

**Hidden Traits, Visible Reaction? Ability to Identify Criteria and Reactions to an Implicit  
Test of Workplace Psychopathy**

Ryan Cook

Nicolas Roulin

Brittany Houson

Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University,  
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

Article “in press” in the *Journal of Personnel Psychology*

*Acknowledgments:* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 38th Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference (Boston, MA, USA, April 2023).

*Publication Ethics:* All procedures in studies involving human participants were performed in accordance with the ethical standards of the Research Ethics Board of Saint Mary's University (19-045).

*Authorship:* Ryan Cook, conceptualization, formal analysis, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, supervision, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing; Nicolas Roulin, conceptualization, formal analysis, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, supervision, writing – review & editing; Brittany Houson, data curation, investigation, writing – original draft

*Funding:* This research was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) via a Canada Graduate Scholarship – Doctoral (767-2020-1448) awarded to the first author.

### **Abstract**

Workplace psychopathy is linked to harmful outcomes, yet it is rarely assessed in hiring due to limitations of existing tools. The Conditional Reasoning Test for Workplace Psychopathy offers a promising alternative by using implicit reasoning to reduce faking. We examined whether test-takers could identify the test's purpose (ATIC) and how different types of disclosure impacted test-takers' reactions in two studies: a generic application scenario with ( $N=187$ ) students and a more ecologically-valid scenario with ( $N=230$ ) active job-seekers. Most participants did not recognize the test assessed psychopathy. ATIC scores were unrelated (Study 1) or weakly related (Study 2) to test performance. Reactions were moderate, though disclosing that the test measure psychopathy (vs. personality) led to slightly lower justice perceptions and organization attraction.

*Keywords:* psychopathy, applicant reactions, ATIC, feedback, conditional reasoning

### **Hidden Traits, Visible Reaction? Ability to Identify Criteria and Reactions to an Implicit Test of Workplace Psychopathy**

Psychopathy is characterized by a grandiose self-view, nonconformity to social rules, and an unempathetic, aggressive, and manipulative approach (O’Boyle et al., 2012; Roth & Klehe, 2024). This syndrome of traits includes affective indifference (e.g., lack of remorse), interpersonal deception (e.g., pathological lying), a negligent lifestyle (e.g., impulsivity), and antisocial behavior (e.g., aggression). Psychopathy is notably more prevalent among managers than in the general population (Roth & Klehe, 2024). In the workplace, psychopathy fosters undesirable behaviours, such as reduced commitment, poor task performance, and reduced organizational citizenship behavior (OCBs; Roth & Klehe, 2024). It also predicts counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), such as sabotage and abusive supervision, which can negatively impacts coworkers and subordinates of employees or leaders high in psychopathy (Cook et al., 2024; Roth & Klehe, 2024). For leaders, psychopathic tendencies show a weak positive correlation with leadership emergence, yet a weak negative association with leadership effectiveness (Landay et al., 2019). These individuals engage in self-serving and abusive supervision, negatively impacting subordinates (Landay et al., 2019; Roth & Klehe, 2024).

Although many organizations incorporate personality testing into their hiring practices, psychopathy is rarely assessed - despite the potential risks posed by individuals with such traits in positions of authority or leadership, particularly in public-facing roles like law enforcement (Mathieu & Babiak, 2016). Some employers rely on tools that assess traits conceptually associated with psychopathy, such as the “Psychopathic Deviate” element in the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) or the “Bold” or “Mischievous” traits in the Hogan Development Survey (HDS). However, organizations have been (and arguably should be)

cautious with using assessments of psychopathic personality or similar traits for three main reasons (Cook et al., 2024). First, tools designed for clinical purposes (like the MMPI) are costly and legally problematic in employment contexts, because they assess mental health variables that could be associated with protected groups (e.g., based on the Americans with Disabilities Act in the U.S.). Regardless, the MMPI is explicitly documented as part of psychological screening in police applicants in Pennsylvania (U.S.A), New South Wales (Australia), and officer recruitment in Canada's federal correctional system. Second, third-party rating approaches (e.g., the B-Scan 360; Mathieu et al., 2013) require informants familiar with the candidate, which is an impractical demand in most hiring situations and can lead to over-estimations. Finally, traditional self-report measures (like the HBS and most measures available) are highly vulnerable to impression management and response distortion (Smith & Lilienfeld, 2013).

To address this issue and respond to growing calls for more workplace-appropriate tools to assess psychopathy (e.g., Mathieu & Babiak, 2016; O'Boyle et al., 2012), Cook et al. (2024) developed the Conditional Reasoning Test for Workplace Psychopathy (CRT-WP). This assessment uses conditional reasoning methodology to detect implicit personality traits by examining the underlying justifications and cognitive biases that influence individual reasoning patterns. Importantly, the CRT-WP was carefully developed as a *sub-clinical* measure of *workplace-specific* psychopathic tendencies, for instance by purposefully excluding clinical elements that could be associated with mental health or non-job-relevant factors that could result in legal challenges (e.g., factors like "juvenile delinquency" and "short-term marital relationships" from clinical models of psychopathy like the PCL-R). In short, Cook et al. (2024) conducted a series of six studies showing that the CRT-WP was a reliable, construct-valid (positively correlated with scores on three other measures of psychopathy and negatively

correlated with Honesty-Humility), and faking-resistant measure of workplace-specific (and non-clinical) psychopathy that predicts relevant outcomes (e.g., counterproductive behavior, selfish decision making). Recognizing the limitations of overt self-report assessments, the CRT-WP offers a promising alternative for evaluating dark personality traits in organizational settings that addresses the three main issues faced by other assessments.

Despite their inherent benefits as compared to self-report approaches, CRT-based measures of personality (e.g., Cook et al., 2024; James et al., 2005; Schoen et al., 2018) rely on the premise that the true nature of the construct being assessed is hidden from test-takers, who are told that the test evaluated logical reasoning. Yet, very little research has examined whether test-takers can figure out the construct being assessed in CRTs (see Schoen et al., 2022; Wiita et al., 2020 for exceptions). In addition, it remains unclear how test-takers react to being misled, if/when the true construct being assessed is revealed to them. The present research contributes to advancing the literature on implicit personality assessment (and CRTs specifically), as well as ATIC and applicant reactions by filling these theoretically and practically important gaps, relying on the CRT-WP. More precisely, we build on the ability to identify criteria (ATIC) literature (Kleinmann et al., 2011) to examine how well can test-takers identify that the CRT-WP assesses workplace psychopathy, and on the applicant reaction literature (e.g., Truxillo et al., 2017) to understand test-takers' changes in justice and organizational attractiveness perceptions depending on how the true construct is disclosed to them.

### **Ability to Identify Criteria (ATIC) for the CRT-WP**

The capacity to accurately identify the dimensions that are assessed in selection methods is referred to as ATIC. Kleinmann et al. (2011), for example, proposed that people with greater ATIC can exhibit more dimension-relevant behaviours in selection procedures because they

grasp what is being assessed. Indeed, higher ATIC allows job applicants to "provide evaluation relevant answers in the [assessment] as well as demonstrate evaluation relevant behaviours on the job" (Ingold et al., 2015, p. 389). If candidates can identify the factors used to evaluate their performance, they may utilise this knowledge to modify their behaviour and responses (Kleinmann et al., 2011). For example, if an applicant is aware that they are completing a personality test for trustworthiness, their responses may be adjusted and thus differ from those of applicants who are oblivious of what the employer is looking for.

Applicants' ATIC levels are associated with superior performance on assessments, with correlations as high as .49 (Kleinmann et al., 2011). Part of the effect could be because this ability enables applicants to conceptualize an "ideal employee profile" and tailor their assessment responses accordingly, contributing to response distortion or "faking good" (Klehe et al., 2012). ATIC is important because it predicts both this response distortion or faking (Bill et al., 2024; Schudlik et al., 2021) and job-related performance (Klehe et al., 2012). It signifies social perceptiveness, helping candidates interpret situational cues and adjust behavior to succeed in selection and job contexts (Kleinmann et al., 2011).

Research on CRT-based personality has examined whether test-takers could differentiate normal CRT items from additional items designed to detect faking (Schoen et al., 2022; Wiita et al., 2020). Yet, to our knowledge, this research has yet to directly examine ATIC for individuals completing the test. Importantly, unlike for other assessments where the criterion can be more or less transparent to test-takers, in CRT-based personality measures the criterion is not just withheld from the test-takers, but they are purposefully misled about what it is. This is meant so that individuals can evaluate situations and select their response based on their implicit tendencies (Schoen et al., 2021). As such, in personality-based CRTs, high ATIC would impact

the validity of the test because it could help test-takers strategically select response options that appear more desirable rather than based on their implicit reasoning. Because ATIC has not yet been explored with regard to CRT-based measures of implicit personality, we pose the following research questions:

RQ1: To what extent can test-takers accurately identify the criteria of the CRT-WP?

RQ2: Do test-takers with higher ATIC scores have lower scores on the CRT-WP?

### **Applicant Reactions and the CRT-WP**

Applicant reactions to selection measures and tests are crucial for both job candidates and organizations due to their significant impact on attitudes, intentions, and behaviors (McCarthy et al., 2017). Negative reactions, such as high anxiety, can interfere with processing performance-relevant information and result in lower test performance, whereas positive perceptions of procedural justice and fairness can improve applicants' attitudes toward the organization, such as attractiveness perceptions, job acceptance intentions, and recommendations to others (Bauer et al., 2001; McCarthy et al., 2017). Reactions also influence "hard" outcomes like test performance, job offer acceptance, and long-term job performance, although the latter effects are smaller (McCarthy et al., 2017). Overall, positive applicant reactions are key for successful hiring of high-quality applicants.

Personality tests in general receive moderately positive applicant reactions (Zibarras et al., 2025). Yet, more negative reactions occur when personality test items are perceived as invasive and possess low face validity, especially when relying on tests not originally designed for selection (but clinical diagnostic) and thus less job-related (Ni & Hauenstein, 1998). As such, assessment of traits like psychopathy could be viewed more negatively. Importantly, CRT-based

measures of personality involve direct deception in test instructions, since test-takers are misled and told that the assessment evaluates logical reasoning abilities, when it truly (but implicitly) measures personality traits. This makes such measures potentially prone to negative applicant reactions. However, no research has examined reactions to CRT-based measures of personality.

In addition, one largely unanswered question related to personality-based CRTs is whether hiring organizations should disclose the true purpose of the test (and what is assessed) after completion, and (if they do so) how to present information in a way that promotes positive, and minimizes potential negative, impacts of such disclosure on applicant reactions. In research contexts, participants who are informed they were misled tend to report more negative reactions (Boynton et al., 2013). Overall, we should thus expect similarly more negative reactions after test-takers are informed that they were misled about the true construct being assessed in CRTs (like the CRT-WP).

Providing information, explanations, or feedback can be a way to help with reactions. For instance, meta-analytical evidence suggests that providing explanations or more transparency about a test leads to small improvements in fairness perceptions or organizational attractiveness (Hausknecht et al., 2004; Truxillo et al., 2009). Yet, these effects also depend on the type of explanation. For instance, providing more detailed information is not always beneficial (Lahuis et al., 2003). Test-takers' reactions improve particularly when explanations emphasize social fairness (vs. process structure), when explanations are provided alongside (vs. before) feedback to test-takers, and when applied to personality (vs. ability) tests (Truxillo et al., 2009).

Information and transparency can also lead to more negative reactions in some cases. For instance, making test dimensions transparent to applicants can be detrimental if such dimensions are perceived as threatening (Jacksch & Klehe, 2016). Disclosing that the test measures

psychopathy, as compared to personality more broadly for example, may make the test appear less directly job relevant (Ni & Hauenstein, 1998), which would harm perceptions of a key justice principle (e.g., Gilliland, 1993).

Overall, we examine test-takers' initial reactions to the CRT-WP, as well as potentially worsened reactions after disclosing the true nature of the test (and the deception involved). Moreover, we compare different types of information provided. Based on the literature described above, we expect that reactions will be particularly harmed when less detailed explanations are provided and/or when the explanations are specifically about psychopathy:

H1: Applicant reactions will worsen after learning the CRT-WP does not assess reasoning ability, but especially when (a) accompanied with a brief explanation (rather than a detailed) explanation as to what the test measures, or (b) told it measures psychopathy specifically (vs. personality in general).

### **Overview of Studies**

We conducted two studies to examine our research questions and hypotheses. Study 1 involves a sample of university students completing the CRT-WP as a part of a generic mock application, and we explore their ATIC and changes in reactions after being informed about the true purpose of the test (manipulating what information is provided). Study 2 replicates Study 1 with a more realistic application scenario and using active job seekers. Key materials and anonymized datasets are available in our OSF folder:

[https://osf.io/6ky7q/overview?view\\_only=968b7a2fb22444409eaaa9759edcc13d](https://osf.io/6ky7q/overview?view_only=968b7a2fb22444409eaaa9759edcc13d)

### **Study 1**

#### **Method**

### ***Participants***

Participants were recruited via a Canadian university's online research participation platform where students are awarded with bonus points towards course grades for participation. Of 212 students who responded, 25 were removed either due to having incomplete responses or selecting over 25% illogical choices on the CRT-WP (commonly used metric of attention for CRTs; Cook et al., 2024). Thus, 187 student participants were included in the final sample ( $M_{age} = 21.11$  years,  $SD = 3.88$ ). The majority of participants were female (77.5%, with 21.9% male), White (67.2%; with 10.2% Asian and 9.1% Black), and almost all were undergraduate students (97.9%) with a mean GPA of 3.57 ( $SD = 0.58$ ) out of possible 4.30 at this university. The sample reported an average of 4.61 years ( $SD = 4.26$ ) of previous work experience and 49.2% reported being currently looking for a new or different job (i.e., prospective job applicants).

### ***Procedure***

Data were collected for approximately eight months throughout the 2021-2022 academic year. Participants first completed the CRT-WP followed by two measures of applicant reactions. Then, they were told that the CRT-WP does not truly measure reasoning ability as they were originally informed in the instructions. After being presented with that reveal, participants were asked to guess what the CRT-WP was truly measuring (our measure of ATIC). Then, participants were assigned to one of four possible conditions based on a 2 (psychopathy specifically vs. general personality) x 2 (low vs. high level of detail) between-subjects design. The low level of detail included two factual sentences whereas the high level of detail included two paragraphs with explanation as to why and how the CRT-WP measures that construct and why it was necessary to deceive participants (see Table 1 for the text for all four possible

conditions). At this point, participants completed the same measures of applicant reactions, with this new information.

### *Measures*

*Psychopathy.* We use the 22-item CRT-WP (Cook et al., 2024) to assess psychopathic tendencies. Each response is scored *+1* for selecting the psychopathic option, *-1* for the non-psychopathic option, and *0* for one of the illogical distractors. Participants who select over 25% of illogical responses are considered inattentive and excluded from analyses. CRT-WP scores thus range from -22 to +22, with higher scores representing a higher level of implicit psychopathic personality. Reliability was good (KR-20 = .79) and consistent with prior research (see Cook et al., 2024 for more details on the psychometric properties of the CRT-WP). An example item is provided below, as it appears in Cook et al. (2024), with the psychopathic option in bold font and the non-psychopathic option in italics.

Firing employees is an essential part of operating an organization. Generally, no employees want to be fired. As a result, sometimes when employees are aware that their organization is considering firing people, they become very worried and begin to act differently. In these desperate times, some people will find ways to make co-workers look bad in order to make them a more likely target for the upcoming firings. Many of these co-workers who get targeted do in fact get fired as a result.

What is most true about the co-workers who were fired?

- A) They are the most obnoxious employees in company meetings
- B) They are casualties of a survival-of-the-fittest environment**
- C) They benefit from having strong memory skills in this situation
- D) They are being targeted by unfair and dirty tactics*

*ATIC.* The method of measuring ATIC was based on the process originally developed by (Kleinmann, 1993) and later updated by (Melchers et al., 2009) and used in recent ATIC work (e.g., Bill et al., 2024; Ingold et al., 2015). Participants were asked to guess what the CRT-WP was measuring (in a few words) and to provide an example or description to support their guess

(in 1-2 sentences). Participants' responses were rated on a 0-4 scale where they scored 4 for correctly identifying (workplace) psychopathy, 3 for responses associated with dark personality traits (e.g., dark personality honesty, integrity), 2 for other or more general personality-related responses (e.g., personality, character, empathy, EI), 1 for responses about logical reasoning, skill, or intelligence, and 0 meant no response or completely unrelated entry (see Online Supplement). The two authors independently rated each participant's response and example on the 0-4 scale, and inter-rater consistency was excellent ( $ICC(2,2) = .92$ ). We thus use the average ATIC rating for analyses.

*Applicant Reactions.* We relied on two complementary measures of applicant reactions. First, we included the 15-item organisational attractiveness scale (Highhouse et al., 2003), which includes three subscales that assess general attractiveness, behavioural intentions (e.g., the inclination to accept a possible employment offer), and perceived prestige. Participants rated each item on a five-point Likert scale from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"). The factors all demonstrated good internal consistency before and after receiving information; General Attractiveness (Time 1  $\alpha = 0.86$ /Time 2  $\alpha = 0.85$ ), Behavioural Intention ( $\alpha$ s = 0.88/0.85), Prestige ( $\alpha$ s = 0.86/0.86).

Second, we included a 12-item version of the Selection Procedural Justice Scale (SPJS; Bauer et al., 2001) to assess perceived justice. It entailed four factors: Opportunity to Perform (Time 1  $\alpha = 0.88$ /Time 2  $\alpha = 0.89$ ), Consistency ( $\alpha$ s = 0.74/ 0.81), Fairness ( $\alpha$ s = 0.74/0.77), and Propriety of Questions ( $\alpha$ s = 0.64/ 0.67). Participants rated each item on a five-point Likert scale from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree").

## **Results and Discussion**

Descriptive statistics and correlations between study variables are presented in Table 2. We first explore how test-takers' ATIC levels for the CRT-WP (RQ1). Overall, ATIC scores were low ( $M = 1.88$ ,  $SD = .97$ ), with only 9 respondents (4.8% of the sample) able to identify psychopathy as the construct, 44 (23.5%) providing a broader "dark personality" response, 43 (23%) describing other personality-related constructs, and most participants describing constructs related to reasoning ability (44.2%) or provided no specific insights (3.7%).<sup>1</sup> In terms of RQ2, ATIC scores were unrelated to CRT-WP scores ( $r = -.01$ ,  $p = .75$ ), suggesting that test-takers who were able to better understand what the test measured were unable to use that knowledge to respond differently, in contrast with past ATIC research (e.g., Kleinmann et al., 2011). Interestingly, test-takers' GPA was slightly positively associated with their ATIC ( $r = .19$ ,  $p = .01$ ), and slightly negatively associated with their CRT-WP scores ( $r = -.16$ ,  $p = .03$ ).

Overall, test-takers' reactions to the CRT-WP were moderate, both pre- and post-disclosure, with means slightly above the middle point of the scale for overall perceived justice and organizational attraction scores (see Table 2). Hypothesis 1 was focused on changes in reactions following the disclosure of the true nature of the CRT-WP. It was examined using 2x2x2 mixed model ANOVAs, with the time (before vs. after disclosure) as a within-subjects factor, the type of information provided (psychopathy vs. general personality, low vs. high level of detail) as between-subject factors, and reaction outcomes (organizational attractiveness or justice perceptions) as dependent variables. Descriptive statistics for each condition,  $F$ -values, and effect sizes (partial eta-squares) are presented in Table 3. Since we are interested in test-takers' reactions in general, we examine our hypotheses using the overall organizational

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on the mean ATIC scores between the two raters. Mean values with .5 were rounded down for frequency reporting, but kept as is in correlations below. The same approach was used in Study 2.

attraction and justice perceptions. However, for the sake of transparency, that table also includes results for each subscale (e.g., chance to perform, prestige).

H1a predicted that reactions would worsen when accompanied with a brief (rather than a detailed) explanation. Contrary to H1a, results showed that the level of detail for the information disclosed about the CRT-WP only had a negligible influence on changes in reactions. For perceived justice, the time x level of detail interaction was not significant,  $F(1, 182) = 0.01, p = .94$ . Participants' justice perceptions were nearly identical before vs. after the information disclosure, both when the explanation was brief ( $M_s = 3.13$  vs.  $3.12$ ) and detailed ( $M_s = 3.36$  vs.  $3.35$ ). Results were similar for organization attraction,  $F(1, 182) = 1.41, p = .24$ . Participants were similarly attracted to the organization before and after the information disclosure when the explanation was brief ( $M_s = 3.16$  vs.  $3.17$ ) and detailed ( $M_s = 3.24$  vs.  $3.38$ ). The same pattern was observed across the four justice components. Detailed descriptive statistics for each condition and effects are reported in Table 3.

H1b predicted that reactions would worsen when participants are told the test measures psychopathy specifically (rather than personality in general). Again, contrary to H1b, the type of trait described in the disclosure had a negligible influence on changes in reactions. For perceived justice, the time x type of trait interaction was not significant,  $F(1, 182) = 1.99, p = .16$ . Participants' justice perceptions were nearly identical before vs. after the information disclosure, both when the disclosure mentioned personality ( $M_s = 3.27$  vs.  $3.33$ ) and psychopathy ( $M_s = 3.21$  vs.  $3.15$ ). The interaction effect was only approaching significance for organization attraction,  $F(1, 182) = 2.76, p = .10$ , with a slight increase in attraction when the disclosure mentioned personality ( $M_s = 3.20$  vs.  $3.36$ ) but nearly identical scores when

psychopathy was mentioned ( $M_s = 3.20$  vs  $3.19$ ). The pattern was similar to across the three attraction components (see Table 3). Interestingly, we note that there was no significant main effect of time on any of our outcomes either, suggesting that reactions did not change much following the disclosure.

Overall, the findings of Study 1 suggest that disclosing the true purpose of the CRT-WP did not negatively impact applicant reactions. Reactions remained largely positive and even slightly improved when the information was about personality in general. Providing more or less information had limited impact, consistent with prior work (Lahuis et al., 2003). While previous research suggested that providing information could harm reactions if the construct assessed is perceived as threatening (Jacksch & Klehe, 2016), disclosing that the CRT-WP measured psychopathy did not lead to substantially worse reactions. However, as we discuss further in Study 2, the effects might have been smaller due to the use of a student sample and the low-stakes application scenario (see Truxillo et al., 2009).

As a more exploratory set of findings, Table 2 shows no significant correlations between CRT-WP scores and any of the reaction measures, including pre-disclosure ( $r = .02$  for attraction,  $r = .03$  for justice), post-disclosure ( $r_s = -.07$  and  $-.03$ ), or changes between the two ( $r_s = -.09$  and  $-.07$ ). This suggests that reactions did not depend on participants' performance on the CRT-WP (or their level of workplace psychopathy). Reactions were also largely unrelated to ATIC, except for post-disclosure attraction ( $r = .16$ ,  $p = .03$ ).

## Study 2

Study 1 provided an initial test of whether the CRT-WP is “transparent” to test-takers (i.e., whether they can identify what it measures) and whether changes in applicant reactions depend on what information they are given during debriefing. However, Study 1 was conducted with a student sample and using a generic application scenario, both of which can limit the effects of explanations provided to test-takers (Truxillo et al., 2009). Study 2 was designed to address these limitations by relying on a sample of active job-seekers and by strengthening the realism of the selection context. Specifically, the application scenario included a job description for an industry participants had prior experience in to increase perceived relevance, and we offered a performance-based monetary incentive to heighten engagement and motivation. Additionally, Study 2 incorporated an established measure of dark personality at work to further evaluate the nomological network of the CRT-WP by testing how the two correlate.

## **Method**

### ***Participants***

We recruited 253 participants from the Prolific.co survey platform who were at least 18 years old, living in the United States, currently seeking a job, fluent in English, had not completed in previous CRT-WP studies, and who had experience working in the retail industry (to fit our mock job presented below). Of those, 23 were removed either due to having incomplete responses, endorsing either of two attention check items which stated they were not paying attention to the survey, or selecting over 25% illogical choices on the CRT-WP. Thus, 230 participants were included in the final sample ( $M_{\text{age}} = 40.46$  years,  $SD = 11.43$ ). Participants were mostly female (55.5%, with 44.5% male), White (62.6%; with 18.3% Black, 7.4% Hispanic, 11.6% Other). Most participants had at least some university education (62.2%) with

37% completing either high school or a trade degree as their highest education. The sample reported an average of 17.52 years ( $SD = 11.55$ ) of previous work experience. Participants were compensated with £4.00 GBP for an average of 35.21 ( $SD = 19.95$ ) minutes of participation. The top 5% of participants (based on CRT-WP scores) also earned an additional £4.00 GBP bonus payment, which we told participants at multiple points during the recruitment and instructions.

### ***Procedure***

Participants were instructed to complete the tests as if they were part of a hiring process for a very attractive and well-paying general manager position at a grocery store (see all study materials in the Online Supplement). They read a job description with information about the (mock) company and the position, including above average pay and benefits. The rest of the study followed the same procedure as Study 1. Participants first completed the CRT-WP followed by two measures of applicant reactions. They gave their guess about what the CRT-WP measured, were then randomly assigned to the same 2x2 feedback conditions, and completed the applicant reactions again. At the end of the study, participants completed another measure of dark personality to help expand the nomological network and validity of the CRT-WP.

### ***Measures***

Most measures were the same as in Study 1, with the same administration and scoring method. Internal consistency estimates of the scales are presented in Table 4, and inter-rater reliability of the ATIC ratings (with the same two raters) was very good ( $ICC(2,2) = .88$ ). As one difference, we included the Dark Tetrad at Work (DTW) scale (Thibault & Kelloway, 2020) as a secondary measure of workplace-relevant dark personality traits, including Machiavellianism (4

items), narcissism (6 items), psychopathy (6 items), and sadism (6 items) at the end of the study. Participants rated their agreement with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”). Example items include “I am much more valuable than my coworkers” (narcissism) and “I love to watch my boss yelling at my coworkers” (sadism).

## Results and Discussion

Descriptive statistics and correlations between study variables are presented in Table 4. Similar to Study 1, ATIC scores were low ( $M = 1.83$ ,  $SD = .88$ ), with only 4 respondents (1.7% of the sample) able to identify psychopathy as the construct, 35 (15.2%) providing a broader “dark personality” response, 100 (43.5%) describing other personality-related constructs, and some participants describing constructs related to reasoning ability (29.6%) or provided no specific insights (10.0%). Addressing RQ2, ATIC scores were weakly but significantly negatively correlated to CRT-WP scores ( $r = -.13$ ,  $p = .04$ ), in contrast with the null relationship in Study 1. This suggests that test-takers who were able to better understand what the test measured (i.e., psychopathy or at least dark personality traits here) could use that knowledge to respond differently (i.e., attempt to reduce their psychopathy score on the CRT-WP). This finding is consistent with the broader literature showing that ATIC scores are associated with higher performance on a variety of assessments (e.g., Kleinmann et al., 2011).

Hypothesis 1 was tested with the same 2x2x2 ANOVA as in Study 1, with descriptive statistics for each condition,  $F$ -values, and effect sizes presented in Table 5. Also following the same template as Study 1, we test our hypotheses with the composite scale scores, although we report individual factor scores in Table 5, as well. As a starting point, and in contrast with Study

1, the findings of Study 2 showed a strong main effect of time for both perceived justice,  $F(1, 226) = 29.53, p < .001$ , and organization attraction,  $F(1, 226) = 32.01, p < .001$ , with reactions being lower post-disclosure. Contrary to H1a, and consistent with Study 1 results, the level of detail for the information disclosed about the CRT-WP (i.e., the time x level of detail interaction) had a negligible effect on both perceived justice,  $F(1, 226) = 0.99, p = .32$ , and organization attraction,  $F(1, 226) = 0.03, p = .87$ . Participants' justice perceptions worsened after the information disclosure in a similar way when the explanation was brief ( $M_s = 3.71$  vs. 3.52) or detailed ( $M_s = 3.62$  vs. 3.34). The same was true for how attracted they were to the organization (brief:  $M_s = 3.91$  vs. 3.68; detailed:  $M_s = 3.86$  vs. 3.62).

In support of H2b, and in contrast to Study 1 findings, reactions did worsen when participants were told the test measured psychopathy specifically rather than personality in general. Indeed, we found significant time x trait interactions for both perceived justice,  $F(1, 226) = 8.06, p = .005$ , and organization attraction,  $F(1, 226) = 9.99, p = .002$ . Participants' justice perceptions worsened more after they were informed that the test measured psychopathy ( $M_s = 3.70$  vs. 3.34) than personality ( $M_s = 3.63$  vs. 3.51). The same was true for how attracted they were to the organization (psychopathy:  $M_s = 3.91$  vs. 3.55; detailed:  $M_s = 3.86$  vs. 3.76). The pattern of findings was similar across all factor-level reaction scores, except for consistency

Table 4 shows that CRT-WP scores were in fact positively correlated with Machiavellianism ( $r = .18, p = .01$ ), narcissism ( $r = .21, p = .001$ ), and psychopathy ( $r = .19, p = .003$ ), but not the sadism factor ( $r = .10, p = .15$ ), as measured by the DTW scale. CRT-WP scores were weakly negatively correlated with Time 2 organizational attraction scores ( $r = -.15, p$

= .03), but unrelated to the other reaction measures, including pre-disclosure ( $r = -.10$  for attraction,  $r = .01$  for justice), post-disclosure ( $r_s = -.05$  for justice).

### **General Discussion**

The present research investigated two aspects of assessment which have not yet been explored with CRTs: (1) ATIC, the degree to which test-takers can discern the true construct being measured, and (2) how test-takers react to being told they were deceived that a CRT for implicit for personality is not truly a measure of conditional reasoning. More precisely, we examined how reactions change depending on the level of detail and specificity in that disclosure. This research makes important theoretical and applied contributions to the literature on implicit personality assessment and CRT research, specifically.

### **Main Findings and Theoretical Implications**

Consistent with the theoretical assumptions underlying CRTs (Cook et al., 2024; James et al., 2005), results showed that the vast majority of participants did not identify psychopathy as the construct being measured. Only 4.8% of participants in Study 1 and 1.7% in Study 2 identified psychopathy directly, and just 25.1% or 23.9% recognized a broader “dark personality” theme. Many participants either continued to guess that the test measured logical reasoning or could not articulate any specific construct. These findings suggest that the CRT-WP is largely successful in masking its true purpose, supporting claims that CRT-based personality measures can be more resistant to faking and impression management than self-reports (see Cook et al., 2024; Smith & Lilienfeld, 2013). Interestingly, although prior ATIC research (e.g., Kleinmann et al., 2011) suggests that individuals who better understand assessment criteria may

adjust their responses and scores accordingly (i.e., correlation with assessment performance *rs* ranging from .23 to .49), our study revealed no significant relationship between ATIC scores and CRT-WP scores in Study 1 and only a small effect in Study 2. This suggests that even those who had somewhat accurate guesses about what the CRT-WP measured were not able to use that knowledge to effectively manipulate their responses likely due to the indirect, reasoning-based nature of CRTs.

From a theoretical standpoint, these findings reinforce the assertion that CRTs capture implicit cognitive biases and justification mechanisms that remain inaccessible to conscious faking (Schoen et al., 2021). It also confirms that the CRT-WP is less transparent and likely harder to fake than other psychopathy assessments (see Cook, 2019, 2024; Cook et al., 2024). These findings thus extend the ATIC framework (e.g., Kleinmann et al., 2011) to implicit personality assessments. Since ATIC scores were largely unrelated to CRT-WP scores (unlike more transparent assessments), our findings suggest that being able to identify what CRTs measure may be too difficult or complex for most applicants to change their response style (or fake) and thus limit the influence of ATIC on construct-related validity.

Regarding applicant reactions, the results offered important insights about personality-based CRTs. Overall, reactions were generally positive with means above the mid-point of the scale across both studies, and both pre- and post-debriefing (e.g., on average 3.24 and 3.23 in Study 1 or 3.67 and 3.43 in Study 2 for overall justice perceptions – on a 1-5 scale). This suggests that the CRT-WP is viewed somewhat positively by test-takers, with average levels similar to those reported for other personality tests, for instance in a recent study showing justice perceptions ranging from 3.84 to 5.08 on a 1-7 scale (Zibarras et al., 2025). In terms of the

impact of disclosing the true nature of the test, something that has been overlooked in the CRT literature, results were mixed. Reactions were slightly less positive following the disclosure in Study 2 but not in Study 1, which is consistent with research showing that information is less impactful in students samples (Truxillo et al., 2009). However, although we increased the realism of the applicant scenario in Study 2, both studies still rely on low-stakes situations, and thus our estimates are likely conservative. Moreover, changes in reactions (in Study 2) or lack thereof (in Study 1) were similar when the disclosure was more or less detailed. Yet, the type of construct disclosed mattered more. In Study 1, descriptions focused on personality in general lead to slight (albeit non-significant) increase in organization attraction reactions (but not justice), while reactions remained unchanged when the information was focused on psychopathy. In Study 2, participants' justice perceptions and organizational attraction were reduced when the assessment was described as measuring psychopathy, but not for personality in general.

Overall, these findings – while not perfectly consistent across studies - are generally in line with past work suggesting that applicant reactions are more negative when the constructs assessed is perceived as threatening (Jacksch & Klehe, 2016) or less job relevant (Ni & Hauenstein, 1998), which can be the case for psychopathy (even if workplace-specific). Importantly, reductions in positive reactions were generally small, suggesting that concerns about strong negative applicant reactions to revealing deception in CRT-based assessments may be overstated. Taken together, these findings add to our understanding of applicant reactions to nontraditional assessments and specifically ones that involve disclosing deception. While some previous research suggests that increased transparency improves reactions (Hausknecht et al., 2004), our findings support a more nuanced view in which transparency may only modestly affect perceptions, particularly when the test assesses a “dark” trait like psychopathy.

## **Practical Implications**

The findings of this study have important implications for incorporating CRT-based assessments into selection processes. Complementing earlier findings that test-takers instructed to act as an applicant could not increase their CRT-WP scores (Cook et al., 2024), our results suggest that CRT-WP scores cannot be improved even by relatively insightful (i.e., high-ATIC) test-takers. Combined with the results of Cook et al. (2024), our results reinforce the test's value as a faking-resistant tool for assessing high-risk personality traits without compromising measurement (e.g., validity).

Additionally, organizations using CRTs to indirectly assess “darker” personality traits (like psychopathy, but also aggression, etc.) might want to disclose the true nature of the assessment at the end of the selection process, for legal or moral/ethical reasons. Yet, they might be concerned about applicants' reactions and potential impact on their image. Our results show that, although disclosure of the CRT-WP's true purpose led to slightly lower applicant reactions when framed around psychopathy (especially in Study 2), these effects were small and reactions were still generally positive. Organizations may therefore be able to use such tools without significant damage to organizational image or candidate perceptions, particularly if they *avoid* highly specific disclosures. Careful framing of the test as a measure of “decision-making style” or “personality related to ethical behavior” may help mitigate negative reactions while preserving some transparency and fairness.

## **Limitations and Future Research Directions**

Despite the contributions of this study, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the samples consisted of university psychology students (Study 1) and active job seekers recruited from Prolific (Study 2). It is possible that reactions would be less positive, or the effect of disclosures stronger, with actual job applicants in high-stakes selection contexts. Applicants with real job opportunities at stake may respond more sensitively to being misled or may exhibit greater motivation to discern test constructs (e.g., doing online searches prior to, or during completion of, testing). Future work should replicate these findings in applied selection settings. Second, while the manipulation of explanation specificity and construct disclosed allowed us to test hypotheses between groups, the manipulations may not have been strong enough to fully differentiate participant responses. The small effect sizes observed may partly reflect the need for more robust or immersive explanation formats, such as video debriefings, interactive or two-way discussion disclosures, for examples. Third, the ATIC measure used in our study relies on a single 0-4 score (based on two raters scoring test-takers' open-ended responses to two ATIC questions). While this rating approach is consistent with past research (e.g., Melchers et al., 2009), studies examining ATIC in multi-dimensional assessments (e.g., interviews, assessment centers) included indicators for each dimension that could then be aggregated for more precision. Although the high inter-rater agreement observed in both studies is reassuring, future research could explore more structured ATIC assessments or collecting participant rationale about *why* they think the CRT-WP measures what they guess it does.

In addition, future work should explore the longitudinal impact of learning the true purpose of CRT-based assessments. For example, do negative applicant reactions persist over time, or do they dissipate once candidates are hired? Are reactions amplified if the applicant is rejected? Second, future research could also explore whether individual differences such as trait

anxiety, prior exposure to personality testing, or sensitivity to deception, impact reactions to CRT-based assessments. Additionally, studies might explore the influence of context and framing on reactions. For example, would reactions differ if psychopathy were framed in terms of ethical risk, leadership suitability, or emotional intelligence deficits rather than simply as a personality construct?

### **Conclusion**

The research advances our understanding of both the perceptibility and reception of CRT-based personality assessments in selection contexts. While the CRT-WP effectively obscures its intent and resists faking, even among relatively perceptive test-takers, revealing its true purpose does not seem to dramatically undermine applicant reactions. These findings support the viability of CRTs in applied organizational settings, particularly for detecting undesirable traits like psychopathy in a way that is both scientifically sound, practically defensible, and fair to applicants by providing at least some information and explanation of the tests true purpose.

### References

- Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Sanchez, R. J., Craig, J. M., Ferrara, P., & Campion, M. A. (2001). Applicant reactions to selection: Development of the selection procedural justice scale (SPJS). *Personnel Psychology, 54*(2), 387–419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00097.x>
- Bill, B., Melchers, K. G., Steuer, J., & Eisele, E. (2024). Are traditional interviews more prone to effects of impression management than structured interviews? *Applied Psychology, 73*(3), 1309–1330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12514>
- Boynton, M. H., Portnoy, D. B., & Johnson, B. T. (2013). Exploring the ethics and psychological impact of deception in psychological research. *IRB, 35*(2), 7–13.
- Cook, R. (2019). *Developing a faking-resistant measure of corporate psychopathy for use in employment selection: The CRT-WP* [Thesis, Saint Mary's University]. [https://library2.smu.ca/bitstream/handle/01/29010/Cook\\_Ryan\\_MASTERS\\_2019](https://library2.smu.ca/bitstream/handle/01/29010/Cook_Ryan_MASTERS_2019)
- Cook, R. (2024). *Refinement and application of the conditional reasoning test for workplace psychopathy (CRT-WP): Faking-detection, IRT, and retail* [Dissertation, Saint Mary's University]. <https://library2.smu.ca/handle/01/32353>
- Cook, R., Roulin, N., & Joy, K. (2024). Development, Validation, and Faking-Resistance of an Implicit Measure of Psychopathy in the Workplace. *Human Performance, 37*(5), 245–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2024.2422341>
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The Perceived Fairness of Selection Systems: An Organizational Justice Perspective. *The Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 694–734. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258595>

- Hausknecht, J. P., Day, D. V., & Thomas, S. C. (2004). Applicant Reactions to Selection Procedures: An Updated Model and Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(3), 639–683. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00003.x>
- Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). Measuring Attraction to Organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 63*(6), 986–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403258403>
- Ingold, P. V., Kleinmann, M., König, C. J., Melchers, K. G., & Van Iddekinge, C. H. (2015). Why do Situational Interviews Predict Job Performance? The Role of Interviewees' Ability to Identify Criteria. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 30*(2), 387–398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9368-3>
- Jacksch, V., & Klehe, U.-C. (2016). Unintended Consequences of Transparency During Personnel Selection: Benefitting some candidates, but harming others? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 24*(1), 4–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12124>
- James, L. R., McIntyre, M. D., Glisson, C. A., Green, P. D., Patton, T. W., LeBreton, J. M., Frost, B. C., Russell, S. M., Sablynski, C. J., Mitchell, T. R., & Williams, L. J. (2005). A conditional reasoning measure for aggression. *Organizational Research Methods, 8*(1), 69–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428104272182>
- Klehe, U.-C., Kleinmann, M., Hartstein, T., Melchers, K. G., König, C. J., Heslin, P. A., & Lievens, F. (2012). Responding to Personality Tests in a Selection Context: The Role of the Ability to Identify Criteria and the Ideal-Employee Factor. *Human Performance, 25*(4), 273–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2012.703733>

- Kleinmann, M. (1993). Are rating dimensions in assessment centers transparent for participants? Consequences for criterion and construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 988–993.
- Kleinmann, M., Ingold, P. V., Lievens, F., Jansen, A., Melchers, K. G., & König, C. J. (2011). A different look at why selection procedures work: The role of candidates' ability to identify criteria. *Organizational Psychology Review, 1*(2), 128–146.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386610387000>
- Lahuis, D. M., Perreault, N. E., & Ferguson, M. W. (2003). The Effect of Legitimizing Explanations on Applicants' Perceptions of Selection Assessment Fairness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*(10), 2198–2215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01881.x>
- Landay, K., Harms, P. D., & Credé, M. (2019). Shall we serve the dark lords? A meta-analytic review of psychopathy and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(1), 183–196.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000357>
- Mathieu, C., & Babiak, P. (2016). Corporate psychopathy and abusive supervision: Their influence on employees' job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 91*, 102–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.002>
- Mathieu, C., Hare, R. D., Jones, D. N., Babiak, P., & Neumann, C. S. (2013). Factor structure of the B-Scan 360: A measure of corporate psychopathy. *Psychological Assessment, 25*(1), 288–293. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029262>
- McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Anderson, N. R., Costa, A. C., & Ahmed, S. M. (2017). Applicant perspectives during selection: A review addressing “So what?,”

- “What’s new?,” and “Where to next?” *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1693–1725.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316681846>
- Melchers, K. G., Klehe, U.-C., Richter, G. M., Kleinmann, M., König, C. J., & Lievens, F. (2009). “I Know What You Want to Know”: The Impact of Interviewees’ Ability to Identify Criteria on Interview Performance and Construct-Related Validity. *Human Performance*, 22(4), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959280903120295>
- Ni, Y., & Hauenstein, N. M. A. (1998). Applicant Reactions to Personality Tests: Effects of Item Invasiveness and Face Validity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(4), 391–406.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025010304332>
- O’Boyle, E. H. Jr., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 557–579. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025679>
- Roth, L., & Klehe, U.-C. (2024). The enemy within one’s own ranks: Meta-analysis on the effects of psychopathy on workplace-related behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001248>
- Schoen, J. L., Bowler, J. L., & Schilpzand, M. C. (2018). Conditional reasoning test for creative personality: Rationale, theoretical development, and validation. *Journal of Management*, 44(4), 1651–1677. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315618012>
- Schoen, J. L., DeSimone, J. A., Meyer, R. D., Schnure, K. A., & LeBreton, J. M. (2021). Identifying, Defining, and Measuring Justification Mechanisms: The Implicit Biases Underlying Individual Differences. *Journal of Management*, 47(3), 716–744.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319889137>

- Schoen, J. L., Williams, J. L., Reichin, S. L., & Meyer, R. D. (2022). It's a trap! Faking and faking detection on conditional reasoning tests. *Personality and Individual Differences, 198*, 111803. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.111803>
- Schudlik, K., Reinhard, M., & Müller, P. (2021). Prepared to fake? The relationship between applicants' job interview preparation and faking. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 29*(1), 29–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12317>
- Smith, S. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2013). Psychopathy in the workplace: The knowns and unknowns. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*(2), 204–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.11.007>
- Thibault, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (2020). The Dark Tetrad at Work. *Human Performance, 33*(5), 406–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2020.1802728>
- Truxillo, D. M., Bauer, T. N., & Garcia, A. M. (2017). Applicant Reactions to Hiring Procedures. In *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Recruitment, Selection and Employee Retention* (pp. 53–70). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118972472.ch4>
- Truxillo, D. M., Bodner, T. E., Bertolino, M., Bauer, T. N., & Yonce, C. A. (2009). Effects of Explanations on Applicant Reactions: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 17*(4), 346–361. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00478.x>
- Wiita, N. E., Meyer, R. D., Kelly, E. D., & Collins, B. J. (2020). Not aggressive or just faking it? Examining faking and faking detection on the conditional reasoning test of aggression. *Organizational Research Methods, 23*(1), 96–123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117703685>

Zibarras, L. D., Castano, G., & Cuppello, S. (2025). Applicant Perceptions of Selection Methods: Replicating and Extending Previous Research. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 33(2), e70007. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.70007>

**Table 1.**

*Condition-Specific Instructions by Condition*

	Low Detail	High Detail
Personality	<p>The CRT-WP was actually assessing <b>personality</b>, instead of workplace reasoning ability. The test you completed gives us an indication of your attitudes, tendencies, and beliefs related to your personality and levels of different traits.</p>	<p>The CRT-WP was actually assessing <b>personality</b>, instead of workplace reasoning ability. The test you completed gives us an indication of your attitudes, tendencies, and beliefs related to your personality and levels of different traits.</p> <p>We are able to assess your personality through your responses to each question. From the four response options to each question, two of them are designed to be clearly illogical and nonsensical answers, which you may have noticed. Because you believed it was a logic/reasoning test, you eliminate these options as possibilities, leaving you with the other two. The trick is that these two remaining response options are both equally correct logical responses to each question, but one is aligned with a way of thinking that is high on a personality trait while the other is aligned with a way of thinking that is low (or opposite) on the same trait. Again, because you believe it to be a logic/reasoning test with only one correct answer per question, you tend to choose the option between those two which is more representative of your personality-based attitudes, tendencies, and beliefs. From your responses to all 22 questions, we get an indication of how high or low you score on those personality traits. We could not tell you about this before completing the test, because it is crucial that you think the test is measuring logic/reasoning ability for it to function as intended.</p>
Psychopathy	<p>The CRT-WP was actually assessing <b>psychopathic tendencies</b>, instead of workplace reasoning ability. The test you completed gives us an indication of your attitudes, tendencies, and beliefs related to your level of the personality trait of psychopathy.</p>	<p>The CRT-WP was actually assessing <b>psychopathic tendencies</b>, instead of workplace reasoning ability. The test you completed gives us an indication of your attitudes, tendencies, and beliefs related to your level of the personality trait of psychopathy.</p> <p>We are able to assess your level of psychopathic tendencies through your responses to each question. From the four response options to each question, two of them are designed to be clearly illogical and nonsensical answers, which you may have noticed. Because you believe it was a logic/reasoning test, you eliminate these options as possibilities, leaving you with the other two. The trick is that these two remaining response options are both equally correct logical responses to each question, but one is aligned with a psychopathic way of thinking while the other is aligned with a way of thinking that is low (or opposite) on a psychopathic way of thinking. Again, because you believe it to be a logic/reasoning test with only one correct answer per question, you tend to choose the option between those two which is more representative of your psychopathic attitudes, tendencies, and beliefs. From your responses to all 22 questions, we get an indication of how high or low you score on the personality trait of psychopathy. We could not tell you about this before completing the test, because it is crucial that you think the test is measuring logic/reasoning ability for it to function as intended.</p>

*Note.* High Detail instructions contained the same low detail instructions in the first paragraph, followed by additional information.

**Table 2.**

*Descriptive statistics and correlations between Study 1 variables*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1. Age	21.11	3.88	-									
2. Sex	1.79	0.42	-.06	-								
3. Condition - Detail	0.49	0.50	-.05	-.01	-							
4. Condition - Psychopathy	0.51	0.50	-.02	.03	.03	-						
5. CRT-WP	-11.76	5.29	-.04	-.01	-.01	.07	(.79)					
6. ATIC	1.88	0.97	.06	-.14	.08	.00	-.01	(.92)				
7. Organization attraction T1	3.20	0.65	-.19**	-.01	.06	.00	.02	.02	(.93)			
8. Organization attraction T2	3.27	0.69	-.11	-.01	.14*	-.12	-.07	.16*	.46**	(.94)		
9. Perceived justice T1	3.24	0.59	-.16*	.04	.19*	-.05	.03	.00	.73**	.38**	(.85)	
10. Perceived justice T2	3.23	0.62	-.06	-.08	.18*	-.14*	-.03	.08	.37**	.64**	.53**	(.85)
11. GPA	3.59	0.58	-.20**	-.04	.01	-.03	-.16*	.19*	.08	.13	.02	.00

*Note.* Pairwise *n*'s ranging 182 to 187. Sex scored 1 = male, 2 = female. Condition – Detail scored 0 = low detail, 1 = high detail. Condition – Psychopathy scored 0 = personality, 1 = psychopathy. ATIC = Ability to identify criteria. T1 = Time 1, T2 = Time 2. Internal consistency estimates are presented in parentheses in the diagonal. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

**Table 3.**

*Reaction Outcomes Before vs. After Disclosure of the CRT-WP Construct, Depending on the Type of Information Provided (Study 1)*

	Means (Standard Deviations)								<i>F</i> -values (partial $\eta^2$ )			
	Low Level of detail				High Level of detail				Time	Time x Detail	Time x Trait	Time x Trait x Detail
	Personality		Psychopathy		Personality		Psychopathy					
Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After					
Justice perceptions	3.17 (.52)	3.27 (.47)	3.10 (.69)	2.97 (.74)	3.38 (.56)	3.38 (.66)	3.33 (.57)	3.32 (.55)	0.03 (.00)	0.01 (.00)	1.99 (.01)	1.63 (.01)
- Chance to perform	2.49 (.82)	2.66 (.82)	2.51 (.90)	2.40 (.86)	2.96 (.95)	2.90 (1.01)	2.76 (.84)	2.69 (.95)	0.07 (.00)	0.59 (.00)	1.24 (.01)	1.12 (.01)
- Consistency	3.54 (.72)	3.54 (.76)	3.32 (.77)	3.18 (.87)	3.36 (.93)	3.39 (.99)	3.61 (.81)	3.69 (.76)	0.01 (.00)	0.94 (.01)	0.15 (.00)	0.51 (.00)
- Question propriety	3.67 (.59)	3.75 (.64)	3.66 (.71)	3.38 (.88)	3.92 (.53)	3.94 (.62)	3.81 (.65)	3.70 (.60)	2.56 (.01)	0.36 (.00)	6.61* (.04)	1.55 (.01)
- Fairness	3.19 (.80)	3.38 (.82)	3.13 (.84)	3.20 (.95)	3.46 (.85)	3.50 (.94)	3.34 (.86)	3.46 (.74)	2.52 (.01)	0.14 (.00)	0.02 (.00)	0.48 (.00)
Organizational attraction	3.14 (.63)	3.24 (.59)	3.17 (.68)	3.11 (.88)	3.26 (.72)	3.48 (.63)	3.22 (.60)	3.27 (.59)	2.11 (.01)	1.41 (.01)	2.76† (.02)	0.02 (.00)
- Intention to pursue	3.23 (.63)	3.27 (.61)	3.21 (.72)	3.11 (.94)	3.28 (.73)	3.47 (.66)	3.26 (.65)	3.24 (.68)	0.22 (.00)	0.97 (.01)	2.49 (.01)	0.11 (.00)
- Attractiveness	3.13 (.79)	3.26 (.72)	3.19 (.76)	3.19 (.95)	3.28 (.84)	3.57 (.72)	3.23 (.67)	3.27 (.66)	3.65† (.02)	0.70 (.00)	2.32 (.01)	0.29 (.00)
- Prestige	3.08 (.64)	3.18 (.62)	3.11 (.69)	3.01 (.86)	3.20 (.70)	3.41 (.59)	3.18 (.65)	3.29 (.63)	2.58 (.01)	2.35 (.01)	2.23 (.01)	0.28 (.00)

*Note.*  $N = 187$ . Results based on 2x2x2 Mixed-Model ANOVAs. Standard Deviation values provided in parentheses. †  $p < .10$  \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

**Table 4.**

*Descriptive statistics and correlations between Study 2 variables*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.
1. Age	40.56	11.43	-													
2. Sex	1.56	0.50	.13	-												
3. Condition - Detail	0.49	0.50	.01	.07	-											
4. Condition - Psychopathy	0.51	0.50	.13*	-.09	.02	-										
5. CRT-WP	-10.28	5.90	-.18*	-.04	.02	.07	(.79)									
6. ATIC	1.83	0.87	-.06	.03	-.08	-.08	-.13*	(.88)								
7. DT Machiavellianism	2.72	0.98	-.10	.08	-.05	-.02	.18**	-.03	(.83)							
8. DT Narcissism	2.76	0.79	.01	-.09	.05	.05	.21**	-.04	.21**	(.84)						
9. DT Psychopathy	1.50	0.64	-.09	-.16*	-.11	.05	.19**	-.07	.37**	.23**	(.89)					
10. DT Sadism	1.31	0.50	-.13*	-.15*	-.08	.01	.10	.01	.21**	.17**	.71**	(.92)				
11. Org. attraction T1	3.88	0.71	.01	.02	-.03	.03	-.10	-.02	-.03	.12	-.14*	-.13*	(.95)			
12. Org. attraction T2	3.65	0.93	-.01	.01	-.03	-.11	-.15*	-.01	-.04	.16*	-.06	-.07	.74**	(.97)		
13. Perceived justice T1	3.67	0.73	-.13*	-.04	-.06	.05	.01	-.01	-.02	.14*	.01	-.01	.61**	.50**	(.89)	
14. Perceived justice T2	3.43	0.84	-.10	.01	-.11	-.11	-.05	.02	.04	.24**	.07	.04	.39**	.59**	.64**	(.91)

*Note.* Pairwise *n*'s ranging 227 to 230. Sex scored 1 = male, 2 = female. Condition – Detail scored 0 = low detail, 1 = high detail. Condition – Psychopathy scored 0 = personality, 1 = psychopathy. ATIC = Ability to identify criteria. DT = Dark Triad. T1 = Time 1, T2 = Time 2. Internal consistency estimates are presented in parentheses in the diagonal. \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01.

**Table 5.**

*Reaction Outcomes Before vs. After Disclosure of the CRT-WP Construct, Depending on the Type of Information Provided (Study 2).*

	Means (Standard Deviations)								<i>F</i> -values (partial $\eta^2$ )			
	Low Level of detail				High Level of detail				Time	Time x Detail	Time x Trait	Time x Trait x Detail
	Personality		Psychopathy		Personality		Psychopathy					
Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After					
Justice perceptions	3.68 (.71)	3.57 (.80)	3.75 (.79)	3.46 (.84)	3.58 (.79)	3.45 (.79)	3.66 (.66)	3.23 (.91)	29.53** (.12)	0.99 (.00)	8.06** (.04)	0.47 (.00)
- Chance to perform	3.25 (1.10)	3.15 (1.14)	3.35 (1.18)	2.86 (1.30)	3.22 (1.13)	2.92 (1.21)	3.10 (1.06)	2.67 (1.14)	29.37** (.12)	0.28 (.00)	4.52* (.02)	1.12 (.01)
- Consistency	3.78 (.76)	3.76 (.76)	4.00 (.82)	3.97 (.75)	3.77 (.79)	3.74 (.86)	3.98 (.79)	3.67 (1.04)	3.10 <sup>†</sup> (.01)	1.69 (.01)	1.52 (.22)	1.38 (.01)
- Question propriety	4.06 (.72)	3.94 (.82)	4.03 (.84)	3.72 (.99)	3.86 (.85)	3.76 (.92)	4.09 (.70)	3.46 (1.10)	32.42** (.13)	2.15 (.01)	12.13** (.05)	2.91 <sup>†</sup> (.01)
- Fairness	3.77 (.95)	3.60 (1.05)	3.74 (.95)	3.49 (1.11)	3.57 (1.08)	3.61 (1.04)	3.68 (.98)	3.31 (1.15)	8.84** (.04)	0.11 (.00)	3.70 <sup>†</sup> (.02)	1.66 (.01)
Organizational attraction	3.90 (.64)	3.73 (.80)	3.91 (.81)	3.64 (.93)	3.82 (.70)	3.79 (.81)	3.90 (.71)	3.46 (1.13)	32.01** (.12)	0.03 (.00)	9.99** (.04)	3.55 <sup>†</sup> (.02)
- Intention to pursue	3.96 (.70)	3.77 (.86)	3.91 (.87)	3.61 (1.01)	3.80 (.80)	3.75 (.92)	3.90 (.78)	3.44 (1.16)	32.26** (.13)	0.02 (.00)	8.67** (.04)	2.95 <sup>†</sup> (.01)
- Attractiveness	3.88 (.73)	3.70 (.95)	3.85 (.91)	3.60 (1.03)	3.78 (.78)	3.79 (.81)	3.92 (.81)	3.44 (1.19)	22.28** (.09)	0.08 (.00)	8.40** (.04)	4.77* (.02)
- Prestige	3.86 (.57)	3.71 (.70)	3.97 (.74)	3.69 (.88)	3.87 (.67)	3.82 (.82)	3.89 (.69)	3.50 (1.11)	27.23** (.11)	0.00 (.00)	8.25** (.04)	1.52 (.01)

*Note.*  $N = 230$ . Results based on 2x2x2 Mixed-Model ANOVAs. Standard Deviation values provided in parentheses. <sup>†</sup>  $p < .10$ , \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .