



## Cynicism Subtests and Exertion Success

Ashley Norris

Department of Psychology, Oregon , USA.

**\*Corresponding Author:** Ashley Norris, Department of Psychology, Oregon , USA.

**Received Date:** February 13, 2022; **Accepted Date:** February 27, 2022; **Published Date:** March 03, 2022

**Citation:** Ashley Norris, Cynicism Subtests and Exertion Success, J Clinical Psychology Research and Reports

**Copyright:** © 2022 Ashley Norris, This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

### Abstract

Various studies have revealed the paradoxical finding that some dark-side traits are positively associated with management and leadership success. This study aimed to investigate the relationship between the newly developed subscales of dark-side trait traits as measured by the Hogan Development Survey (HDS) and criteria-keyed personality test measures of work success. In all, 262 British employees participated in the study. In the study we examined the facets of the three super-factors: Moving away from, Against and Towards other, on at a time onto the six criterion variables: service orientation, stress tolerance, reliability, clerical potential, sales potential and managerial potential. Mercurial and moody behaviours were negative predictors, whereas fantasied talent and public confidence were positive predictors of six measures of work success. The results suggest that a finer-grain analysis of dark-side traits which is made possible by the updated Hogan Development Survey offers an opportunity to understand the paradox mentioned above. Implications and limitations are acknowledged.

**Keywords:** Distance perception; visual impairment; real distance judgment; magnitude estimation; perceptual rehabilitation; clinical psychophysics

### Introduction

There's now an expansive literature on dark- side traits in the plant (-). colorful studies show that, maybe paradoxically, some dark traits like Narcissistic Personality complaint have a positive effect on leadership emergence if not effectiveness (35). Indeed, reviews using data from three different countries have shown that Chief Executive Officers frequently have elevated scores on multitudinous dark- side measures. Furnham, Richards and Paulhus (2013) also showed that the "dark trio" (Narcissism, Machiavellianism and Psychopathy) in sub-clinical situations appear in numerous successful leaders.

This a small, but growing literature, on the paradoxical finding from numerous studies that occasionally show dark- side traits are associated with work success as well as failure. A part explanation for these findings is the way sub-clinical personality complaint tests, like the HDS, are valenced and articulated. Others suppose that some of these dark traits (e.g. Egocentricity) are originally veritably useful at getting a job( i.e. leadership emergence) but that they're associated with long term operation derailment and failure. Grounded on their data, Kaiser etal. ( 2015) proposed that both lower and advanced HDS scores represent adding threat for derailing behaviours, whereas moderate scores represent low threat and may indeed be associated with desirable behaviours. There are also distinctions within diseases similar as the different between grandiose and vulnerable egocentricity which may be differentially related to work- related behaviours. A more detailed examination of the angles of the dark- side traits may indeed offer an sapience into this incongruity.

In this study, we used the streamlined Hogan Development Survey (HDS) which now has three angles for each complaint. The HDS assesses dysfunctional interpersonal themes which reflect distorted beliefs about others.

These crop when people encounter stress or stop considering how their conduct affect others (Hogan & Hogan, 2001 2009). Over time, these dispositions may come associated with a person's character and can stymie job performance and career success. The HDS assesses tone-defeating expressions of normal personality. The HDS has decreasingly attracted the attention particularly by Industrial/ Organisational psychology experimenters interested in operation derailment (18).

As presented in Table 1, and verified in colorful studies (16), the HDS has three advanced order factors that was grounded on Horney's model (1950). The three advanced order factors (Moving Down, against and Towards Others) have parallels with the Clusters A (i.e., Odd/ Eccentric), Cluster B (i.e., Dramatic/ Emotional/ Erratic) and Cluster C (i.e., Anxious/ Fearful) as defined in colorful DMS primers including DSM- IV-R (APA, 2000).

The HDS measures dark- side traits at the sphere position, yet numerous particularity measures have developed tests which measure at the sphere and hand position to prop better interpretation (7). The first end of this study is to validate the streamlined subscale factor structure of the HDS. To our knowledge this is the first study probing the streamlined hand- position HDS.

### Work Success

There's an expansive literature, lately reviewed by Furnham (2018a), on personality and work success. There are multitudinous delineations and measures of work success and operationalized by both objective and private career criteria. Objective success refers to foreign pointers of success, which can be estimated objectively by others, similar as periodic income and number of elevations, as well as salient performance criteria



(i.e., profit from deals). private, or natural, measures of career success attempt to capture an existent's particular judgments about their career achievements and generally include tone- report measures similar as job or career satisfaction. The two are relatively related. Nearly all experimenters note the advisability of an accrued measure of objective performance at work but note how delicate this is to gain, as many organisations record this data.

There are still other measures similar as that used in this study (17) which are criterion- reconciled personality measures. This approach goes back over 50 times where personality experimenters determine which personality test questions are dependable and valid pointers of performance and success in colorful jobs or relating to colorful job issues (11). They're easily not as robust or valid as objective measures.

In this study we used the HPI which has six established occupational scales service exposure (i.e., being attentive, affable and gracious to guests and guests), stress forbearance (i.e., being suitable to handle stress - low scores are associated with absenteeism and health problems), trustability( i.e., high scores correspond to integrity and low scores to organisational delinquency), pastoral eventuality( i.e., the capability to follow directions, pay attention to details and communicate easily), deals eventuality( i.e., energy, social chops, and the capability to break problems for guests) and directorial eventuality( i.e., leadership capability, planning and decision timber chops). These measures have been used as "dependent variables " in colorful studies().

This study extends the work of Furnham, Trickey and Hyde (2012). Using the HDS scale scores and the HPI criterion- grounded measures of occupational success, that study showed that whilst some diseases sounded constantly associated with low success and implicit conditions, others sounded either neutral or appreciatively associated. Specifically, Moody, unpredictable, hyperexcitable personalities are a challenge to work with, and accordingly had a strong negative association with all six occupational measures. The same result applied to conservative people who are likely to be distrustful, suspicious, and pessimistic; and Avoidant types whose inhibition and threat- aversion preferences frequently prove problematic. still, there's substantiation that Bold and Imaginative biographies are associated with success at work.

Grounded on Furnham etal.'s (2012) findings, we hypothesised originally, that the subscales corresponding to Moving Down from Others (i.e., hyperexcitable, Sceptical, conservative, Reserved and Laggardly) will be negative supplements; and secondly that the subscales corresponding to Moving Against (Bold, Mischievous, various, Imaginative), as well as Towards others (Diligent, Dutiful) will be positive supplements of work success. Third, grounded on former exploration it was prognosticated that of the six work success criteria the dark- side disciplines and hand would be easily related to stress forbearance, trustability and deals eventuality (13).

**Styles**

**Actors and Procedure**

In total 262 British workers took part in this study of which 102(38.9) were ladies. Their mean age was42.94 times (SD = 9.45) with the range being between 16 to 71 times. In all 68 were between 30 and 50 times old. The data for this study came from a British consultancy company which runs assessment and development centres for big organisations. The data used in this study was attained from substantially transnational organisations who agreed to let the anonymised data be used for this analysis. All actors entered detailed, expert feedback on their scores. Ethical blessing was sought and entered for this study.

**Accoutrements**

1. The Hogan Development Survey (HDS)(23) is a tone- administered questionnaire 168 particulars that are dichotomous( true- false). HDS morals include data from over,000 working grown-ups and job aspirants from a variety of associations. These data include administrative andnon-supervisory labor force and strikes a balance between selection and development cases. Descriptive statistics for HDS scales appear by gender, age, and race/ race in the HDS Manual (27). nascence reliableness for the scales are shown in Table 2 and short- term test- pretest reliableness, range from.64 to.75 (27).

2. The Hogan Personality force (HPI) is one of the most honored and used measures in theU.S.A and inU.K( 25). It's a 206- item dimension that was designed grounded on the Five Factor Model (31). The six work success criterion- reconciled scales are deduced from this measure.

The homemade notes that the HPI occupational scales prognosticate a person's faculty to perform in six general occupational places. The scales are grounded on exploration comparing high and low players grounded on large data sets. The scales assess rates that distinguished the high-rated players from the low- rated players The nascence in classes refers to the nascence shown in the Hogan and Hogan (2009) primer grounded on the results from 1532 men and 322 women.

**Results**

**Descriptive statistics**

HDS scales	HDS subscales	Mean	Std. Dev	Cronbach's Alpha
Excitable	Volatile	1.48	1.28	0.49 (.78)
	Easily Disappointed	1.25	1.32	
	No Direction	1.07	1.14	
Sceptical	Cynical	1.57	1.17	0.61 (.76)
	Mistrusting	0.87	1.08	
	Grudges	1.94	1.51	
Cautious	Avoidant	1.03	0.97	0.59 (.73)
	Fearful	0.91	1.19	
	Unassertive	2.26	1.42	
Reserved	Introverted	1.49	1.04	0.66 (.66)
	Unsocial	1.88	1.63	
	Tough	1.46	1.27	
Leisurely	Passive-Aggressive	2.03	1.27	0.45 (.58)
	Unappreciated	1.13	1.13	
	Irritated	1.05	1.10	
Bold	Entitled	2.31	1.27	0.64 (.69)
	Overconfidence	1.72	1.28	
	Fantasized Talent	3.53	1.28	
Mischievous	Risky	2.86	1.43	0.62 (.59)
	Impulsive	1.99	1.27	
	Manipulative	2.32	1.15	
Colourful	Public Confidence	2.58	1.54	0.54 (.72)
	Distractible	2.36	0.94	
	Self-Display	2.15	1.35	
Imaginative	Eccentric	1.14	1.22	0.62 (.64)
	Special Sensitivity	3.57	1.33	
	Creative Thinking	2.87	1.53	
Diligent	Standards	3.70	0.89	0.62 (.65)
	Perfectionistic	3.03	1.40	
	Organized	2.71	1.37	
Dutiful	Indecisive	2.10	1.15	0.46 (.50)
	Ingratiating	2.65	1.33	
	Conforming	2.86	1.21	

In Table 1, descriptive statistics and Cronbach's nascence values are presented. More recent exploration supports a "cut- off" point of.60 (Nagpal, Kumar, Kakar & Bhartia, 2010). As presented in Table 2, the range of Cronbach's nascence is from.45 to.66. In proposition, these values indicate a low trustability. still, Cortina (1993) proposed that if a scale has a many particulars (2- 3) also it's reasonable and respectable to have a lower "cut- off" point. also, studies have shown that values between.50 and.70 indicate a good fit (40).

Table 1 also shows the nascence reliableness of the original HDS that doesn't have hand scores. With only one exception (videlicet for Colourful) the baselines are advanced for the original interpretation though the differences for half of them aren't great (i.e., lower than.5). The topmost difference is for hyperexcitable and various. Those psychometricians who advise the strict.70 guideline for respectable baselines will note that neither interpretation of the HDS fulfills that criterion veritably well.

**Multiple Retrogression analysis**

A series of hierarchical multiple retrogressions were also conducted using as the criterion variables the six occupational scales from HPI (i.e., service exposure, stress forbearance, trustability, pastoral eventuality, deals eventuality and directorial eventuality) and as predictor variables the subscales that correspond to each advanced order factor. In all retrogressions, demographics (i.e., age and gender) entered first and also the HDS subscales. This replicated Furnham etal.( 2012) and Furnham( 2018). The findings showed that in the first step, gender and age reckoned from.01 to .2 of the friction whereas the dark- traits reckoned from .17 to .54. The subscales explained further friction for Stress Forbearance and lower in trustability. likewise, fearful, unpredictable and no direction were the most influential negative predictors.



Unassertive was a positive predictor for both Service Orientation and Reliability whereas ungrateful was a strong predictor only for Service Orientation. In all, Service exposure and Stress Forbearance were explained the most from the HDS subscales corresponding to the Moving Down factor whereas trustability is explained the least. This verified the suppositions.

In step 2, the friction reckoned by the dark traits was from 14 to 51, with Service Orientation counting for lower where deals counting for further. Specifically, public confidence was a positive strong predictor for all six scores, followed by fantasized gift. It seems that the most common predictor of the six work outgrowth scores is organised and conforming which are positive predictors and indecisive and norms are negative predictors.

## Discussion

The first findings concerned the internal trustability of the dark-side hand model HDS. Around half of the baselines are within respectable ranges (for three subscales per scale) inferring some variations of the measure may be necessary. There are those still who see the nascence as a implicit measure of redundancy and are more forgiving of low baselines as long as the scales show other measures of trustability (test-pretest, resolve half) and further particularly validity (construct, prophetic).

Regarding the alternate end of the study our thesis were incompletely verified. As exploration has shown (42) traits that are related with Borderline and Neurotic characteristics have negative relation with work-related goods similar as performance. As in Furnham et al.'s (2012) study, personality traits that are related with temperamental, unpredictable, unpredictable behaviours (hyperexcitable) are delicate to work with and accordingly are negative predictors of the six work variables. Our results verified, the thesis that subscales of the Moving Down from Others factor will be negative predictors of colorful aspects of work success. The hand unassertive was a positive predictor for service exposure and trustability. Making opinions sluggishly seems to be salutary for occupations that are related with integrity and pleasing guests and/ or others. It provides a feeling of cooperativeness.

Our alternate thesis was incompletely verified. We set up those subscales similar as "fantasized gift" and "public confidence" are the strongest positive predictors amongst utmost of the professions. Interestingly, overconfidence wasn't a significant predictor. amongst utmost of the professions. Interestingly, overconfidence wasn't a significant predictor. This suggests that people with confidence are perceived able, whereas the verity seems to be that it's their belief in their fantasized gift that's what makes them feel more successful. In addition, we set up that the manipulation and curiosity are negative predictors in utmost of the outgrowth variables, whereas parlous and tone-display are positive predictors for deals but strong negative predictors for trustability. also, "impulsive" is a positive predictor of Service Orientation and deals but negative for trustability. These findings are in line with Furnham et al. (2012), and Furnham (2018b) showing that Mischievous was a positive predictor of Service Orientation, deals and negative for trustability.

Our thesis about the super-factor moving towards others was incompletely verified, still two subscales were positive predictors and two negative predictors of the outgrowth measures. More specifically, the angles norms and indecisive were both negative predictors for Stress Forbearance and pastoral. In addition, indecisive as also a negative predictor for directorial Success. Organised and norms were positive predictors for Stress Forbearance, director Success and Service exposure, trustability and pastoral consequently. Interestingly, norms and organised are both traits associated with meticulousness (that is the strongest work-related predictor for success in any profession (32). still, the former is a negative predictor whereas the ultimate is a positive predictor. A possible explanation could be that norms may be more associated with micro-managing therefore being a negative predictor. This an illustration of where a hand approach can explain anomalies or dichotomies in the literature.

Another intriguing finding was that the friction explained by this factor was veritably low (lower than 10). A possible explanation for this outgrowth could be that substantially Stress Forbearance and pastoral variables were explained by these subscales whereas deals wasn't prognosticated by any subscale. pastoral is associated with professions related to follow directions which is nicely explained by subscales that are related to Dutiful.

The streamlined HDS provides us with some veritably useful perceptivity as to which subscales are the bones that make each scale a positive or a negative predictor.

Primarily, unpredictable and no direction and fearful are the stronger subscales that contribute to make the Moving Down from others as overall a negative predictor for job success. pessimistic, tough, unresistant-aggressive, withdrawn and distrusting aren't predictors in any occupation whereas unassertive is a positive predictor for only two professions. This leads us to the conclusion that query, burst of wrathfulness and fear are the strongest traits contributing to someone being unprofitable at work and leading to implicit derailment. Also, public confidence is the only positive predictor for all six work outgrowth measures, followed by fantasized gift.

Manipulative and eccentric are negative predictors, followed by entitled. parlous, impulsive and tone-display are positive predictors for some occupations but negative for others. Interestingly, overconfidence distractible weren't predictors on any of the six work success scales. There's a fine line between overconfidence, fantasized gift and public speech in language. The difference of overconfidence and fantasized gift is that in the former the individual believes generally in his/ her capacities whereas in the after believes that retain unusual maybe unique bents, in. Public confidence is more on making people engaged and presenting ideas with enthusiasm and energy.

Eventually, the capability to be scrupulous and on time as well as probative, collaborative and putting away particular passions while following instructions are the strongest predictors of work success. This is no doubt because it gives the print of a dependable existent that's suitable to execute orders indeed if (s) he believes that those aren't correct, showing a high position of maturity norms has a negative relation since it seems to be related to micro-managing therefore noway being suitable to please with someone's work and being fixated in trivial effects. Also, indecisive is perceived as lack of independent thinking and being visionary. Interestingly, perfectionism and ingratiating don't prognosticate anything. A possible explanation could be that norms is about being fixated with high performance that could lead to micro-managing, perfectionism is about work in general whereas organised is further about time, rules and thoroughness. As, in the case of conforming it shows a position of maturity and responsibility, whereas norms and perfectionism can be perceived as peculiar, maybe inordinate behaviours.

## Conflict of Interest

The author declares he have no conflict of interest.

## References

1. [Altman, D. G. \(1991\). Practical Statistics for Medical Research. Chapman & Hall: London.](#)
2. [American Psychiatric Association. \(2000\). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders \(4th ed., text rev.\) Washington, DC: Author.](#)
3. [Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. \(1980\). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 588 - 606.](#)
4. [Board, B. J., & Fritzon, K. \(2005\). Disordered personalities at work. Psychology, Crime & Law, 11, 17-32.](#)
5. [Brown, T. A. \(2015\). Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research 2nd edition. The Guilford Press: New York.](#)
6. [Cortina, J. M. \(1993\). What is coefficient alpha: an examination of theory and applications? Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 98-104.](#)
7. [Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. \(1992\). Revised NEO Personality Inventory \(NEO-PI-R\) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory \(NEO-FFI\) Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources](#)



8. [Dilchert, S., Ones, D.S., & Krueger, R.F. \(2014\). Maladaptive Personality Constructs, Measures, and Work Behaviors. \*Industrial and Organizational Psychology\*, 7, 98-110.](#)
9. [Field, A. \(2013\). \*Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics\*. Sage.](#)
10. [Furnham, A. \(2018a\). Personality and Occupational Success. In Virgil Zeigler-Hill & Todd K. Shackelford \(Eds\). \*The SAGE Handbook of Personality and Individual Differences\*. New York: Sage. Pp 537-551.](#)
11. [Furnham, A. \(2018b\). Dark Side Correlates of Job Reliability and Stress Tolerance in two large samples. \*Personality and Individual Differences\*, 117, 255-259.](#)
12. [Furnham, A., & MacRae, I. \(2020\). The Dark Side of Work Values. \*Current Psychology\*, 39, 1725-1731](#)
13. [Furnham, A., Trickey, G., & Hyde, G. \(2012\). Bright aspects to dark side traits: Dark side traits associated with work success. \*Personality and Individual Differences\*, 52, 908-913.](#)
14. [Furnham, A., Hyde, G., & Trickey, G. \(2013a\). The values of work success. \*Personality and Individual Differences\*, 55, 485-489](#)
15. [Furnham, A., Crump, J., & Ritchie \(2013b\). What it takes: Ability, demographic, bright and dark side trait correlates of years to promotion. \*Personality and Individual Differences\*, 55, 952-956.](#)
16. [Furnham, A., Richards, S., & Paulhus, D. \(2013\). The Dark Triad: A 10-year review. \*Social and Personality Psychology Compass\*, 7, 199-216.](#)
17. [Furnham, A., Humphries, C., & Zheng, E. \(2016\). Can successful sales people become successful managers? Differences in Derailers and Motives across two jobs. \*Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research\*, 68, 252-268.](#)
18. [Gaddis, B. H., & Foster, J. L. \(2015\). Meta-Analysis of Dark Side Personality Characteristics and Critical Work Behaviors among Leaders across the Globe: Findings and Implications for Leadership Development and Executive Coaching. \*Applied Psychology\*, 64, 25-54.](#)
19. [Gøtzsche-Astrup, O., Jakobsen, J., & Furnham, A. \(2016\). The higher you climb: dark side personality and job level in a sample of executives, middle managers, and entry-level supervisors. \*Scandinavian Journal of Psychology\*, 57, 535-541.](#)
20. [Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Tay, L., Donnellan, M. B., Harms, P. D., Robins, R. W., & Yan, T. \(2015\). Gender differences in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. \*Psychological Bulletin\*, 141, 261-275.](#)
21. [Harms, P. D., Spain, S. M., & Hannah, S. T. \(2011\). Leader development and the dark side of personality. \*The Leadership Quarterly\*, 22, 495-509.](#)
22. [Harrison, S., Furnham, A., & Grover, S. \(2018\). The perception of personality disorders by employers, employees and co-workers. \*Psychiatry Research\*, 270, 1082-1091.](#)
23. [Hogan, R. \(2014\). \*Hogan Development Survey: Form Five. Technical Manual\*. Tulsa, OK: HAS](#)
24. [Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. \(1997a\). \*Hogan development survey manual\*. Tulsa, OK: HAS.](#)
25. [Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. \(1997b\). \*Hogan personality inventory manual\*. Tulsa, OK: HAS.](#)
26. [Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. \(2001\). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. \*International Journal of Selection and Assessment\*, 9, 40-51.](#)
27. [Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. \(2009\). \*Hogan development survey manual\*. Tulsa, OK: HAS.](#)
28. [Horney, K. \(1950\). \*The Collected Works of Karen Horney \(Vol. 2\)\*. New York: WW Norton.](#)
29. [Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., & Simon, L. S. \(2013\). Hierarchical representations of the Five Factor Model of Personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks with two theoretical perspectives. \*Journal of Applied Psychology\*, 98, 875-925.](#)
30. [Kaiser, R. B., LeBreton, J. M., & Hogan, J. \(2015\). The dark side of personality and extreme leader behavior. \*Applied Psychology\*, 64\(1\), 55-92.](#)
31. [McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. \(1999\). A five-factor theory of personality. \*Handbook of personality: Theory and Research\*, 2, 139-153.](#)
32. [Li, N., Barrick, M. R., Zimmerman, R. D., & Chiaburu, D. S. \(2014\). Retaining the productive employee: The role of personality. \*Academy of Management Annals\*, 8, 347-395.](#)
33. [Lusk, D., & Hayes, T. \(Eds\). \(2021\). \*The Good, the Bad, and the Human Dark Side at Work\*. New York: SIOP](#)
34. [Nagpal, J., Kumar, A., Kakar, S., & Bhartia, A. \(2010\). The Development of 'Quality of Life Instrument for Indian Diabetes Patients \(QOLID\). \*Journal of Association Physicians India\*, 58, 295-305.](#)
35. [Ouimet, G. \(2010\). Dynamics of narcissistic leadership in organizations: Towards an integrated research model. \*Journal of Managerial Psychology\*, 25, 713-726.](#)
36. [Palaïou, K., & Furnham, A. \(2014\). Are bosses unique? Personality facet differences between CEOs and staff in five work sectors. \*Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research\*, 66, 173-196.](#)
37. [Simonet, D. V., Tett, R. P., Foster, J., Angelbeck, A., & Bartlett, J. \(2017\). Dark side personality trait interactions: Amplifying negative predictions of leadership performance. \*Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies\*, On line](#)
38. [Spain, S. M., Harms, P., & LeBreton, J. M. \(2014\). The dark side of personality at work. \*Journal of Organizational Behavior\*, 35\(S1\), S41-S60.](#)
39. [Strainer, D. L., & Norman, G. R. \(2008\). \*Health measurement scales: a practical guide to their development and use\*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.](#)
40. [Teodorescu, A., Furnham, A., & Macrae, I. \(2017\). Trait correlates of success at work. \*International Journal of Selection and Assessment\*, 25, 36-42.](#)
41. [Thompson, R.J., Payne, S.C., Horner, M.T., & Morey, L.C. \(2012\). Why borderline personality features adversely affect job performance: The role of task strategies. \*Personality and Individual Differences\*, 52, 32-36.](#)
42. [Winsborough, D. L., & Sambath, V. \(2013\). Not like us: An investigation. Treglown, L., Zivkov, K., Zarola, T., & Furnham, A. \(2018\). Intention to quit and the role of dark personality and perceived organizational support: a moderation and mediation model. \*Plos One\*, 13e, 0195155.](#)



43. [Treglown, L., Zivkov, K., Zarola, T., & Furnham, A. \(2018\). Intention to quit and the role of dark personality and perceived organizational support: a moderation and mediation model. Plos One, 13e, 0195155.](#)

**Ready to submit your research? Choose Alcrut and benefit from:**

- fast, convenient online submission
- rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- authors retain copyrights
- unique DOI for all articles
- immediate, unrestricted online access

At Alcrut, research is always in progress.

Learn more:

<https://alcrut.com/Journals/index.php?jname=Clinics%20in%20Psychology%20and%20Mental%20Health%20Research>



This work is licensed under creative commons attribution 4.0

To Submit your article Click Here: [Submit Manuscript](#)

