

Do Machiavellianism and Ingratiation Predict Sorority Officer Status?

by

Georgey Weissman

A thesis presented to the Honors College of Middle Tennessee State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation from the University Honors College

Spring 2020

Do Machiavellianism and Ingratiation Predict Sorority Officer Status?

By Georgey Weissman

Approved:

Dr. John T. Pennington

Department of Psychology

Dr. Philip E. Phillips, Associate Dean

University Honors College

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. John Pennington, for his aid and support. I am truly grateful for the time he spent providing guidance and feedback throughout this process. I also would like to thank the Honors College for providing this opportunity. Finally, I would like to thank my family for their continued love and encouragement.

Abstract

This study examined whether individuals' tendencies toward Machiavellianism and ingratiation would predict their leadership behavior in sororities. Participants were 13 undergraduates who were present or past members of a sorority. Participants partook in a survey inquiring about a) how often they engaged in ingratiation (e.g., purposefully agreeing with and complimenting others) and b) their acceptance of "Machiavellian" actions (e.g., manipulating others to achieve one's goals). Participants then indicated how often they had been elected to officer-held positions in a sorority and how long they had held those positions. Correlational analyses indicated that employing ingratiation tactics was the best predictor of a participant holding an officer position, and that specific elements of Machiavellianism (i.e., desire for control, a distrust of others) predicted running for (but not being elected to) leadership sorority positions.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Predictions and Data Analyses.....	4
Methodology.....	5
Participants.....	5
Materials.....	6
Procedure.....	7
Results.....	7
Discussion.....	9
References.....	15
Appendix A: Institute Review Board Approval Letter.....	17
Appendix B: Ingratiation Scale Survey Items.....	18
Appendix C: Machiavellianism Personality Scale Items.....	19
Appendix D: Sorority Leadership Scale Items.....	22
Appendix E: Informed Consent Form.....	23
Appendix F: Debriefing Form.....	24
Appendix G: Survey Request Email.....	25

Do Machiavellianism and Ingratiation Predict Officer Status in Sororities?

The various ways people present themselves to others, otherwise known as self-presentation (Schlenker, Forsyth, Leary, & Miller, 1980), can impact their position in society in a multitude of organizations. One tactic often employed during self-presentation is ingratiation. Ingratiation is the use of social influencing tactics, such as opinion conformity, for personal gain. The three subtypes of ingratiation used quite frequently are opinion conformity, flattery/self-enhancement, and favor rendering (Westphal & Stern, 2007). In general, these tactics are employed by people who feel they will appear more favorable to those in higher social positions (Jones, Gergen, & Jones, 1963). In fact, those who use ingratiation tend to be seen in a more positive light, and are hired more often than those who do not employ this tactic (Higgins & Judge, 2004), as it is difficult for us to dislike those who seem to like or admire us (Jones et al., 1963). In addition, the use of ingratiation has been linked to more positive performance reviews (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003) and higher level promotions (Westphal & Stern, 2007; Westphal, Stern, & Park, 2011). As these research findings show, there are many benefits associated with using ingratiation.

Although there are a wide variety of benefits, there are also risks to using ingratiation. For instance, if a higher status person on whom an ingratiatory tactic is being used realizes what the user is attempting to do, the former may become very distrustful and even negative. As described by Kunstman, Fitzpatrick, and Smith (2017), flattery may lead to self-enhancement, but the ambiguity of the motive may cause the praise to backfire, leaving the higher-status person with negative feelings. These feelings include aversion, anger, irritation, or disappointment if the manipulation is recognized (Brehm,

1966). Thus, those who are willing to take the risk, despite these possible outcomes, are likely to score high in Machiavellianism.

As defined by Dahling, Whitaker, and Levy (2009), Machiavellianism refers to one's inclination to (a) engage in amoral manipulation, (b) distrust others, (c) seek control over others, and (d) improve one's own status. The term *Machiavellianism* was first developed based on Christie and Geis's (1970) study of extremist groups to explain how the leaders of these groups influenced and exploited their followers to fulfill their own desires. The particular characteristics the effective leaders possessed, such as instilling a distrust of others and acting amorally, were interpreted by Christie et al. from a historical perspective on power described by Niccolo Machiavelli in *The Prince* (Machiavelli, 1513). In fact, the statements from Christie and Geis's (1970) measurement of Machiavellianism were taken directly from Machiavelli's work.

Over the years, the Machiavellian Scale has been widely used. Pandey and Rastogi (1979) report that those who score high in Machiavellianism are more inclined to engage in general ingratiation behaviors and significantly more likely to praise and agree with target persons. They also look for more opportunities to do such behaviors. More recently, some researchers have considered certain aspects of the scale to be problematic. Specifically, some of the scale statements (e.g., "Most people forget more easily the death of their parents than the loss of their property") could potentially evoke a defensiveness in respondents (Christie & Geis, 1970). Another aspect deemed problematic is that factor analyses of the scale only provide data on interpersonal tactics and interpersonal views (Ahmed & Stewart, 1981). To address these issues, Dahling, Whitaker, and Levy (2009) updated the Machiavellianism Scale, focusing on the

behavioral characteristics of Machiavellianism, namely the distrust of others, amoral manipulation, seeking control over others, and improving one's own status.

Although many studies focus on the use of ingratiation in day-to-day work settings, ingratiatory behaviors are employed in a wide variety of status hierarchies (Jones et al., 1963). For example, Westphal and Stern (2007) examined the relationship between Fortune 500 directors' use of ingratiation and other Machiavellian tactics and their likelihood of receiving significant employment promotions (e.g., membership on the board of directors). It was found that the greater the extent to which a director complimented, provided advice to, or performed a personal behavior to the CEO, the greater the chances that the director would gain the promotion (Westphal & Stern, 2007).

Unfortunately, the vast majority of research in this area focuses on work place settings; very few examine possible earlier arenas. For example, to date there are no studies that showcase ingratiation *in sororities*, despite the fact that there are many tangible benefits to being promoted/elected to executive positions in sororities (e.g., opportunities to network, gain scholarships, etc.). At Middle Tennessee State University, for example, scholarships such as The Amy Spain Memorial Scholarship are available only to Greek females. In terms of advancing *within a sorority* at Middle Tennessee State University, the use of ingratiation could be very pertinent. For example, in the Zeta Tau Alpha sorority, everyone is able to apply for any position she would like to have. These positions include President, Secretary, Treasurer, Academic Officer, Vice President (1), Vice President (2), Vice President (3), Ritual Officer, Risk Officer, Historian, and Panhellenic Delegate. A board comprised of members from each college year (e.g., freshman, etc.) reviews the applications and selects those eligible. Based on eligibility,

the selected applicant schedules an interview with the board in ways similar to a job interview. According to the Panhellenic Executive Board at Middle Tennessee State University, the Vice President of Membership interviews, appoints and presides over the recruitment team, which guides all aspects of Panhellenic recruitment. Thus, people could use ingratiation tactics towards the Vice President in order to be placed on the recruitment team.

On the surface, sororities may seem different from Fortune 500 companies, but when it comes to seeking advancement in the former, the social tactics used may be quite similar. In addition, the tangible outcomes of their use in work and corporate settings may also exist within the sorority system. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the association between sorority members' ingratiation tendencies, level of Machiavellianism, and time spent in sorority leadership positions at Middle Tennessee State University.

Predictions and Data Analyses

Overall, the author predicted that those who frequently use ingratiation and/or possess certain Machiavellian traits would report having spent more time in officer positions in sororities at Middle Tennessee State University. Specifically, the present author predicted that:

1. sorority members' scores on the Amoral Manipulation sub-scale and the Desire for Status sub-scale of the Machiavellianism Scale would be *strongly positively* correlated with the length of time they report having spent in an officer-held position;

2. sorority members' scores on the Desire for Control sub-scale and the Distrust of Others sub-scale of the Machiavellianism Scale would be *moderately positively* correlated with the length of time they report having spent in an officer-held position; and
3. sorority members' overall score on the Ingratiation Scale (measuring opinion conformity, flattery/self-enhancement, and favor rendering) would *strongly positively* with the amount of time they report having spent in an officer-held position.

All data were analyzed using the JASP statistical software program. Specifically, the author computed the Pearson R correlation coefficients between participants' time spent in an officer position (in a sorority) and their scores on both the Ingratiation Scale and the four sub-scales of the Machiavellianism Scale (i.e., Amoral Manipulation, Desire for Status, Desire for Control, and Distrust of Others).

Method

Participants

A total of 13 participants met the prerequisites of being a current Middle Tennessee State University student and a current or past member of a sorority. Participants were recruited over the course of two semesters, though Spring 2020 data collection was interrupted as a result of COVID-19 related remote instruction. All participants were over the age of 18. Twelve participants identified themselves as being European American, and one self-identified as Asian American. Participants earned one credit toward a psychology course requirement as a result of their participation in this study. Institutional Review Board approval was received (see Appendix A).

Materials

Demographics. Two questions were included regarding demographic information – participant ethnicity (i.e., African American, Asian American, Hispanic, European American, Other) and if the participant had been or was currently a sorority member.

Ingratiation Survey Scale Items. This section of the survey contained 9 Ingratiation Scale items initially used in Westphal and Stern's (2007) study regarding Fortune 500 companies. For this study, each item was slightly modified to apply to sororities. The items were rated on a 5-point Likert-scale that ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (numerous occasions), where participants reported the extent to which they have engaged in each behavior. An example of an item used is: "In the past twelve months, how often have you expressed to a sorority officer that you enjoy working with her?" See Appendix B for the complete set of survey items employed.

Machiavellianism Personality Scale Items. A portion of the survey employed in the present study consisted of scale items originally validated and developed by Dahling, Whitaker, and Levy (2009). Dahling et al. created four Machiavellianism sub-scales: amoral manipulation, desire for status, desire for control, and distrust of others. For this study, each sub-scale item was rated on a 5-point Likert-scale, which ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Participants reported the extent to which they agreed to each statement. The following is an example of one of the five survey items from the amoral manipulation sub-scale: "I am willing to be unethical if I believe it will help me succeed." An example of one of the three survey items from the desire for status sub-scale is: "Status is a good sign of success in life." An illustration of one of the three survey items from the desire for control sub-scale is: "I enjoy having control over other

people.” A sample of one of the five survey items from the distrust of others sub-scale is: “Team members backstab each other all the time to get ahead.” A complete list of the survey items used can be found in Appendix C.

Sorority Leadership Scale. To test whether ingratiation tactics predicted participants’ leadership experience in a sorority, specific survey items were developed by the present author. For instance, one question asked was: “Have you served in a leadership position at any point in your membership in a sorority?” Participants who answered “No” were directed to a final question. Participants who selected “Yes” were then asked, “How many positions did you hold?” A complete list of these questions can be found in Appendix D.

Procedure

Prior to participating in the study, participants were informed that their survey responses would help researchers better understand various social dynamics within campus sororities. To keep participants’ responses from being influenced, the terms *ingratiation* and *Machiavellianism* were not used in recruiting emails or in the informed consent form (see Appendix E). Participants were made aware of the deeper purpose at the end of the survey through the debriefing form (see Appendix F). Participants were provided the survey through an email (see Appendix G) or through Middle Tennessee State University’s SONA system. The survey was offered through either Qualtrics or the SONA system.

Results

Scores on the Amoral Manipulation sub-scale ranged from 1.00 to 3.00, with a mean of 1.69 ($SD = 0.70$). Scores on the Desire for Status sub-scale ranged 1.00 to 4.00,

with a mean of 2.75 ($SD = 1.06$). The number of months that participants reported holding an elected position in a sorority ranged from 0 to 24 months, with a mean of 3.5 months. The present author predicted that participants' time spent in an officer-held sorority position would have a strong, positive association with the Amoral Manipulation and the Desire for Status sub-scales of the Machiavellianism Scale. Contrary to predictions, neither sub-scale was related to participants' time spent as a sorority officer. The correlation for Amoral manipulation was weak and statistically non-significant ($r(13) = -.010, p = 0.98$). To a lesser degree, the same was true for the correlation for Desire for Status ($r(13) = 0.19, p = 0.56$).

In addition, the present author predicted that participants' time spent in an officer-held sorority position would have a moderate, positive association with their scores on the Desire for Control and the Distrust of Others sub-scales of the Machiavellianism Scale. Overall, both of these predictions were supported. For Desire for Control, the correlation was moderate ($r(13) = 0.36, p = 0.26$). For Distrust of Others, the correlation was modest ($r(13) = 0.22, p = 0.50$). Although these correlations were generally in line with predictions in terms of valence (i.e., positive) and strength, they were not statistically significant because of the small sample (i.e., 13 participants). Scores on the Desire for Control sub-scale ranged from 1.33 to 4.33, with a mean of 2.85 ($SD = 1.01$). Scores on the Distrust of Others sub-scale ranged from 1.00 to 4.20, with a mean of 2.43 ($SD = 1.08$).

Participants' scores on the Ingratiation Scale were expected to have a strong, positive correlation with time spent in an officer-held position in sororities. This prediction was clearly supported. The correlation between these two measures was $r(13)$

= 0.41, $p = 0.19$. That is, participants' tendency to ingratiate themselves to others (e.g., by doing them favors or agreeing with their opinions) was a strong predictor of how many months participants had spent as a sorority officer. Scores on the Ingratiation Scale ranged from 4.00 to 7.11, with a mean of 5.71 ($SD = 1.10$).

Included in the survey was a question asking participants if they had ever run for an officer-held position in a sorority to which they were not elected. The Desire for Control sub-scale of the Machiavellianism Scale had a strong positive correlation with participants' answers to this question, ($r(13) = 0.61, p = 0.03$). Specifically, those who expressed a strong desire to control others were significantly more likely to run for, but not be elected to sorority leadership positions, compared to those who expressed a much weaker desire to control others.

Discussion

This study explored the role Machiavellianism and ingratiation may play in young women's chances of acquiring maintaining officer status in sororities. Previous studies have found that such traits predict executives' success in "climbing the corporate ladder." This study is, therefore, an extension of that work. Importantly, prior to this study, there had not been any studies delving into this relationship and how it applies to sororities.

The present author predicted that two forms of Machiavellianism - amoral manipulation and desire for status - would have a strong positive correlation with time spent in an officer-held position. The results, however, indicated that participants who scored high in amoral manipulation and had a high desire for status were not any more likely to have spent time in an officer-held position within a sorority than those who scored low on those traits. Though the statements measuring these traits were taken from

Dahling, Whitaker, and Levy's (2009) updated version of the Machiavellianism Scale, current participants still may have figured out what the statements to these scales were alluding to, and became defensively unwilling to endorse those items (as was the case in Christie & Geis, 1970).

Another possible explanation is that sorority members are adept at detecting fellow members' manipulative, status-seeking tendencies, and resist giving such individuals an advantage when it comes to leadership elections. That is, although certain characteristics of Machiavellianism may lead one to run for leadership positions, those same characteristics are taken into account by others, and thus neutralized come election time. In fact, prior research finds that those who discover such tactics in others tend to react with aversion, anger, or disappointment (Brehm, 1966). Thus, participants in the present study who had a high desire for status and/or a tendency to showcase manipulative behavior may have been viewed by their fellow sorority members as rather self-centered, making the formers' leadership election chances lower than it might otherwise be.

The present author also predicted that two Machiavellianism sub-scales - desire for control and distrust of others - would have a moderate positive correlation with time spent in an officer-held position. This hypothesis was supported by the present study, and is consistent with previous findings by Dahling, Whitaker, and Levy (2009). Sorority members who distrust their fellow sorority sisters and seek control over them would be expected to have a cynical viewpoint of the motivations of others, believing that leaving their peers in power would lead to negative outcomes for themselves (e.g., being largely forgotten for events or not being recommended for awards within the sorority). As a

result, members with strong distrust and control dispositions would be expected to seek leadership positions frequently so as to lower the odds fellow members could negatively influence their situation.

Interestingly, though not predicted, participants who expressed a strong need for control over others/situations were especially likely to run unsuccessfully for sorority offices. Thus, overall, it looks like certain Machiavellian traits (e.g., a desire for control) do predict how often individuals seek leadership positions, both successfully and unsuccessfully. If this disposition is less noticeable by fellow sorority members than are tendencies toward manipulation and status seeking, participants having the former feelings may be somewhat successful in being elected to the leadership positions to which they apply.

It is worth mentioning that very few associations involving Machiavellianism found in this study were strong. Why? Present participants were not members of their sorority for very long, given that the opportunity to complete this survey was offered to introductory psychology students. Therefore, perhaps participants did not have a long enough time period established in their sorority to successfully use the more complex, strategic social influence tactics typically used by “high Machs.”

The final hypothesis tested in the present study was that participants who frequently ingratiate themselves to others (e.g., do unsolicited favors, pay many compliments, often express conforming opinions, etc.) would be especially likely to have spent a large amount of time in sorority officer positions. The present findings strongly support this prediction, and are consistent with previous research by Higgins and Judge (2004), who found that those who often used ingratiation were hired more frequently

(Higgins & Judge, 2004), and were more likely to gain a promotion within their respective jobs (Westphal & Stern, 2007) than those who did not engage in such behaviors.

Although the term “ingratiation” (and the moniker “suck up”) have negative connotations, sorority members may respond positively to those who flatter them, do unsolicited favors for them, and agree with them. This could be due to an unwritten, socially learned rule that says, “when someone does something nice for you (e.g., pays you a compliment), you are obliged to return the favor in some way” (Vonk, 2002). Thus, sorority members of higher status may feel the need to aid those who employ ingratiation tactics by supporting their interests (i.e., acquiring a leadership position).

The present study is the first to look into whether ingratiation *and* Machiavellianism are somehow linked to leadership experiences within sorority hierarchy structures. Though this study had a small sample size, its findings may help sororities more carefully consider those among them who want to be elected to authority positions. For example, rather than having the Vice President of Membership interview, appoint, and preside over the recruitment team, thereby guiding all aspects of Panhellenic recruitment, perhaps a larger number of people should be involved. Doing so might reduce the possible impact of ingratiation, for example, since it would require coordinated effort to ingratiate oneself to a large number of decision-makers simultaneously.

In addition to its strengths and potential contribution, there were several limitations of the present study. Most importantly, the sample size was very small. Specifically, responses from only thirteen of nearly forty participants were usable for

analyses. This was because, in eight of the cases, participants failed to answer a large number of the survey questions. This could be due to participants not realizing this survey was directed at only sorority members (until they already filling it out). In addition, the data from a number of participants were inadvertently deleted from the SONA system prior to being downloaded.

In an attempt to overcome this problem and obtain more participants, the author used pre-testing procedures carried out by the Psychology Department at the beginning of both the Fall 2019 and the Spring 2020 semesters. Unfortunately, very few eligible pretesting participants responded to my email asking them to complete the survey. This was especially true for Spring 2020. A possible explanation is that, as the university's instruction moved online because of COVID-19, the email containing the survey could have gotten lost among the large number of emails students (i.e., potential additional participants) received.

Perhaps most important, the Institute Review Board's approval process took much longer than originally expected. The present author began the IRB process in early June 2019, but the IRB office failed to approve the initial request. The present author spent the next month proving IRB training certification before being asked by the office to make the same or similar revisions over and over again. By early October 2019, the present author still did not have approval, resulting in the thesis advisor taking the lead in responding to the IRB. The advisor met with the main compliance officer in an attempt to expedite the process. Luckily, with this meeting, the compliance officer allowed the protocol to move forward, only to be hampered by, in the advisor's view, at least one IRB members' objections that reflect that person's poor understanding of survey research in

psychology. As a result of this process, data collection for the present study began months later than initially planned.

Future research on the possible influence of Machiavellianism and ingratiation tactics in hierarchies other than corporate settings is needed. This study focused solely on sororities at Middle Tennessee State University. Additional research should be done with sororities at more than one university to widen the pool sample. Also, future studies could include other organizations with hierarchies (e.g., fraternities, student councils, etc.) to study the role of Machiavellianism and ingratiation may play in such settings.

In closing, manipulation, distrust, desires for control and status, and ingratiation pervade many hierarchical organizations, from board rooms to high political offices. However, the present study is the first to investigate such dynamics in college sororities. Thus, it represents an important attempt to better understand whether these dynamics emerge and influence leadership positions in social organizations populated by young adults.

References

- Ahmed, S.M.S., & Stewart, R.A.C. (1981). "Factor analysis of the Machiavellianism Scale." *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, Vol. 9, pp. 113-116.
- Brehm, J.W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance*. New York: Academic Press.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.
- College Panhellenic Executive Board 2019 Application*. (2019, January). Retrieved from <https://www.mtsu.edu/fsl/documents/panhellenic-exec-board-app.pdf>
- Dahling, J.J., Whitaker, B.G., & Levy, P.E. (2009). "The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale." *Journal of Management*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 219-257.
- Higgins, C.A., & Judge, T.A. (2004). "The effect of applicant influence tactics on recruiter perceptions of fit and hiring recommendations: A field study." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89, No. 4, pp. 622-632.
- Higgins, C.A., Judge, T.A., & Ferris, G.R. (2003). "Influence tactics and work outcomes: a meta-analysis." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 24, pp. 89-106.
- Jones, E.E., Gergen, K.J., & Jones, R.G. (1963). "Tactics of ingratiation among leaders and subordinates in a status hierarchy." *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 1-20.
- Kuntsman, J.W., Fitzpatrick, C.B., & Smith, P.K. (2017). "Poisoned praise backfires and undermines subordinate impressions in the minds of the powerful." *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 470-480.
- Officers*. (2019, January). Retrieved from <http://mtsu.zetataualpha.org/officers>

- Machiavelli, N. (1513). *The Prince*. Trans. Harmondsworth, England.
- Pandey, J., and R. Rastogi. 1979. "Machiavellianism and ingratiation." *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 108, No. 2, pp. 221-225.
- Park, S.H., Westphal, J.D., & Stern, I. (2011). "Set up for a fall: The insidious effects of flattery and opinion conformity toward corporate leaders." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 56, pp. 257-302.
- Schlenker, B.R., Forsyth, D.R., Leary, M.R. & Miller, R.S. (1980). "Self-presentational analysis of the effects of incentives on attitude change following counterattitudinal behavior." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp. 553-577.
- Vonk, R. (2002). "Self-serving interpretations of flattery: Why ingratiation works." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 82, pp. 512-526.
- Westphal, J.D., & Stern, I. (2007). "Flattery will get you everywhere (especially if you are a male Caucasian): How ingratiation, boardroom behavior, and demographic minority status affect additional board appointments at U.S. companies." *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50, pp. 267-288.

Appendix A

IRB
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
 Office of Research Compliance,
 010A Sam Ingram Building,
 2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
 Murfreesboro, TN 37129



IRBN001 - EXPEDITED PROTOCOL APPROVAL NOTICE

Tuesday, October 29, 2019

Principal Investigator **Georgey Weissman** (Student)
 Faculty Advisor John Pennington
 Co-Investigators NONE
 Investigator Email(s) *gw3a@mtmail.mtsu.edu; john.pennington@mtsu.edu*
 Department Psychology

Protocol Title ***Does machiavellianism predict ingratiation and officer status in sororities?***
 Protocol ID **19-2261**

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the **EXPEDITED** mechanism under 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110 within the category (7) *Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior*. A summary of the IRB action and other particulars in regard to this protocol application is tabulated below:

IRB Action	APPROVED for ONE YEAR		
Date of Expiration	10/31/2020	Date of Approval	10/29/19
Sample Size	50 (FIFTY)		
Participant Pool	Target Population 1: Primary Classification: General Adults (18 or older) Specific Classification: Psychology SONA and other students Target Population 2: Primary Classification: NONE Specific Classification: NONE		
Exceptions	1. Contact information allowed for coordinating research interactions and to award course credit to certain student participants. 2. Online data collection and online informed consent via a Qualtrics link are permitted.		
Restrictions	1. Mandatory active informed consent. 2. Approved for only interaction only; NOT approved in person data collection. 3. Not approved for collecting certain identifiable data, such as, audio/video data, photographs, handwriting samples, and etc. 4. Mandatory inal report (refer last page).		
Approved Templates	Online Informed Consent and Email Recruitment Script		
Comments	NONE		

Appendix B

Ingratiation Survey Scale Items:

1. When talking to a sorority officer, to what extent do you express her viewpoint on a sorority issue, even when you do not completely share her opinion?
2. When speaking with a sorority officer, to what extent do you point out attitudes and/or opinions you have in common?
3. During your time in a sorority, how often have you publicly disagreed with a sorority officer's point of view on a sorority issue?
4. During your time in a sorority, how often have you complimented a sorority officer about her insight on a particular sorority issue?
5. During your time in a sorority, how often have you expressed to a sorority officer that you enjoy working with her?
6. During your time in a sorority, how often have you complimented a sorority officer regarding her contributions to the sorority?
7. During your time in a sorority, have you complimented a sorority officer regarding her sorority accomplishment or achievements?
8. When speaking with a sorority officer, to what extent have you given him/her advice on a personal or sorority matter, without her asking for it?
9. During your time in a sorority, have you ever done a personal favor for a sorority officer?

Appendix C

Machiavellianism Personality Scale Items

Amoral Manipulation sub-scale

1. I am willing to be unethical if I believe it will help me succeed.
2. I am willing to sabotage the efforts of other people if they threaten my own goals.
3. I would cheat if there were a low chance of getting caught.
4. I believe that lying is necessary to maintain a competitive advantage over others.
5. The only good reason to talk to others is to get information that I can use to my benefit.

Desire for Status sub-scale

1. Status is a good sign of success in life.
2. Accumulating wealth is an important goal for me.
3. I want to be rich and powerful someday.

Desire for Control sub-scale

1. I like to give the orders in interpersonal situations.
2. I enjoy being able to control the situation.
3. I enjoy having control over other people.

Distrust of Others sub-scale

1. People are only motivated by personal gain.
2. I dislike committing to groups because I don't trust others.
3. Team members backstab each other all the time to get ahead.

4. If I show weakness at work, other people will take advantage of it.
5. Other people are always planning ways to take advantage of the situation at my expense.

Appendix D

Sorority Leadership Scale Items

1. Have you served in a leadership position at any point in your membership in a sorority?

If “Yes” is selected,

a) How many positions did you hold?

b) How long in total, did you served in this/these leadership position(s)?...months

2. Have you ever run for a leadership position in your sorority but were not elected to the position?

If “Yes” is selected,

a) How many positions did you run for?

b) How long were you a member of your sorority (in months)?

Appendix E

Information and Disclosure Section

1. **Purpose:** You are being asked to participate in this research study because your participation will help researchers better understand various social dynamics within campus sororities.
2. **Description:** In this study, you will answer survey questions about various sorority experiences, personality traits, and demographics. After completing this survey, you will be fully debriefed regarding the nature of the study.
3. **Duration:** The whole activity should take about 30 minutes/hours.

Here are your rights as a participant:

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You may skip any item that you don't want to answer, and you may stop the experiment at any time (but see the note below) If you leave an item blank by either not clicking or entering a response, you may be warned that you missed one, just in case it was an accident. But you can continue the study without entering a response if you didn't want to answer any questions. Some items may require a response to accurately present the survey.

4. **Risks & Discomforts:**

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts for completing this survey.

5. **Benefits:**

Your participation will help researchers better understand various social dynamics within campus sororities.

6. **Identifiable Information:** You will NOT be asked to provide identifiable personal information/You may provide contact information for follow-up / We may request your contact information for compensation purposes

7. **Compensation: There is no monetary compensation for participating in this study.**

The participants will be compensated as described below:

Class credit: Participants will earn 1 credit toward the 4 credit research requirement in their introductory psychology course.

- a) The qualifications to participate in this research are: to be a current sorority member or have been one. If you do not meet these qualifications, you will not be included in the research and you will not be compensated.
- b) After you complete this consent form you will answer screening questions. If you fail to qualify for the research based on these questions, the research will end and you will not be compensated.

- c) Please do not participate in this research more than once. Multiple attempts to participate will not be compensated.
- d) To be compensated, you must complete the survey in its entirety.

8. **Confidentiality.** All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep your personal information private but total privacy cannot be promised. Your information may be shared with MTSU or the government, such as the Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board, Federal Government Office for Human Research Protections, if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.

9. **Contact Information.** If you should have any questions about this research study or possibly injury, please feel free to contact Georgey Weissman (615) 800 0879 or Dr. John Pennington (615) 898 5937. You can also contact the MTSU Office of compliance via telephone (615 494 8918) or by email (compliance@mtsu.edu). This contact information will be presented again at the end of the experiment.

Appendix F

Debriefing

You have been a part of a study testing people's Machiavellianism scores and its relation with the use of ingratiation in sororities. It is believed that those who score high in Machiavellianism are more likely to use ingratiation tactics in sororities, resulting in more time spent in officer-held positions in sororities. There are no anticipated risks of participating in this study and no penalties for declining participation. You will receive one research credit for your introductory psychology course.

All materials and surveys will be kept anonymous and locked away in an office in Jones Hall so that your information will remain completely secure. If you have any questions or concerns about the nature of this study, please feel free to contact Dr. John Pennington at (615) 898-5937 (or john.pennington@mtsu.edu), or the Office of Compliance at (615) 494 8918 (or compliance@mtsu.edu).

I, _____ have been debriefed as to the nature of this study and grant the experimenters permission to retain and analyze my responses.

Appendix G

Dear xxxx,

Study Description & Purpose – In this study, you will answer survey questions about various sorority experiences, personality traits, and demographics. Full participation will require 30 minutes, after which you will be fully debriefed regarding the nature of the study. The purpose of this study is to gather information and develop a better understanding of social dynamics within campus sororities.

Target Participant Pool – In this study, we are looking for current MTSU students who have been in a sorority or are currently in one.

Risks & Discomforts – There are no anticipated risks or discomforts for completing this survey

Benefits – Your participation will help researchers better understand various social dynamics within campus sororities

Additional Information – You will earn 1 credit toward the 4 credit research participation requirement in PSY 1410.

Contact Information – If you have any questions about this study or possibly injury, feel free to contact Georgey Weissman (615-800-0879) or Dr. John Pennington (615-898-5937). For additional information about giving consent or your rights as a participant in this study, please feel free to contact the Office of Compliance at (615) 494-8918.

Please enter the survey by clicking the link in the bottom of the email. You will be given a chance to read the entire informed consent to assist you make a final determination.

Yours Sincerely,

Georgey Weissman
Qualtrics link for Survey