

## WERSJA DO SPRAWDZENIA

In addition to the test of the Dark Triad structure within national samples, we investigated whether this structure was invariant across the analyzed countries (i.e., to test whether people from across the globe understand the Dark Triad as a construct in a similar way). In analysis, we included Model 3 and Model 4 to see potential differences between these two (see Table 4). Both Model 3 (at least in terms of CFI) and Model 4 reached configural level of invariance. However, Model 4 represented substantially better fit to the data. Thus, the cross-cultural replication of the Dark Triad structure was confirmed and the presence of the dark core was notable around the world. Regarding other levels of measurement invariance, although Model 3 fell below the good model fit threshold, the overall difference between configural and metric model was acceptable. In turn, the estimates for the metric invariance of the Model 4 were suggesting a good model fit, the overall difference between configural and metric model exceeded the evaluation criteria. Given the number of groups however and the small difference in RMSEA, we interpret this result as confirming the metric invariance of the Model 4. Therefore, researchers aiming to compare correlates (i.e., covariances and regression coefficients) of the Dark Triad traits (and for the dark core) across cultures can do so. The goodness of fit of the scalar model in Model 3 and Model 4 was poor, thus, comparing latent means of the Dark Triad traits across the world is not trustworthy.

As many ambiguities in the Dark Triad research exist, especially when confronting biased with social desirability self-report (Kowalski et al., 2018) with different approaches where the effect of the social desirability is at least partially limited (e.g., experimental designs, implicit tests, power tests), it may be deemed that the initial predictions concerning the relationship between Machiavellianism and intelligence have not been sufficiently verified as the research relied more on self-appraisals (e.g., Rauthmann, 2012). Although it may be hypothesized that Machiavellians, with their ease of manipulating others (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), should be characterized by extraordinarily high intellectual skills (e.g., Jones & Paulhus, 2009), there is no data that would support such assumptions (e.g., O'Boyle et al., 2013; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Wilson, Near, & Miller, 1996). As Jones and Paulhus indicate (2014), one of the key elements of Machiavellianism, apart from manipulativeness and callous affect, is the strategic-calculating orientation, what – through the prism of the results of empirical research – suggests that the phenomenon of Machiavellian intelligence leaves much to be explained (see also: Jones & Paulhus, 2011).

Regarding your second issue, whether our model is data-derived, descriptive, and integrative in statistical meaning what makes possible to put all the forms of narcissism together, we would like to make two following remarks. First, as we explained above and also in the revision of our paper, it is possible to find a theoretical justification for putting all forms of narcissism in one basket. Second, general remark, Alpha and Beta found by Digman were for sure a statistical tool as they were just found in a factor analysis. However, it turned out very soon, that these constructs have a very interesting theoretical meaning, explored by Digman, DeYoung and many others scholars that led to the Two Factor Model of Personality (for a overview see Cieciuch, Strus, 2017). CPM continues this tradition and moves even farther from the purely statistical tool to theoretical model of a basic dimension of personality or a “matrix of personality”. The statistical meaning has been remained only as a way how the model can be tested and falsified what you called for in your first remark and we already answered above.