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Abstract

The present study was conducted to examine the relationship between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employees. It was hypothesized that there is likely to be a relationships in self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employees. It was hypothesized that self-efficacy and need for achievement likely to predict the Machiavellianism. The sample size of was (N=200) males selected from different public sector department of Lahore using the purposive sampling. The data was collected using New Generalized Self-efficacy Scale (Gully & Chen, 2001), Need for Achievement Scale (Jackson, 1974) and Mach IV scale (1970). Results revealed that the significant positive relationship between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism. And self-efficacy was the positive significant predictor of the Machiavellianism and need for achievement was the negative predictor of Machiavellianism. The present study helps to understand the predictors of Machiavellianism and that could help to eradicate this manipulation and deceptive behavior and could be used for improve interventions.
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INTRODUCTION

This study aims to investigate the relationship of self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employees. People with high self efficacy tend to have the more abilities and high manipulative tactics, and people who have high level of need for achievement they use deception and other techniques to get success. Self-efficacy is a belief that was mainly concerned with the concept of an individual’s ability through which he performs behavior or task that was necessary for an outcome (Bandura, 1977). Henceforth self-efficacy decrees are concerned with one’s skills that he possess with what one can do with a skill one possess instead of the skill itself (Bandura, 1986). According to Bandura (1977), that people know their weigh, their all process and they handle the information according to their capability and they control their behavior choice and efforts according to them. So, expectations that are related to mastery of individual determine their goal choices and direction of goals’ behavior, outflow of efforts that person do in the pursuit of goals, consistency in expression of difficulty and experience of emotions (Bandura, 1986; Locke & Latham, 1990). Self-efficacy is conceptualized and dignified in the framework of behaviors that one performs in specific situations rather than as a personality trait.

• Perceived self-efficacy helps individuals in determining and using coping strategies in different types of situation by increasing many self-regulatory processes, achievement strivings and growth of intrinsic interest as well as career pursuits (Bandura, 1993).

• Creative self-efficacy is a certainty, in employees, to perform their roles assigned to them creatively. Creative performance is predicted by creative self-efficacy which is in influence under self-efficacy of job predicted in office settings (Tierney& Farmer, 2002).

Whenever people face difficult task and the people who have high self-efficacy take the trial as a situation to learn and master something. Motivation and interest they possess drives them through the challenge to fulfill their problematic yet approachable goal (Pajares&Schunk, 1986).

Although self-efficacy has multiple advantages, but very high level of self-efficacy can leads to pride and creates a false sense of ability which leads to poor or degraded performance on a specific task. Overconfidence usually leads to engaging in the wrong chores, making many mistakes, responsibility refusal of mistakes, and denying the correction feedback (Clark, 2001). Arrogance could also lead to reduced hard work and concentration that is necessary for a task (Stone, 1994).

Everybody in the world has motivation to accomplish their different tasks. And motivation of one person could be different from the motivation of other person. Our traits and career oriented objectives which make persons motivated because they feel the need to achievement. On one hand, employees want appreciation and they want to be acknowledged for successful completion of a task. On the other hand, other people want the praise by public and they are intrinsically motivated. Employees that have the motivation for the need for achievement are the people who take risks in the organization. These employees want challenges and want to learn new things in the world. Jex and Britt (2008) state that these employees have the tendency to become captivated to their work.

Murray (1938) has defined the need for achievement as person’s need to arrange, control, and master the thoughts, human beings and the physical objects. And he does it like quickly and freely as soon as possible, to control or remove the hurdles and to attain a high position. To be exceed in one’s life, to be competent and excel others, to rise the self-standard and position by exercising his talents successfully. Atkinson (1957, 1964) recommended that the emotional
problems and conflicts that are for being successful or the fear of failure create or produce the human motivation.

Leary and Kowalski (1990) establish in a research that people who have a high need of achievement focused on their self-representation behaviors that create an impression of competency. Likewise, Mowday (1978) described that persons who have a higher need of achievement are involved in behaviors that have the ascendant influence. Thus, need for achievement can reveal as stimuli that is for will power for a task, or an action which could construct a notion of political will describes by Mintzberg in (1983).

Many studies by (McClelland, 1985; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1976) have showed that three needs (need of power, need of affiliation and need for achievement) could be use as to state the real or major reason that why the human beings do the things.

Need for achievement is a desire that leads towards achievement and created by achievement imagery (Gorman, 2004). In everyday life, stories and videos of a person achievement imagery is means through which the attitudes that leads to achievement are described (Gorman, 2004). Images that surrounds the people and grow up around are highly motivated will have more effect and express the high need for achievement. As an example people who see all hard working people around him that are working hard to get success will more likely to work hard and perform well than people who have low motivated people around them. People who have the high tendency or desire to be successful with high standard that excel the excellence and are more goal oriented and ambitious for their or tasks (Smith, et al., 1992). People who have high level of achievement will tend to do more moderately difficult tasks, so that they would likely to increase or improve their performance (Smith, et al., 1992). The task that are moderately difficult will more likely increase their performance and have more chance of learning than the extremely difficult tasks and in this you have the high chance of being successful with high standard with high level of excellence. In many occupations most tasks have the high level of difficulty that these are totally money oriented (Atkinson and Feather, 1966). As an example, doctors are most rewarded with money, but if they want to be M.D that need more hard work and motivation level than that the doctors have.

The Machiavellianism gets its roots to the Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) who is the writer of “The Prince” guiding others on in what way to get and keep their authority. Christie and Geis (1970) stood the pioneers to start Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism is basically a procedure through which the exploiter gains some sort of return than he or she would acquire lacking exploiting, though others get less, as a minimumismide that particular situation (Christie, Geis, 1970). Machiavellianism meant a part of a person’s personality to some people for a long period of time. The people having this personality type tend to be manipulative, exploiting, expedient, and devious and lack the customary features of trust (Chen 2008). A Machiavellians person may adopt the method of using their cleverness if essential to get their goals and are self-centered as much as individual benefits are alarmed. In a century of twentieth Machiavellian might adopt violent, cunning, amusing and tricky actions to attain private and administrative goals (Jamal et al. 2007; Tang and Chen 2008).

Fehr and colleagues (1992) explained the motivations of Machiavellianism concert of insensitive egoism or untainted means. Instead of consuming an exclusive pack of goals, persons that were at high level of Machiavellianism were supposed to have classic inherent intentions (like sex, success, and sociality). Of any kind the purposes, Mach track themselves in deceitful means. This point needs nearly some sort of adjustment based on recent work wherein Mach was inquired about their impulses. High Mach gave high importance to money, as compared to low Mach supernorm and opposition (Stewart, & Stewart, 2006) and comparatively low preference to communal building, and family matters (McHoskey, 1999). Mach confessed to focus on complete accomplishment and to win at any rate (Ryckman, Thornton, & Butler, 1994). It should be noticed that this typical profile of motivation does not essentially oppose the novel view that Mach have as totally influential, nevertheless, money in the hunt for and power seeking lean towards to extend their tangential benefits to a maximal level in the long run.

Fehr and colleagues (1992) underlined encouragement and disclosure by way of the working diplomacies that were most preferably by Mach. A slightly current study still managed to expand on these and others strategies. As an example, Falbo's (1977) concept of Mach using inside influence tactics was sustained by the research done by Kumar and Beylein's (1991) like that Mach are specifically motivated to do brain manipulation, deception, and ingratiation.

The link between Mach and vengeance was completely taken into account for the overlapping of Machiavellian with subclinical psychopath (Nathanson & Paulhus, 2006). Simulation games were used to study Betrayal behavior among college students. The results showed that Machiavellian were involved in much unethical behavior like as showing (Hegarty, 1995). Meyer (1992) revealed that high scorer Mach were found to more tendency to involve in beating another person in one shot in bargaining games. The current researches show that Mach tends to beat other when there is no chance to another person of getting retribution (Gunnthorsdottirs, McCabes, & Smith, 2002).

Christie and Geiss (1970) highlighted that Mach has a cool detachment in conflict situations. Through anonymous reports it may be concluded that Machis more upfront in confessing the feeling of hostility and behavior (Locke & Christensen’s, 2007, Wightmans, 1991). As for hostility per, the date of self-reporting another time suggested a low positive correlation with Machiavellian (Sumans, Singh, & Ashoks, 2000; Watson & Morris, 1994), which included vocal anger (Martin, Anderson, & Thweate, 1998). Machiavelli officers similarly reported a greater inclination to use forceful (Corzine & Hozier, 2005).

Jay (1967) proposes that a Mach tactic is familiar with self-centeredness being the primary of employee’s motivation. Jay (1967) states inside organizations faithfulness towards one and the career of him and this excel in the loyalty of employee to the organization. To correct the condition, Jay (1967) proposes that through the creation of mutual goals the self-regard of persons might be connected to the wellness of the organization. Still, Plamenaets and Wokeir (1992) claim that Machiavellian overstated the degree to which individuals can alter sectors which suit to their desires and goals.

Gradually, leaders of world business, ethical behavior is considered as a main part of success in social or economic field. As an example, the chief officer of Unilever currently laid a great stress on the need of environment of the corporate sector and the motives of social interactions into the means of doing the business, the reason of transforming the capitalism as a good force (Scott, 2013). Most researches on ethical decision making emphasized the personal variables as previous circumstances (Craft, 2013), because of high ability to govern people ethical standard, to be informed of their ethical perception problems, and make their ethical direction (Rayburn 1996). In the terms of psychology, these all facets give symmetries and regularities in an individual’s behavior crosswise contexts, above time and among spheres (Snyder, 1983). As a determinant of ethical decision making Mach has received widespread attention (Liu, 2008), along with powerful negative impact perceived often in the researches of organizational behavior (Craft, 2013, Dahling et al., 2012, Growers & Enz, 2005, O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). Beneficial features are featured, like the manipulative behavior, dishonesty, deception and cold detachment (Liu, 2008), yet less part of this is known that the other individualistic features also impact it, identification of such behavior may help the managers in the realization of the presence and capacity and effect in work settings. The construct Mach stimulates the certain behaviors, meanness, and self-desired behaviors (Growers & Enzes, 2005: Kish-Gephart et al., 2010), hence it is posited that other variables or covariates (education; Christie & Geis, 1970) and common individual features impact the Machiavellian. As an example, Liu (2008) proposed that in terms of values, a ductile and inconsistent person might follow and seeks in work life tend to be more Machiavellian aspects. Therefore, it has the
possibility of the other variables related may affect psychological construct.

Economic and Political theory (Hobbes, 1991; Smith, 1998). The idea of humans is determined by both self-regard and others' motives has long pervaded organizational psychology and organizational behavior research (De Dreu & Nauroth, 2009). Nevertheless, based on the researches into human motivations that are still based on moral and social bases (Guillen et al., 2015), instinctive and unconscious self-regard has a main motivation for the actions of a person (De Cremer & Bakker, 2003; Grover & Hui, 1994). According to economic and political theory (Hobbes, 1991; Smith, 1998), the idea of homo economics the coherent, informed, egoistical, utility maximizing, and self-directed person has controlled many well-known management theories and subsequent business rehearses, and seems in charge for most immoral verdicts in today's business ground (Alderson & Kakabadse, 2012).

People who place their self-interests before other intentions and others' wellbeing and they were asked to evaluate themselves on the dimensions of Machiavellianism. The thinking personality type indicated the stronger relationship to Machiavellian beliefs than feeling personality type and participants who were younger and male reported high Machiavellianism than other regardless of personality type. And moreover, the individuals with extraversion and thinking personality type demonstrated high level of self-efficacy at office politics. By knowing the results it could state that individual with high self-efficacy reported strong and high level of Machiavellianism.

Okanes and Murray (1982) explored cultural differences in relation to Machiavellianism and need for achievement. They anticipated that students of the United States and the Philippines will score high on achievement scale and the Mach IV scales than to the students of Arabs like Iran. The Taiwanese were likely to score moderately for both measures. Their hypotheses were made on a cultural differences linked with these countries. The findings were supported to the hypothesis as there were no cultural differences in order to need for achievement and Machiavellianism.

Research conducted by Fehr and Pahlus (1992) studied the impact of Machiavellianism and need for achievement. The participants of the study were from but education and corporate sectors and they were asked to evaluate themselves on the dimensions of Machiavellianism. The thinking personality type indicated the stronger relationship to Machiavellian beliefs than feeling personality type and participants who were younger and male reported high Machiavellianism than other regardless of personality type. And moreover, the individuals with extraversion and thinking personality type demonstrated high level of self-efficacy at office politics. By knowing the results it could state that individual with high self-efficacy reported strong and high level of Machiavellianism.

Boozer, Harris and Forte conducted a research in (2005) in which they studied the psychological type, Machiavellianism and perceived self-efficacy. The participants of the study were from but education and corporate sectors and they were asked to evaluate themselves on the dimensions of Machiavellianism. The thinking personality type indicated the stronger relationship to Machiavellian beliefs than feeling personality type and participants who were younger and male reported high Machiavellianism than other regardless of personality type. And moreover, the individuals with extraversion and thinking personality type demonstrated high level of self-efficacy at office politics. By knowing the results it could state that individual with high self-efficacy reported strong and high level of Machiavellianism.

The purpose of the study by McGuire and Hutchings (2006) was to carry out the analysis of Machiavellianism of the determinants of the organizational change. The aim was to help sent a model that how the factors like power, front-runners, rules and values enhance or block the change in an organization. The sixteenth century Machiavellian text was used to check the change. The study found that Machiavellian thinking properly guides the challenges and hurdles of the organizational change and that how these all effects on the solution strategies like these identifies the individuals that play a concrete role in shaping if the changing strategies should be accepted or rejected. The study was so implacable to the organization like through this Machiavellian behavior could be understood and the organization could make interventions to improve their good organizational change.

A study of Hungarian refugees conducted by Weinstocks (1964) in which he examined the relationship between need for achievement and Machiavellianism. The participants of the study were 100 refugees. Correlation analysis was done to check the supposed hypothesis. The results showed low positive correlation between need for achievement and Machiavellianism, on Mach and achievement scale.

Johnson (1980) conducted a study to check the relationship between Machiavellianism and need for achievement. The sample of the study was 200 undergraduates students consisted of two groups. The finding of the research was that they found positive correlation of male groups on his own scale.

The study by Gullly and Phillips (1997) which studied the ability self-efficacy, goal orientation and different personality traits that predicts individual differences and performance. The sample of the study was 200 employees. The model of study was tested using LISREL 8. Ability, learning goal orientation, and locus of control were significant and positively correlated to self-efficacy while performance goal orientation was not significant and negatively correlated to self-efficacy. Self-efficacy and achievement need were positively related to level of goal, which was positively linked to performance in to with capability and self-efficacy. Moreover the results highlighting the connection and influence of personality traits they showed the self-efficacy and achievement were identified significant to the job performance.

A study was conducted by John Mike and Kiven (2014), in which they examined the indicators of need for achievement, need for power, affiliation, political orientation, ethical behavior and Machiavellian. The sample of the study was 178 marketing managers. The results and statistical analysis showed that those who had a high level of achievement they had a high level of need of power and Machiavellian and they were more politically oriented and less ethically oriented.

In an organization a cooperative and peaceful environment is necessary. For successful burnout, hard work and potential of employees is seen essential. If there is cooperative behavior and understanding of employees is found, that contribute to the positive outcomes for organization. If there is no leg pulling and deception the organization get success and therefore employees also get many privileges. But if the cunning, manipulative, deceptive and non-cooperative behavior of workers is found in an organization, that could be very dangerous for that organization and the employees. The employee’s high confident could cause this. And there high achievement needs could also be behind there. By knowing all these aspects there is less research that is carried out on self-efficacy and need for achievement as to relation with Machiavellianism. I wasn’t able to find international or indigenous literature regarding the said relationship within an organizational setting.

Rationale

In an organization a cooperative and peaceful environment is necessary. For successful burnout, hard work and potential of employees is seen essential. If there is cooperative behavior and understanding of employees is found, that contribute to the positive outcomes for organization. If there is no leg pulling and deception the organization get success and therefore employees also get many privileges. But if the cunning, manipulative, deceptive and non-cooperative behavior of workers is found in an organization, that could be very dangerous for that organization and the employees. The employee’s high confident could cause this. And there high achievement needs could also be behind there. By knowing all these aspects there is less research that is carried out on self-efficacy and need for achievement as to relation with Machiavellianism. I wasn’t able to find international or indigenous literature regarding the said relationship within an organizational setting.

Thus, this study is going to find out the relationship between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism, and it will help in understanding that how high self-efficacy or confident and achievement needs could cause manipulative and deceptive behavior.
and to which extent these behavior could be dangerous for an organization. This present study will help to understand this and then will open door for new researches in this field. Objective/Purpose of this research is,

- To find out the relationship between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employees
- To find out that either self efficacy or need for achievement is strong predictor of Machiavellianism in public sector employees

Hypotheses

H1: There is likely to be a relationship between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employees.

H2: Self-efficacy and Need for Achievement is likely to predict Machiavellianism in public sector in employees.

Research Design

The present study was done through co-relational and cross sectional research design to assess the relationship of self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employees.

Sample and Sampling Technique

For the collection of data the purposive sampling technique was used. The sample consisted on a total number of 200 public sector employees age between 25 to 60 years (M=35.89, SD=8.49) were selected from the different government departments in Lahore according to following criteria.

**INCLUSION CRITERIA**

- Public Sector Employees were included
- Employees with minimum Graduation degree
- Employees minimum service at that place at least 1 year experience
- Between the age range to 25 to 60 years were included

**EXCLUSION CRITERIA**

- Private Employee
- Contract or Daily basis employees were excluded

Demographic characteristics are described in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>35.89</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(Male)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(200%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(19.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>(64.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total work experience</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present work experience</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>(71%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(28.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>(44%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse working status</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>(72%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>7565</td>
<td>91799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Working</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; f=frequency; %=Percentage
Ethical Considerations

- Informed consent was sought.
- Permission was taken from department’s authorities.
- Confidentiality and anonymity of research respondents were assured.
- The participants were given the right to withdraw from research any time.

Results

The present research was conducted to examine the relationship between Self-efficacy, Need for Achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employees. Total 200 employees were taken from different departments of Lahore.

The data was analyzed in following steps. At first the descriptive statistics like mean, standard deviation, frequencies and percentage were computed. Reliability analysis was run to check the reliability of the scales. Pearson product moment correlation was used to check the relationship of variables. Multiple Regressions was run to check which of the variable strong predictor of Machiavellianism is. Reliabilities of the scales are described in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Reliability Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. K=Total no. of items;M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; value; α = Cronbach alpha

To test the hypothesis that there is likely to be a relationship between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employees; correlation analysis was run.

The result of Table 3 showed that there is a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism on the p value of <.01 and <.05. If the person has high level of self-efficacy and need for achievement he has the Machiavellian personality that leads him to manipulation and deception.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Pearson Product Moment Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Need for Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Machiavellianism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p < .05; p < .01

To test the hypotheses that Self-efficacy and Need for Achievement is likely to predict Machiavellianism in public sector in employees; regression analysis was run. The results of table 4 showed that the overall Machiavellianism explained the 0.59 of variance, and Self-Efficacy at the p value of <.01 is the strong predictor of Machiavellianism. Self-efficacy predicts the Machiavellianism in public sector employee like if an individual is high on self-efficacy he would have Machiavellianism. The results also show that need for achievement is the predictor of Machiavellianism. Results are described in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Regression Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p<.05; p<.01; B = Unstandardized Co efficient; \( R^2 \) = Square change; \( \Delta F \) = F change; CI=Confidence

Summary of the Findings

Reliability analysis was used to find the reliability of the scales. The results indicated that self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism scales have good reliability. The Pearson product moment correlation was used to find out the relationship between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism, and the results were significant as the self-efficacy, need for achievement has relationship with Machiavellianism. Overall model for Machiavellianism explained .59% of variance in Machiavellianism and the self-efficacy and need for achievement are predictors of Machiavellianism.

Discussion

Organizations are very important part of a country. Corporate sector have a very important part in the progress of a country hence these are the building blocks of a country. If the organizations and the public department are doing their work accurately a country could get more and more success. And if an organization wants an efficient and fast work their employee should be capable and they should have the potential to the best. And for the employee’s best work the environment should be good and cooperative and honesty should be prevail.

The present research was conducted to check the relationship among self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism in public sector employee. The objective of study was to check the relation and to check which variable is the strong predictor of Machiavellianism in employees of public sector.

It was hypothesized that there is an association between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism. And the results of the study were significant to the hypothesis and relationship was detected between self-efficacy need for achievement and Machiavellianism. The results of the present study were significant to the previous researches. The individuals with high self-efficacy have high level of Machiavellianism (Harris, Forte & Boozer, 2015). Harris (2015) found the significant association between self-efficacy and Machiavellianism. And in another study conducted by Fehr and Pahus(1992) they found the relationship between need for achievement and Machiavellianism. Their study hypothesis was based on the Skinner saying that high Mach tend to be high achiever and go to business oriented occupation. Their sample was business students and they found relationship between need for achievement and Machiavellianism. A study by Johnson in 1980 also confirms the relationship between need for achievement and Machiavellianism.

It was also hypothesized that the self-efficacy is the strong predictor of Machiavellianism. The results were significant to the hypothesis. And a study by Harris (2105) confirms the results of the present study.

It was also hypothesized that need for achievement would be strong predictor, which was negatively significant in regression analysis. A study by Weinstock (2014) stated the positive low correlation between need for achievement and Machiavellianism. And a study by Smith (1976) obtained a moderate negative correlation and a near-zero, positive correlation when his own short scale was used. Vleeming (1984), in a multiple regression analysis, reported a non-significant relation between scores on the Mach IV and achievement scale.
The sample of the study was 200 males from different public sectors departments. As the results were significant as previous study of Johnson (1980) stated that male group was high in relation to need for achievement and Machiavellianism.

CONCLUSION

- The study was carried out to investigate the association between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism.
- The study results were significant to the hypothesis and the previous researches.
- The results show the significant relationship in males.
- And it is concluded that there is an association between self-efficacy, need for achievement and Machiavellianism.

Implications

- The present study helps to understand the predictors of Machiavellianism and that could help to eradicate this manipulation and deceptive behavior and could be used for to improve interventions.
- Self-efficacy and need for achievement are needed but this study state that if the things go beyond to limits they create disturbance. And like so the employees should make realize that they should check there tendencies.
- Every organization needs potential and capability but through this study it is understood the balance between all things to make environment good.
- Through this study the manipulative and deceptive behavior could be understand and steps could be made to resolve it.
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