took an ethics course during their university education are evaluated separately; together with Machiavellianism, psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior are analyzed with analysis of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) (Table 5).

Table 5: Multivariate Test Results

	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial eta Squared
1. Age	Wilks'Lambda	,947	2,443	8,000	706,000	,013	,027
2. Experience	Wilks'Lambda	,940	1,808	12,000	923,659	,043	,020
3. Gender	Wilks'Lambda	,967	2,977	4,000	350,000	,019	,033
4. Ethics Lesso	Wilks'Lambda	,990	,790	4,000	324,000	,532	,010
5. College Majo	Wilks'Lambda	,989	,904	4,000	326,000	,462	,011

As seen in Table 5 and Table 6, results of MANOVA conducted between age groups and Machiavellianism, and psychological withdrawal behavior, and physical withdrawal behavior, and antagonistic behavior indicate that there is a significant difference in Machiavellian personality and psychological withdrawal behavior but no significant differences in physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior of individuals between the age groups (Wilks' Lambda (Λ)= $F(8, 706) = 2{,}443$, $p < 0{,}05$).

Table 6: Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (Test of Between-Subject Effects)

Source	Dependent Variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Age	Machiavellianism	2	2,899	6,039	,003	,033
	Psychological Work B.	2	1,320	3,133	,045	,017
	Physical Work B.	2	1,039	2,116	,122	,012
	Antagonistic B.	2	,286	,623	,537	,003
Experience	Machiavellianism	3	1,296	2,645	,049	,022
	Psychological Work B.	3	,878	2,066	,104	,017
	Physical Work B.	3	,513	1,047	,372	,009
	Antagonistic B.	3	,203	,438	,726	,004
Gender	Machiavellianism	1	,248	,502	,479	,001
	Psychological Work B.	1	1,079	2,530	,113	,007
	Physical Work B.	1	5,339	11,184	,001	,031
	Antagonistic B.	1	,618	1,353	,245	,004
Ethics Lesson	Machiavellianism	1	,194	,401	,527	,001
	Psychological Work B.	1	,076	,176	,675	,001
	Physical Work B.	1	,526	1,120	,291	,003
	Antagonistic B.	1	,133	,280	,597	,001
College Major	Machiavellianism	1	,841	1,683	,195	,005
	Psychological Work B.	1	,725	1,721	,191	,005

Physical Work B.	1	,403	,828	,363	,003
Antagonistic B.	1	,891	1,968	,162	,006

Post Hoc tests and mean scores (Table 7) clarifies that individuals in the age group of up to 30 years incline to represent higher Machiavellian personality than those in the age group of between 31 and 35 (2,895>2,646, Mean difference = 0,2485). Similarly, individuals in the age group of up to 30 years apt to conduct higher Machiavellian personality than those above 36 years (2,895>2,547, Mean difference = 0,3483). Furthermore, being the age group up to 30 years prone to exhibit higher psychological withdrawal behavior than above 36 (2,048>1,794, Mean difference = 0,2548). As a consequence, 5a hypothesis was partially supported.

Table 7: Post Hoc (Tukey) Test Results

Dependent Variable	**(I) Age Group**	**(J) Age Group**	**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**
Psychological Withdrawal Behavior	Up to 30 years	31-35	,1431	,09754	,308
		Above 36 years	,2548*	,11519	,071
	31-35	Up to 30 years	-,1431	,09754	,308
		Above 36 years	,1117	,14022	,706
	Above 36 years	Up to 30 years	-,2548	,11519	,071
		31-35	-,1117	,14022	,706
Machiavellianism	Up to 30 years	31-35	,2485*	,10409	,046
		Above 36 years	,3483*	,12293	,013
	31-35	Up to 30 years	-,2485*	,10409	,046
		Above 36 years	,0998	,14964	,783
	Above 36 years	Up to 30 years	-,3483*	,12293	,013
		31-35	-,0998	,14964	,783
	(I) Experience	**(J) Experience**	**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**
Machiavellianism	0-5 years	6-10 years	,0996	,09506	,721
		11-15 years	,1923	,12862	,441
		Above 16 years	,3873*	,15621	,045
	6-10 years	0-5 years	-,0996	,09506	,721
		11-15 years	,0927	,14596	,921
		Above 16 years	,2877	,17076	,333
	11-15 years	0-5 years	-,1923	,12862	,441
		6-10 years	-,0927	,14596	,921
		Above 16 years	,1950	,19149	,739
	Above 16 years	0-5 years	-,3873*	,15621	,045
		6-10 years	-,2877	,17076	,333
		11-15 years	-,1950	,19149	,739

*. The mean difference is significant at the ,05 level. Post hoc tests are not performed for gender, ethic lesson and college major varibales because they consist of fewer than three groups.

A significant difference has been found in Machiavellianism, yet no significant difference in psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior of individuals between the experience level groups ($\Lambda = F(12, 923) = 1{,}81$, $p < 0{,}05$) (Table 6).

Post Hoc test indicates that mean score for Machiavellianism of individuals who have between 0-5 years of experience incline to represent higher Machiavellian personality than those have above 16 years of experience (2,886>2,498, Mean difference = 0,3873). So 5b hypothesis was partially supported.

MANOVA results represent a significant difference in physical withdrawal behavior, but no significant differences in Machiavellianism, psychological withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior of individuals between genders ($\Lambda = F(4, 350) = 2,977$, $p < 0,05$). Mean score for males' physical withdrawal behavior is higher than females' withdrawal behavior (1,603>1,358, Mean difference = 0,245). Thus, 5c hypothesis was partially supported.

We conducted MANOVA separately between other demographic variables (whether received ethics course, college major evaluated) and Machiavellianism, and psychological withdrawal behavior, and physical withdrawal behavior, and antagonistic behavior. However, we did not found any significant difference between ethics lesson issue and Machiavellianism, psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior, antagonistic behavior ($\Lambda = F(4, 324) = 0,79$, $p > 0,05$). Non-significant result was found for individuals college major ($\Lambda = F(4, 326) = 0,904$, $p > 0,05$), as well. Following these results, we rejected the 5d and 5e hypotheses.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Machiavellianism as a dark side of personality has been investigated to explain problematic behaviors of individuals (Paulhus and Williams, 2002; Christie and Geis, 1970). On the basis of previous research, we have used Machiavellianism in order to explain negative behavioral outcome as psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior of individuals. The results of the previous researches have inspired us to conduct this research on MBA student.

Present research results indicate that Machiavellianism significantly affects psychological and physical withdrawal behavior. This could be stem from nature of Machiavellianism because it is defined at the root of expediency and innocent of merit of trust (Christie and Geis, 1970). Furthermore, Machiavellians frequently behave in an antagonistic manner in interpersonal relations (Rauthmann, 2012). Confirming Rauthmann's (2012) study, we have found positive influence of Machiavellianism on antagonistic behavior. Another study conducted by Jones and Paulus (2010) supports these results, because they claim individuals having dark personality prone to represent exploitative as well as antagonistic behaviors.

There can be found emerging stream of work on Machiavellianism investigating the differences between high and low Mach individuals in the literature (McHoskey, 1999; Wiggins and Broughton, 1985; Fehr et. al., 1992; Mudrack 1990). On that framework, we have achieved the result lying in the fact that high Mach individuals are more likely to represent upper level psychological withdrawal behavior than low Mach individuals. In addition, high Mach individuals are more likely to exhibit upper level physical withdrawal behavior than low Mach individuals. It has confirmed Pilch's (2012) researches findings that indicates the positive relationship between Machiavellianism and destructive strategies (escalation and withdrawal) and negative relationship between Machiavellianism and constructive strategies (loyalty and dialog). Another implication is that high Mach individuals are more likely to represent upper level antagonistic behavior than low Mach individuals. Machiavellianism researches indicate high Mach people have offensive manner to achieve their goal (Christie and Geis, 1970; Zagenczyk et al., 2014). Following these results, psychological as well as physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior of individuals could be explained with their high Mach personality.

Being evaluated demographic variables represents that individuals' Machiavellian personality, psychological as well as physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior differentiates in terms of individuals' ages, experience levels and genders. Age groups differences are observed in Machiavellian personality and psychological withdrawal behavior of individual, but not found in physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior. Implication shows that younger individuals represent more Machiavellian personality than older ones. This result supports the Mudrack's (1992) research indicating that age and Machiavellian personality has negatively in relation. In addition, younger individuals have higher tendency to exhibit psychological withdrawal behavior than older ones. Nevertheless, Shapira-Lishchinsky and Even-Zohar's (2011) found no differences in withdrawal behavior in terms of work experience of individuals. The results could be explained the idea that the younger generation is highly ambitious for success, higher position and salaries in comparison to older ones.

The results indicate that experience differences are found in Machiavellian personality, yet not found difference in psychological withdrawal, physical withdrawal and antagonistic behavior. Shapira-Lishchinsky and Tsemach (2014) assert that there is no relationship between withdrawal behavior and seniority, as well. Clarifying the difference, we found individuals who have not much work experience are higher degree Machiavellian personality than those have pretty much experience. This result could be explained via age differences, indirectly.

Gender differences are indicated in physical withdrawal behavior, but not reached any differences in Machiavellian personality, psychological withdrawal behavior, physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior. It is confirmed Shapira-Lishchinsky and Tsemach's (2014) research representing no relationship between withdrawal behavior and gender, but contradicted Mueller and Plug's (2006) research representing that males are more antagonistic than females. According to Shapira-Lishchinsky and Even-Zohar's (2011) research, males represent more withdrawal behavior than females, as well. Supporting it, present research results show that the tendency of males to exhibit physical withdrawal behavior is higher than of females.

This research has some limitation to generalize the results of the study. Therefore, it could be better to conduct this research on different sample from analogous sectors. Despite the constraints, present research offers important contributions to the literature, especially investigating the difference between high and low Mach individuals' psychological as well as physical withdrawal behavior and antagonistic behavior tendency in the work place. In addition to that, demographic characteristic difference is vital to comprehend individuals' Machiavellian personality and their behavior. However, more researches should be done in this field. Other kinds of negative behaviors or negative outcomes of organizations could be explained Machiavellian as well as dark personality in future researches. Differentiating low and high Machiavellian personality individuals, especially, would stress the important of the concept.

References

Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1980), *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Bennett, R. J. and Robinson, S. L. (2000), "Development of a measure of workplace deviance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. *85 No.* 3, pp. 349-360.

Blau, G. (1995), "Influence of group lateness on individual lateness: A cross-level examination", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. *38, No.* 5, pp. 1483-1496.

Carraher, S. M. and Buckley, M. R. (2008). "Attitudes towards benefits and behavioral intentions and their relationship to absenteeism, performance, and turnover among nurses". *Academy of Health Care Management Journal*, Vol. *4, No.* 2, 89-109.

Christie, R. and Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism* (p. 106). Academic Press, New York.

Cole, M. S., Bernerth, J. B., Walter, F. and Holt, D. T. (2010). "Organizational justice and individuals' withdrawal: Unlocking the influence of emotional exhaustion". *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. *47, No.* 3, pp. 367-390.

Costa, P. T., Jr. and McCrae, R. R. (1985), The NEO personality inventory manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resource.

Dahling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G. and Levy, P. E. (2009), "The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale". *Journal of Management*, Vol:39, 219-257.

Den Hartog, D. N. and Belschak, F. D. (2012), "Work engagement and Machiavellianism in the ethical leadership process". *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. *107 No.* 1, pp.35-47.

Drory, A. and Gluskinos, U. M. (1980). "Machiavellianism and leadership". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. *65No.* 1, 81-86.

Etzioni A. (2002), "When It Comes to Ethics, B-schools get an F", *The Washington Post*, 4 August, B4.

Feiner, M. (2004), *The Feiner points of leadership: The 50 basic laws that will make people want to perform better for you*, Warner Business Books, New York.

Farrell, D. (1983), "Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. *26 No.* 4, pp. 596-607.

Fehr, B., Samson, D. and Paulhus, D. L. (1992), "The construct of Machiavellianism: Twenty years later", in Spielberger C. and Butcher J. (Ed.), *Advances in Personality Assessment,* Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 77-116.

Field A. (2009), *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. Sage Publications, London.

Fuentes, R. R. and Sawyer, J. E. (1989), Towards a comprehensive model of organizational withdrawal and job adaptation. *Unpublished manuscript*.

Gemmill, G. R. and Heisler, W. J. (1972), "Machiavellianism as a factor in managerial job strain, job satisfaction, and upward mobility", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. *15, No.* 1, pp. 51-62.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W. and Gaertner, S. (2000), "A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium", *Journal of Management*, Vol. *26, No.* 3, pp. 463-488.

Harrison, D. A. and Price, K. H. (2003), "Context and consistency in absenteeism: Studying social and dispositional influences across multiple settings". *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. *13, No.* 2, pp. 203-225.

Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states* (Vol. 25). Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Hosmer Jr, D. W. and Lemeshow, S. (2004). *Applied Logistic Regression*. John Wiley & Sons.

John, O. P. and Srivastava, S. (1999). "The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research"*, Vol. 2, pp. 102-138.

Jones, D. N. and Paulhus, D. L. (2010). "Differentiating the Dark Triad within the interpersonal circumplex". *Handbook of İnterpersonal Theory and Research*, pp. 249-267.

Jones, D. N. and Figueredo, A. J. (2013). "The core of darkness: Uncovering the heart of the Dark Triad". *European Journal of Personality*, Vol. 27, No.6, pp. 521-531.

Kaplan, S., Bradley, J. C., Luchman, J. N. and Haynes, D. (2009). "On the role of positive and negative affectivity in job performance: a meta-analytic investigation". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94, No.1, pp. 162-176.

Koslowsky, M., Sagie, A., Krausz, M. and Singer, A. D. (1997). "Correlates of employee lateness: Some theoretical considerations". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. *82, No.* 1, pp. 79-88.

Lambert, E. and Hogan, N. (2009). "The importance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in shaping turnover intent a test of a causal model", *Criminal Justice Review*, Vol. *34, No.*1, pp. 96-118.

Lehman, W. E. and Simpson, D. D. (1992), "Employee substance use and on-the-job behaviors". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. *77, No.* 3, 309-321.

Machiavelli, N. (2014). *Prens.* (Leyla Tonguc Basmacı trans.), Remzi Press, Istanbul, Turkey.

McCabe, D. L., Dukerich, J. M. and Dutton, J. E. (1991). "Context, values and moral dilemmas: Comparing the choices of business and law school students". *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. *10, No.*12, pp. 951-960.

McCrae, R. R. and Costa, P. T. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective*. Guilford Press, New York.

McHoskey, J. W. (1999), "Machiavellianism, intrinsic versus extrinsic goals, and social interest: A self-determination theory analysis", *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. *23, No.*4, pp. 267-283.

McHoskey, J. W., Worzel, W. and Szyarto, C. (1998). "Machiavellianism and psychopathy". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 74, No.1, pp.192-210.

Meisler, G. and Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2014), "Perceived organizational politics, emotional intelligence and work outcomes: empirical exploration of direct and indirect effects". *Personnel Review*, Vol.*43, No.* 1, pp. 116-135.

Mendeş Pekdemir I. and Turan, A. (2015). "The Influence of Ethical Ideologies on Promotive Extra Role Behaviors and Positive Work Behavior of Individuals". *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, Vol.5, No.8, pp. 34-47.

Moore, C., Detert, J. R., Klebe Treviño, L., Baker, V. L. and Mayer, D. M. (2012). "Why employees do bad things: Moral disengagement and unethical organizational behavior", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. *65, No.* 1, pp. 1-48.

Mudrack, P. E. (1990). "Machiavellianism and locus of control: A meta-analytic review". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 130, No. 1, 125-126.

Mudrack, P. E. (1992). "Additional evidence on age-related differences in Machiavellianism in an adult sample". *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 70, No. 3, 1210-1211.

Mueller, G. and Plug, E. (2006). "Estimating the effect of personality on male and female earnings". *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, Vol. *60, No.* 1, pp. 3-22.

Nilsson, J. (2008). "Investment with a conscience: Examining the impact of pro-social attitudes and perceived financial performance on socially responsible investment behavior", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. *83, No.* 2, pp. 307-325.

Norusis, M. (2005). SPSS *Advanced Statistical Procedures Companion*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River , New Jersey.

O'Boyle Jr, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C. and McDaniel, M. A. (2012). "A meta-analysis of the dark triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. *97, No.* 3, pp. 557-579.

Özdamar, K. (2001), *SPSS ile Biyoistatistik. Kaan Kitabevi, Eskişehir.*

Parks, C. D., Joireman, J. and Van Lange, P. A. (2013), "Cooperation, trust, and antagonism how public goods are promoted". *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol. *14, No.* 3, pp. 119-165.

Paulhus, D. L. and Williams, K. M. (2002). "The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy". *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. *36, No.* 6, pp. 556-563.

Pilch, I. (2012). "Machiavellianism and Problem-solving Strategies in a Marriage Relationship". *The New Education Review, Vol. 27, No. 1*, pp. 324-336.

Rauthmann, J. F. (2012). "The Dark Triad and interpersonal perception: Similarities and differences in the social consequences of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy". *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, Vol. *3, No.* 4, pp. 487-496.

Rayburn, J. M. and L. G. Rayburn (1996), "Relationship between Machiavellianism and Type A Personality and Ethical-Orientation", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 15, No. 11, pp. 1209–1219.

Shapira-Lishchinsky, O. and Even-Zohar, S. (2011), "Withdrawal behaviors syndrome: An ethical perspective". *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. *103, No.* 3, pp. 429-451.

Shapira-Lishchinsky, O. and Tsemach, S. (2014), "Psychological empowerment as a mediator between teachers' perceptions of authentic leadership and their withdrawal and citizenship behaviors", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 4, pp. 675-712.

Sagie, A., Birati, A. and Tziner, A. (2002), "Assessing the costs of behavioral and psychological withdrawal: A new model and an empirical illustration". *Applied Psychology*, Vol. *51, No.* 1, pp. 67-89.

Siegel, J. P. (1973). "Machiavellianism, MBA's and managers: Leadership correlates and socialization effects", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 404-411.

Tang, T. L. P., and Chen, Y. J. (2008), "Intelligence vs. wisdom: The love of money, Machiavellianism, and unethical behavior across college major and gender", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. *82, No.*1, pp. 1-26.

Valentine, S. and Fleischman, G. (2003), "The impact of self-esteem, Machiavellianism, and social capital on attorneys' traditional gender outlook", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 323-335.

Wiggins, J. S. and Broughton, R. (1985), "The interpersonal circle: A structural model for the integration of personality research". *Perspectives in personality*, Vol. *1*, pp. 1-47.

Wu, J. and Lebreton, J. M. (2011), "Reconsidering the dispositional basis of counterproductive work behavior: The role of aberrant personality". *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. *64, No.* 3, pp. 593-626.

Zagenczyk, T. J., Restubog, S. L. D., Kiewitz, C., Kiazad, K. and Tang, R. L. (2014). "Psychological contracts as a mediator between Machiavellianism and employee citizenship and deviant behaviors". *Journal of Management*, Vol. *40, No.* 4, pp. 1098-1122.

To cite this article:

Turan, A. (2015). Examining the Impact of Machiavellianism on Psychological Withdrawal, Physical Withdrawal and Antagonistic Behavior. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, 7(3), 87-103.