JEL Classification: M12, M54

Anna Tomkova,
Ph.D., The University of Presov in Presov, Slovakia
ORCID ID, 0000-0002-6285-2300
email: anna.tomkova@unipo.sk
Ivana Ondrijova,
Ph.D., The University of Presov in Presov, Slovakia
ORCID ID, 0000-0003-4760-5931
email: ivana.ondrijova@unipo.sk
Dagmara Ratnayake-Kascakova,
Ph.D., The University of Presov in Presov, Slovakia
ORCID ID, 0000-0002-9829-1293
email: dagmara.ratnayake-kascakova@unipo.sk
Jozef Nemec,
Ph.D., The University of Presov in Presov, Slovakia
ORCID ID, 0000-0002-0969-9319
email: jozef.nemec@unipo.sk

Correspondence author: ivana.ondrijova@unipo.sk

LEADERS AND MACHIAVELLIAN MANIFESTATIONS: WORKERS' INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT AND BUSINESS PERFORMANCE

Abstract. *This research aims to assess the level of manipulation of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in the work process within selected socio-demographic characteristics of employees. Based on the described theoretical basis, three hypotheses were established. The hypotheses concern is examining the differences between manipulation and Machiavellian manifestations regarding employees' residence (urban or rural), the sphere of the organization (private or public) in which they work, and the age of employees. The data were obtained through a questionnaire survey in which 123 respondents participated. The study involved methodological tools such as CASADI (Calculativness, Self-Assertion, Diplomacy) and MPS (Machiavellian Personality Scale). The new CASADI methodology identifies Machiavellian manifestations in business and managerial behavior. It contains statements that relate to the respondent's opinion on manipulation between people. The MPS methodology was created for leaders in determining the level of their manipulation through four factors determining Machiavellianism. The survey results were evaluated through a t-test and Pearson's correlation coefficient. The findings confirmed the differences in Self-Assertion, Desire for Control, and Distrust regarding respondents' residence. The study of age differences recorded the statistical significance for the attribute of Diplomacy within Machiavellian manifestations and the attribute of Desire for social status within the manipulation of leaders. Within the differences between the private and public spheres, statistical significance was recorded for the attributes of Machiavellian manifestations of Computation and Self-Enforcement, and for the attributes of the manipulation of leaders Amorality, Desire for Control and Distrust of others. The research results indicated that employees living in the city might have a higher degree of Machiavellianism. It is reflected in their motivation for for-profit and the need to control others and not trust them. Research suggested that the rate of Machiavellianism decreases with age. In the case of the organization activity where the employee works, it was found that Machiavellian tendencies were more pronounced in employees of the private sphere.*
Keywords: CASADI, Machiavellianism, manipulation, MPS, organization.

Introduction. The construct of Machiavellianism was originally developed by Christie and Geis (1970) based on their studies of political and religious extremist groups and eventually focused on how the leaders

of these groups manipulated their subordinates to fulfill their desires. They identified several topics that are extremely important to effective manipulators, such as the willingness to use manipulative tactics, amoral action, and the promotion of a cynical, distrustful view of human nature. Machiavellianism uses other tools to accomplish its own goals (Christie and Geis, 1970; Wilson et al., 1996). Individuals who exhibit a high level of Machiavellian tend to resist social influences, try to control their interpersonal interactions, and show a general lack of influence in their relationships (Bedell et al., 2006). Dahling et al. (2009) described Machiavellianism as a construct based on inner beliefs, values, and motivations. Although it involves amoral manipulation, highly Machiavellian people are not constantly and actively involved in amoral manipulation. They tend to be very adaptive. If they realize that this would accelerate their goals and interests, they could engage in pro-organizational behavior in a friendly and cooperative manner. Besides, Judge et al. (2009) pointed out such manifestations of Machiavellian behavior. Machiavellianism as such speaks of the means that man chooses to achieve something. Wilson et al. (1996) showed that unethical Machiavellian tactics in real life rarely led to success. It was proved that the positive correlation between Machiavellianism depends on the context, the field specificity to the education level, or the situation ambiguity. In unclear situations where people receive asymmetric information, the advantage is highly Machiavellian people who could more easily and quickly adapt and apply more adaptable strategies to maximize their own profit. The research aims to assess the level of manipulation of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in the work process within selected socio-demographic characteristics of employees.

Literature Review. Kessler et al. (2010) aptly defined Machiavellianism in the work environment. This study introduced the organizational Machiavellianism concept. The authors characterized it as a belief in manipulation when it is necessary to achieve the desired goals. Organizational Machiavellians are individuals who are comfortable exploiting others and doing so when it is beneficial to them. The key theme of organizational Machiavellian is that he would use manipulative and deceptive strategies only when advantageous. These employees are not necessarily callous, disgusting, or vindictive, but they could be truly accommodating and respectful if it is in their best interests. Motowidlo et al. (1997) pointed out that work performance includes two dimensions: performance of tasks (activities related to the organization's technical support) and contextual performance. Contextual performance is behavior that is not formally required as part of a job but facilitates or makes it easier to maintain a broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which technical support operates (Bergman et al., 2008). The contextual performance could be understood as the part of work where Machiavellian tendencies are most pronounced, as personality variables influence it.

Drory and Glusinkos (1980) examined the performance of groups led by Machiavellian leaders and found that highly Machiavellian leaders showed considerable flexibility in handling structured or unstructured tasks. However, these leaders also showed a highly directive leadership style with minimal regard for interpersonal interests. Gemmill and Heisler (1972), Siegel (1973) and Frankovsky et al. (2015) also point to these trends in management.

Wilson et al. (1996) pointed out that Machiavellians hide their true nature in a group for as long as possible. They use their exploitative abilities and then move on to another unsuspecting group as knowledge of their tendencies expands. This tendency leads them to change groups frequently, which means that Machiavellians are likely to have great fluctuations and focus only on their benefits.

Sendjaya et al. (2014) examined Machiavellianism concerning the authenticity and morality of leaders. They found that moral reasoning rather interacted with low Machiavellianism and created higher authentic leadership behavior. They further state that authentic leadership promotes the moral conduct of leaders when influenced by characteristics associated with lower Machiavellianism (i.e., a greater focus on the needs and interests of others).Ross and Robertson (2000) stated that Machiavellianism is positively related to the willingness to lie. Manipulation and deception do not constitute the ethical conduct of leaders.

Brown and Trevino (2006) indicated that Machiavellian leaders are motivated to manipulate others to achieve their own goals, unlike ethical leaders. They have little confidence in people and, conversely, they tend not to trust others. It follows that Machiavellianism and ethical leadership are negatively related. Unethical behavior could certainly bring beneficial results, even though these results may not be sustainable (Veiga, 2004; Lajcin et al., 2014).

Machiavellians could demonstrate prosocial and coercive strategies to achieve their goals successfully (Hawley, 2003). They are skilled in making agreements and work with others to advance their interests. Machiavellian leaders are good liars and skilled in creating the desired image (DePaulo and Rosenthal, 1979). Deluga (2001) found that Machiavellianism is positively associated with the leader's charism. Ali et al. (2009), Jones and Paulhus (2009), Paulhus and Williams (2002) explored Machiavellian personality traits, attitudes, and moral sense. Besides, Mischel (1968) and Pervin and John (1997) noted that individuals might behave differently in different situations regarding manifestations of Machiavellianism.

The following four factors are often associated with Machiavellianism and success: gender, age, ethnicity, and birth order (Ricks and Fraedrich, 1999). Gable and Topol (1991) showed a partial connection between gender and Machiavellianism. Age is considered an important variable of success, and research has shown that younger managers are more Machiavellian than older managers (Lumpkin and Rawwas, 1991). Ricks and Fraedrich (1999) sugged that gender is a modifier of sales volume, with older, more experienced women selling at higher volume levels. This study assumes that the degree of Machiavellianism is related to the leader's age, originating point (city or countryside), the type of organization where employee works (public or private).

Methodology and research methods. The research aims to assess the level of manipulation of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in the work process within selected socio-demographic characteristics of employees. Based on the theoretical background and the goal of the research, three hypotheses were established:

H1: It is assumed that there are statistically significant differences in selected attributes of assessing the manipulation level of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in the work process regarding respondents' residence.

H2: It is assumed that there are statistically significant relationships in selected attributes of assessing manipulation level of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in the work process regarding age.

H3: It is assumed that there are statistically significant differences in selected attributes of assessing the manipulation level of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in the work process between the private and public spheres.

Within the quantitative research, a questionnaire method of collecting empirical data and mathematical-statistical methods were used to analyze the obtained data in the SPSS program. For verifying the established hypotheses, the data were obtained from the respondents through the following questionnaires.

The CASADI methodology (Frankovsky et al., 2017) was designed to detect Machiavellian business and managerial behavior manifestations. Three factors extracted using factor analysis are calculativness (CA), self-assertion (SA), and diplomacy (DI). The new CASADI methodology contains statements that relate to the respondent's opinion on manipulation between people. The individual items of the questionnaire were inspired by the publication The Prince by Niccol Machiavelli (2007). The questionnaire contains 17 items, to which the respondents answer using the scale «0 – definitely no, 1 – no; 2 – rather no than yes; 3 – rather yes than no; 4 – yes, 5 – definitely yes».

Factor analysis using the Principal Component method with Varimax rotation extracted three factors that confirmed the presumed factor structure of Machiavellian manifestations in business behavior. These factors were characterized as follows.

Calculativness – respondents who score higher in this factor are more convinced that people's control must be maintained at all costs. These respondents believe that it is necessary to tell others what they want to hear and that it is necessary to gain knowledge so that they could be used to control others. Calculating people believe that when two competitors compete, it is necessary to recognize whose victory is more beneficial. In any case, it is beneficial to base their power on the control of other people. Cronbach's alpha is 0.760.

Self-Assertion – respondents who score higher in this factor are characterized by the fact that they believe that only such a person is reliable, who relies on himself and his strength. A successful person must always keep in mind the necessity to avoid allies stronger than himself. Besides, this factor adheres that whoever helps another seize power cuts the branch on which they sit. And then the one who wants to stay in power must consider all the necessary tough measures in advance and take them all at once so that he does not have to return to them later. Cronbach's alpha is 0.521.

Diplomacy – respondents who score higher in this factor are characterized by the fact that they are constantly collecting information that could later be used for their benefit. Skillful diplomacy is used to control others, and false and indirect communication is preferred. Respondents surround themselves with capable people and society in general and show them generosity and recognition at the right time. Cronbach's alpha is 0.696.

Dahling et al. (2009) developed the MPS (Machiavellian Personality Scale) methodology. This methodology was created for leaders in determining the level of their manipulation. The construct is based on studies of political and religious extremist groups as leaders of these groups manipulate their subordinates (Christie and Geis 1970).

The methodology contains 16 items, and its internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) is 0.89. Items are judged on a 5-point scale (1 – strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree). Factor Component Analysis with Varimax rotation extracted four factors determining Machiavellianism, which Dahling et al. (2009) named:

Amorality – those who score higher in this factor believe that they would prevail over others by deception. They know how to use the information to their advantage and just have a conversation with others. These people behave unethically if they believe it would help them succeed. They often commit fraud and could sabotage others as long as they threaten their goals. Cronbach's alpha is 0.790.

The Desire for status – in this factor, higher-scoring individuals know that social status is a good sign of success in life. Their efforts are focused on material security and wealth. These people want to be rich and influential. Cronbach's alpha is 0.709.

Desire for control – people characterized by a higher score in this factor enjoy controlling the situation. In interpersonal relationships, some give orders, and overall control over others satisfies them to the maximum. Cronbach's alpha is 0.831.

Distrust of others – people characterized by a higher score in this factor do not like teamwork and distrust others. If they are already in the team, they kick each other's knees because they want to be unique. They are motivated only based on personal gain. They claim others would use the situation to their advantage without hesitation if they showed them any work weakness. They think that people are planning ways to benefit from the situation on their behalf. Cronbach's alpha is 0.731.

The research sample consisted of 123 respondents. The average respondents' age was 31.85 years (standard deviation was 9.637 years). Notably, 86 (70%) of the respondents were from the city, 37 (30%) – from the countryside. From the work point of view, 100 (81%) of respondents were from the private sphere, 23 (19%) –from the public sphere.

Results. The mathematical-statistical t-test method compared the differences in selected attributes of manipulating leaders and Machiavellian manifestations between urban and rural areas.

Table 1 describes selected attributes for assessing the level of manipulation of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in the work process in terms of respondents' residence. Within the

differences concerning the residence, statistical significance was recorded for the attribute of
Machiavellian manifestations of Self-Enforcement and human manipulation, the Desire for Control and
Distrust of others. Higher average values were measured for respondents from the city. Respondents from
the city are more rely on themselves and their forces

**Table 1. Differences in selected attributes of leader manipulation and Machiavellian
manifestations within the place of residence**

	Residence	Mean	St. Deviation	t	Sig (2-tailed)
Calculativness	City	2.7256	1.02856	1.487	0.140
	Countryside	2.4162	1.12485		
Self-Assertion	City	3.1860	0.80548	2.405	0.018
	Countryside	2.7838	0.94861		
Diplomacy	City	3.4826	0.76460	0.138	0.890
	Countryside	3.4662	0.51593		
Amorality	City	2.7558	1.16474	1.546	0.125
	Countryside	2.4000	1.18322		
Desire for status	City	3.3256	0.98747	0.868	0.387
	Countryside	3.1622	0.88409		
Desire for control	City	3.1822	0.95062	2.646	0.009
	Countryside	2.6937	0.91077		
Distrust of others	City	3.2674	0.95381	2.264	0.025
	Countryside	2.8595	0.82174		

Sources: developed by the authors.

They avoid stronger allies. These respondents could control the situation, often give orders, want to
be unique. Besides, their motivation is personal gain. For the other attributes, no statistical significance
was recorded in the distribution regarding the residence. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to
verify the relationship in selected attributes for assessing the level of manipulation and Machiavellian
manifestations in terms of age (Table 2).

**Table 2. Relationships between age and selected attributes of leader manipulation and
Machiavellian manifestations**

		Calculativ-ness	Self-Assertion	Diplomacy	Amorality	Desire for status	Desire for control	Distrust of others
Age	r	.099	-.044	-.212*	.037	-.264**	-.061	-.057
	p	.276	.632	.019	.685	.003	.503	.530

*. ** Correlation significant at the significance level 0.05 and 0.01.
Sources: developed by the authors.

As part of the study of age differences, statistical significance was recorded for the attribute of
Diplomacy within Machiavellian manifestations and the attribute of Desire for status within the manipulation
of leaders. This negative correlation indicates that the older the respondents are, the less they promote
elements of diplomacy for their own benefit. At the same time, social status is no longer successful in their
lives. For the other attributes, no statistical significance was recorded regarding age differences. The
mathematical-statistical t-test method was used to determine the differences in selected attributes of
manipulating leaders and Machiavellian manifestations between the private and public spheres.

Table 3 describes selected attributes of leader manipulation and Machiavellian manifestations based
on the classification in the organization.

Table 3. Differences in selected attributes of leader manipulation and Machiavellian
manifestations within the organization

	Classification in the organization	Mean	St. Deviation	t	Sig (2-tailed)
Calculativness	private	2.7920	1.03237	3.638	0.000
	public	1.9391	0.92527		
Self-Assertion	private	3.2100	0.76436	3.446	0.002
	public	2.4348	1.01471		
Diplomacy	private	3.5100	0.67506	1.074	0.285
	public	3.3370	0.78646		
Amorality	private	2.8120	1.18196	4.050	0.000
	public	1.9391	0.86431		
Desire for status	private	3.2733	0.92160	-0.074	0.941
	public	3.2899	1.12054		
Desire for control	private	3.1833	0.88048	3.747	0.000
	public	2.3913	1.05242		
Distrust of others	private	3.2480	0.91987	2.624	0.010
	public	2.6957	0.86523		

Sources: developed by the authors.

Within the differences, statistical significance was recorded for the attributes of Machiavellian
manifestations of Calculativness and Self-Assertion, and the attributes of manipulation of the leaders'
Amorality, Desire for Control, and Distrust of others. Higher average values were measured in the private
sector. Rather, private-sector workers are inclined to believe that it is essential to tell others what they
want to hear and at the same time use it to their advantage. They rely on themselves and could sabotage
others. Overall control over others reassures them. Besides, they do not like teamwork.

The hypotheses could be confirmed because the assumptions that there are statistically significant
differences in selected attributes of leader manipulation and Machiavellian manifestations regarding
differences by residence and classification in the organization have been confirmed. There are statistically
significant relationships in selected attributes of leader manipulation and Machiavellian manifestations
regarding age.

Conclusions. In the context of manipulating leaders and Machiavellian expressions, statistically
significant differences in selected attributes of assessing the level of leaders' manipulation of and
Machiavellian expressions in the work process regarding employee residence were examined. Higher
values were measured among respondents from the city with the Self-Assertion attribute, the Desire for
Control, and Distrust of others. It has been found that employees who have indicated a city as their place
of residence believe that they will only be successful if they rely on themselves and their strength. They
give orders more often and like to control the situation. Compared to rural employees, these are employees
who are motivated mainly based on personal gain.

Frankovsky et al. (2018) researched manifestations of manipulation, where they compared traders
and non-traders from other sectors of the economy. They recorded a statistically significant difference in
selected attributes of manifestations of manipulation, where traders achieved higher scores than
employees from other sectors of the economy. Compared to employees in other sectors of the economy,
trade workers expressed a higher degree of agreement with manipulative behaviors.

By examining statistically significant relationships in selected attributes of assessing the level of manipulation of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in terms of age, we found a statistically significant difference in the attribute of diplomacy and Desire for social status. This negative correlation testifies that the older the respondents, the lower their Desire for social status and is not to a large extent a sign of success in life for them. With increasing age, these employees do not generally choose the company, and their communication misses the false and indirect.

Jaffe et al. (2019) focused on whether a high level of Machiavellianism could lead to dishonest behavior. In one part of the study, it was shown that the age of the respondents played an unexpectedly important role, as it is negatively correlated with Machiavellianism. They found no support for the assumption that Machiavellianism strongly predicted dishonest behavior. They also found no support for the interaction between Machiavellianism and the constructive level of dishonest behavior. However, research suggests that age may play an important role in examining the interaction between Machiavellianism and the constructive level. According to the findings, the younger respondents gather more information from various sources, while the older ones focus on clear facts. Young people are rather indirect and dishonest, which is the opposite of older respondents.

Statistically significant differences in selected attributes of assessing the level of manipulation of leaders and Machiavellian manifestations in the work process regarding inclusion in the organization of employees were examined. Higher values were measured in the private sphere within the attributes of manipulation of leaders Amorality, Desire for control, and Distrust of others. Within Machiavellian manifestations, higher values were measured for the Calculativness and Self-Assertion attributes. Research suggests that private employees rely on themselves and often use the information to their advantage. They are among those who give orders and are motivated only based on personal gain.

Ibragimov et al. (2018) found that the characteristics of Machiavellianism and manipulation (indirect, hidden and implicit influence, deception, disrespect for moral and ethical norms and social and cultural values, focus on domination, control, coercion, use of force, use of others as objects, objects, programming of ideas, intentions, etc.) are rather features of public administration. Besides, they refer to special and interpersonal relationships.

Frankovsky et al. (2017) focused on manipulative manifestations in business behavior, admitted other interesting findings. Using the CASADI methodology, a statistical difference was recorded from the organization's point of view in the attribute of diplomacy, where respondents from the private sphere were more inclined to skillful diplomacy.

Wrobel (2008) indicated the essence of manipulation is to influence people and social influence. The manipulator uses his knowledge of the rules of human action, trying to exert the desired influence on a person or group of people so that they are not aware that they are subjected to the target action. The scientist stated that the interest of an individual is not always identical with the interest of society. In this case, those who hold power in society reach for different manipulation methods – the goals set by the perpetrator of the manipulation conflict with the manipulated person's goals. Knowledge of the purpose of the procedure is given only to the manipulator and not to the manipulated person. Generally, the person who is the object of manipulation accepts these goals into his life unconsciously. However, the degree of participation of his consciousness varies, from unconscious submission to external control, through various forms of pretense, to the conscious involvement in manipulation.

The study showed that the degree of manipulation and Machiavellian manifestations could be related to different socio-demographic characteristics. As mentioned in previous research, this one also confirmed the importance of age and the work sphere. The new finding is that even the place where a person lives, the city or the countryside, can play its part in the tendency to manipulate and Machiavellian manifestations. It creates a precondition for new similar research dealing with other socio-demographic characteristics related to manipulation and Machiavellianism.

References

Ali, F., Amorim, S., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2009). Empathy deficits and trait emotional intelligence in psychopathy and Machiavellianism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, (47) 7, 758-762. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Bedell, K., Hunter, S., Angie, A., & Vert, A. (2006). A historiometric examination of Machiavellianism and a new taxonomy of leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12, 50–72. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Bergman, M. E., Donovan, M. A., Drasgow, F., Overton, R. C., & Henning, J. B. (2008). Test of Theory of Individual Differences in Task and Contextual Performance. *Human Performance*, *21*(3), 227-253. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). Studies in Machiavellianism. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Dahling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G., & Levy, P. E. (2009). The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale. *Journal of Management*, 35, 219–257. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Deluga, R. J. (2001). American presidential Machiavellianism: Implications for charismatic leadership and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12(3), 339–353. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

DePaulo, B. M., & Rosenthal, R. (1979). Telling lies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(10), 1713–1722. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Drory, A., & Gluskinos, U. M. (1980). Machiavellianism and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 81-86. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Frankovsky, M., Birknerova, Z., & Tomkova, A. (2017). Dotazník zisťovania machiavellistickych prejavov v obchodnom spravaní – VYSEDI (prírucka). Bookman, s. r. o., Presov.

Frankovsky, M., Birknerova, Z., & Tomkova, A. (2018). Prejavy manipulacie v obchodnom spravaní – porovnanie obchodníkov a nie-obchodníkov z inych odvetví hospodarstva. In Psychologia prace a organizacie. Zborník príspevkov z medzinarodnej vedeckej konferencie. Kosice, Katedra psychologie Filozofickej fakulty Univerzity Pavla Jozefa Safarika v Kosiciach, 2019.

Frankovsky, M., Zbihlejova, L., & Birknerova, Z. (2015). Links between the social intelligence attributes and forms of coping with demanding situations in managerial practice. *In 2nd International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts, SGEM2015 Conference Proceedings*, (1)1, 109-116. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Gemmill, G. R., & Heisler, W. J. (1972). Machiavellianism as a factor in managerial job strain, job satisfaction, and upward mobility. *Academy of Management Journal*, 15, 51–62. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Hawley, P. H. (2003). Prosocial and coercive configurations of resource control in early adolescence: A case for the well adapted Machiavellian. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 49(3), 279–309. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Ibragimov, I. D., Sangadzhiev, B. V., Kashurnikov, S. N., Sharonov, I. A., Krokhina, J. A., & Obstaravacia, S. V. (2018). Machiavellianism and manipulation: From social philosophy to social psychology. *XLinguae*, *11*(2), 404. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Jaffe, M. E., Greifeneder, R., & Reinhard, M. A. (2019). Manipulating the odds: The effects of Machiavellianism and construal level on cheating behavior. *PloS one*, *14*(11), e0224526. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2009). Machiavellianism. In Leary, M. R. and Hoyle, R. H. (Eds.), Individual differences in social behavior. The Guilford Press, New York, 93-108. [Google Scholar]

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leadertraits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 855–875. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Kessler, S. R., Bandelli, A. C., Spector, P. E., Borman, W. C., Nelson, C. E., & Penney, L. M. (2010). Re-Examining Machiavelli: A Three-Dimensional Model of Machiavellianism in the Workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40, 1868-1896. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Lajcin, D., Slavikova, G., & Frankovsky, M. (2014). Social intelligence as a significant predictor of managerial behaviour. *Economics journal*, *6*, 646-660. [Google Scholar]

Machiavelli, N. (2007). The Prince. XYZ, Prague.

Mischel, W. (1968*).* Introduction to personality. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, New York*.*

Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10, 71–83. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, (36) 6, 556-563. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Pervin, L. A.*, &* John, O. P. (1997*).* Personality: Theory and research. John Wiley & Sons, New York. [Google Scholar]

Ricks, J., & Fraedrich, J. (1999). The paradox of Machiavellianism: Machiavellianism may make for productive sales but poor management reviews. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *20*(3), 197-205. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Ross, W. T., & Robertson, D. C. (2000). Lying: The impact of decision context. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *10*(2), 409-440.
[Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Sendjaya, S., Pekerti, A., Härtel, C., Hirst, G., & Butarbutar, I. (2014). Are authentic leaders always moral? The role of
Machiavellianism in the relationship between authentic leadership and morality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *133*(1), 125-139. [Google
Scholar] [CrossRef]

Siegel, J. P. (1973). Machiavellianism, MBA's and managers: Leadership correlatesand socialization effects. *Academy of
Management Journal*, 16, 404–411. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Veiga, J. F. (2004). Bringing ethics into the mainstream: An introduction to the special topic. *Academy of Management
Perspectives*, *18*(2), 37-38. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Wilson, D. S., Near, D., & Miller, R. R. (1996). Machiavellianism: a synthesis of the evolutionary and psychological
literatures. *Psychological bulletin*, *119*(2), 285. [Google Scholar]

Wrobel, A. (2008). *Vychova a manipulace*. Grada Publishing as. [Google Scholar]

Анна Томкова, Ph.D., Пряшівський університет в Пряшеві, Словаччина
Івана Ондрійова, Ph.D., Пряшівський університет в Пряшеві, Словаччина
Дагмара Ратнаяке Каскакова, Ph.D., Пряшівський університет в Пряшеві, Словаччина
Йозеф Немец, Ph.D., Пряшівський університет в Пряшеві, Словаччина

Лідерство та Макіавеллівські прояви: інноваційний розвиток працівників та ефективність бізнесу

Метою статті є оцінювання рівня маніпулювання керівників та проявів макіавеллізму в трудовому колективі залежно від
його соціально-демографічних характеристик. На основі теоретичного аналізу визначено три гіпотези щодо вивчення
відмінностей між маніпуляціями та проявами макіавеллізму з точки зору місця проживання працівників (міських чи сільських),
форми власності організації (приватної чи державної) та віку працівників. Вихідні дані дослідження сформовано на основі
результатів опитування 123 респондентів. Для перевірки висунутих гіпотез застосовано методологічний інструментарій
CASADI (розсудливість, самоствердження, дипломатичність) та шкалу макіавеллізму особистості (MPS). Використання
CASADI дозволило визначити прояви макіавеллізму в бізнесі та управлінській поведінці на основі результатів оцінювання
думки респондентів щодо маніпуляцій між людьми. Методологія MPS дозволила оцінити рівень маніпуляцій керівників.
Практичну реалізацію усіх етапів дослідження здійснено за допомогою t-тесту та коефіцієнта кореляції Пірсона. Емпіричні
розрахунки підтвердили наявність відмінностей у рівнях самоствердження, бажання контролю та недовіри залежно від місця
проживання респондентів. У ході дослідження встановлено статистичну значущість між віковою різницею та проявом
дипломатії відповідно до макіавеллізму, а також прагненні до соціального статусу при маніпуляціях керівників. Встановлено
статистичну значущість для рівнів самоствердження та розсудливості (які є атрибутами прояву макіавеллізму), а також
атрибутів маніпуляцій лідерів (аморальності, бажання контролювати та недовіри до інших) залежно від форми власності
організації (приватної чи державної). Авторами наголошено, що працівники, які проживають у місті, мають вищий рівень
макіавеллізму, про що свідчать мотивація до отримання прибутку, необхідність контролювати інших та недовіра. При цьому
рівень макіавеллізму є обернено пропорційним до віку. Отримані результати засвідчили, що у працівників приватних
організацій більш виражені прояви макіавеллізму.

Ключові слова: CASADI, макіавеллізм, маніпулювання, MPS, організація.