

Empathy, Dominance, and Everyday Sadism: Insights from Educated Males in Pakistan

Mahnoor Khan, Afia Sabir, Rafia Sabir, Hajra Tariq, and Ayesha Shahid Sheikh¹
Government College Women University, Faisalabad

With an emphasis on the issue of everyday sadism, the current study sought to investigate the link among educated males between empathy, order dominance, and sadism. This study combined a handy, non-probability sampling method with a correlation research approach. The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire (TEQ), Order Dominance Scale (ODS), and Comprehensive Assessment of Sadistic Tendencies (CAST-12) were completed by 100 educated males between the ages of 18 and 25. Findings revealed through Pearson's Correlation was that, a positive correlation between everyday sadism and empathy ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that individuals exhibiting sadistic traits can also possess empathetic qualities. Conversely, a negative correlation was found between everyday sadism and dominance ($r = -0.30$, $p < 0.01$), suggesting that those engaging in everyday sadism do not necessarily exhibit dominant behaviors. The results imply that everyday sadism may represent a distinct personality trait separate from other forms of aggression and antisocial behavior, as evidenced by the observed correlations. This study contributes significantly to the understanding of everyday sadism, highlighting its prevalence among educated males and its potential impact on social interactions. The findings can inform researchers and practitioners in developing effective interventions for individuals exhibiting these behaviors, thereby enhancing awareness of everyday sadism beyond its traditional sexual connotations. Overall, this research underscores the importance of recognizing everyday sadism as a relevant factor in psychological studies related to personality traits and social behavior.

Keywords: sadism; everyday sadism; empathy; order dominance; males; personality trait.

According to Baumeister and Campbell (1999), sadism is the enjoyment of another person's suffering or injury. Since the diagnosis of sadism in sex offenders can be a powerful predictor of violent sexual and non-sexual reoffending, research on this issue usually focuses on sexual sadism and sadism in sex offenders (Eher et al., 2015). A preference for BDSM (bondage-discipline, domination-submission, and sadomasochism), a sexual propensity in which people derive pleasure from their own or another's suffering or enactment of such activity, is an example of sexual sadism at subclinical levels (Hébert & Weaver, 2014; Richters et al., 2008). But sadism isn't always sexual. Although psychopaths were more sadistic than non-psychopaths in a sample of violent offenders, there was no significant difference in the sadistic features of violent and sexually violent psychopaths (Holt et al., 1999). "Everyday sadism" is the term used to describe non-sexual, subclinical sadism (Buckels et al., 2013).

Seldom do contemporary ideas of sadism go beyond criminal activity or sexual fetishes (Fedoroff, 2008; Knight, 1999; Nitschke et al., 2009). However, cruelty is enjoyed by seemingly ordinary, everyday individuals (Baumeister & Campbell, 1999). The antithesis of a masochist is a sadist, who takes pleasure in suffering. The main goal of a sadist is to cause harm to others, usually in order to get sex. But there's more to this word than just sex. A sadist could be anybody who enjoys being cruel, such as a bully. A sadist is most likely somebody who tortures another human being. Sadistic tendencies can manifest in everyday contexts, ranging from bullying behaviors to more extreme acts such as torture. Sadistic behavior is not limited to pathological cases but can emerge in subclinical contexts. For

¹ Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ms. Ayesha Shahid Sheikh, Consultant Clinical Psychologist, Hameed Latif Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan. Email: ayeshasheikh37@hotmail.com

instance, research highlights sadistic tendencies in actions such as killing insects or harming innocent individuals (Buckels et al., 2013), engaging in destructive online behavior like trolling (Buckels et al., 2014), or participating in violent video games, which can provide a virtual outlet for aggressive and sadistic inclinations (Greitemeyer, 2015). These findings underscore the pervasive and multifaceted nature of sadism, both in clinical settings and everyday interactions. We modified and extended the Short Dark Triad (SD3) measure to include sadism. According to research on dark personalities, sadism should be included in the constellation of dark personalities because it is closely related to other dark traits (Book et al., 2016). The Short Dark Tetrad (SD4) is a four-subscale inventory with seven items per construct that was developed through a series of three studies.

Thus, boredom is an aversive state that drives people to participate in various activities that provide “stimulation” or “arousal and pleasure” (Barbelet, 1999; Bench & Lench, 2013). Baumeister and Campbell (1999) argued in their analysis of evil behavior that “inflicting harm is likely to be arousing and can perhaps be pleasant, too. As such, it is certainly an antidote to boredom” (p. 216). Since hurting other people can generate excitement and stimulation (Chester, 2017; Chester et al., 2019; Cikara et al., 2014), we contend that sadistic behavior may be able to counteract boredom, especially boredom that results from attention deficits and understimulation, as in many archetypal cases of boredom. It may even be that sadistic acts become particularly alluring when one is bored because boredom raises one's overall reward sensitivity (Milyavskaya et al., 2019), which may change the perceived potential emotional reward of sadistic behavior. Bullies are rewarded by peers' vocal praise (such as applauding) and nonverbal signs like laughing and smiling, according to research on bullying (Salmivalli, 2010).

Paulhus and Dutton (2016) claim that because sadism's primary goal is to degrade and cause pain to others, it is at least as damaging to others as psychopathy (Myers et al., 2006; O'Meara et al., 2011). Sadism in its subclinical (non-pathological) form is sometimes called “everyday sadism”. However, everyday sadism is not regarded as a pathology, even when it is strong (LeBreton et al., 2006). Subclinical sadism manifests socially as a tendency to impose painful or degrading experiences on others or to enjoy watching them go through such experiences (Trémolière & Djeriouat, 2016). Strong practitioners of everyday sadism frequently commit expensive or destructive acts motivated by antisocial behavior, impulsivity, a need for validation, a lack of empathy, and a lack of regret, which have a variety of detrimental effects on the lives of others (O'Meara et al., 2011; Paulhus, 2014; Pfattheicher & Schindler, 2015; Southard et al., 2015; Trémolière & Djeriouat, 2016). In general, sadism in daily life is linked to immoral actions (Paulhus, 2014).

Daily sadism is an even more socially worrisome conduct since, in contrast to the other “Dark Tetrad” (Paulhus, 2014) features, it seems to be more representative of a non-goal exaltation where arousal-seeking orientation is crucial (Trémolière & Djeriouat, 2016, p. 160). According to Kaplan et al. (2007); Krasikova et al. (2013); and Trémolière and Djeriouat (2016), the presence of executives who exhibit strong traits of everyday sadism is detrimental to organizations because they create a toxic work environment, compromise the quality of products and services, delay assignment delivery, prevent the recruitment of talent, and increase the risk of fraud, corruption, and results management. The degree of everyday sadism stated by research participants was impacted by sociodemographic factors, including gender, age, education, and nationality. It's interesting to note that the correlation between sadism and educational attainment indicates that those with more advanced degrees are probably more sadistic. High degrees of sadism tend to generate damaging leaders who are likely to undermine the company strategy since sadism is closely associated with aggression, impulsivity, and bullying (Bates et al., 1991; Ferris & Grisso, 1996).

According to Jolliffe and Farrington (2006), empathy is a key component of pro-social conduct and is thought to promote social connections and growth. In general, global empathy is the response one has upon seeing another person's experience (Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias, 2015). Cognitive empathy and affective empathy are the two aspects of empathy. According to Mitsopoulou and Giovazolias (2015), cognitive empathy is the capacity to identify and comprehend the feelings of another person. The capacity to feel, absorb, and react to another person's feelings is known as affective empathy (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004). Social skills are seen as a measure of empathy in addition to cognitive and affective aspects, and they have long been a means of assisting in the assessment of global empathy (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004). Antisocial conduct was positively correlated with sadism across all cognitive empathy levels, suggesting that people who exhibit high levels of sadism and adequate cognitive empathy are more likely to engage in antisocial behavior (Bojanic & Dinic, 2018).

Being dominant, or having the power to influence or control, is the state of being dominant. An individual's tendency to take charge while interacting with others. the use of power or influence on other people. When someone or something is more significant, strong, or successful than other people or things, that person or thing is said to be dominant. Comprehensive Assessment of Sadistic Tendencies (CAST-12) scale was used for measuring everyday sadism. It is a quick assessment of sadistic personality consisting of 12 items. The Author of CAST-12 is Erin E. Buckels, The most recent modification to the scale was made on February 1, 2023. It includes subscales for three different types of sadism: vicarious sadism, direct verbal sadism, and direct physical sadism. CAST-12 total = mean of elements 1–12 ($\alpha=.87$). The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire To evaluate empathy, the 16-item TEQ was utilized. created in 2009 by Spreng et al. The TEQ consists of 16 items, of which 8 have negative scores and 8 have positive scores. You have greater than average empathy if your score is 45 or above. Your level of empathy decreases with a lower score. The TEQ is a solid and dependable tool for measuring empathy. The internal consistency reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded a respectable result of 0.72. The Order Dominance scale ODS is a dominance scale consisting of 25 items. Kyle Garrett Jones is the scale's author, and it was released in 2009. This test is intended to predict how you might respond in specific social settings. There are three alternative answers for each of the twenty-five questions. Though it should be used as little as possible, the "not sure" choice in every question might occasionally double as a "sometimes" option. This scale's dependability was determined to be 0.7527.

Overall, our approach to examine the association between empathy and dominance with sadism reflects a step in a new direction and constitutes a contribution to research that increases the awareness in this field of study. Our study aims to investigate sadism in its more commonplace form, or daily sadism, since the majority of research on sadism is in the realm of psychology and focuses on sexual problems. People who exhibit high levels of daily sadism frequently do expensive and destructive activities motivated by antisocial conduct, impulsivity, a need for validation, a lack of empathy, and a lack of regret, which have a variety of detrimental effects on other people's life. Our study aims to raise awareness of the detrimental impacts that everyday sadism has on a person's social and professional life. Everyday sadism, for instance, has been scientifically linked to traits like bullying, impulsivity, and aggression; online trolling; participation in antisocial punishments; and moral judgment patterns that extend beyond the suppression of emotional revulsion toward harmful intent or actual injury. It is commonly seen in interpersonal interactions and at work, where it is virtually always aimed at subordinates and seldom at superiors.

According to Pinker (2011), "everyday sadism," a milder and more common type of sadism, is a subclinical personality feature. Cruel, degrading, or violent actions, such those

seen in the workplace, provide everyday sadists with a sense of self-affirmation or enjoyment. Depending on the sadist's participation in the relationship, everyday sadism can be either direct or vicarious. Thus, although vicarious sadists would rather witness cruelty being performed, direct sadists take pleasure in causing suffering directly. Furthermore, direct sadism might be verbal or physical. Compared to the former, the latter can cause more serious and persistent injury. Numerous violent and antisocial behaviors, such as bullying, online "trolling," and provoked and unprovoked white noise blasts, have been linked to everyday sadism.

The capacity to see things from another person's perspective, feel what they are feeling, and put oneself in their shoes is known as empathy. In essence, it involves placing oneself in another person's shoes and experiencing their emotions. The word "empathy" comes from the German word *Einfühlung*, which means "feeling into" (Wispé, 1987) and was translated by Titchener (1909; Wispé, 1986). In general, it refers to both the ability to appropriately perceive another person's emotional condition and the results of doing so. According to Winter (2010), dominance is the propensity to express oneself or enforce one's will, frequently by acting boldly and assertively (Barrick et al., 2002; Buss & Craik, 1980; Maner & Case, 2016; Winter, 2010). Possessing the power to influence or exert control is the state of dominance. The tendency of a person to take charge while interacting with others, exerting power or influence on other people. A person or thing is said to be dominant if they are more significant, powerful, or successful than other people or things.

Few theories help explain role of empathy and dominance in relation with everyday sadism. According to the Social Dominance Theory, those who have a greater social dominance orientation (SDO) are more likely to enjoy seeing other people suffer and work to keep or improve their own position of authority and prestige (Sidanius & Pratto, 1992). According to Attachment Theory, there four attachment styles—secure, dismissive-avoidant, anxious-preoccupied, and fearful-avoidant—have an impact on empathy and interpersonal connections. Insecure attachment styles (anxious-preoccupied, dismissive-avoidant) may lead to difficulties in empathizing with others and a greater need for control and dominance (Bowlby & Ainsworth, 1969).

Sadism, often recognized for its extreme manifestations in sexual and violent contexts, has garnered limited exploration in its more common, everyday forms. Everyday sadism, characterized by deriving pleasure from inflicting or witnessing harm, is an under-researched personality trait that influences social interactions, workplace dynamics, and moral judgments. Understanding everyday sadism is critical because it exists on a spectrum and impacts behaviors such as bullying, internet trolling, and aggression, which are pervasive in modern society. Previous studies have primarily focused on sadism in clinical or criminal contexts, leaving a gap in understanding how this trait manifests in non-pathological populations, particularly educated individuals in professional and academic settings. Furthermore, the interplay between sadism, empathy, and dominance remains an area of ambiguity. While empathy is typically associated with pro-social behavior, emerging evidence suggests that sadistic individuals may possess heightened levels of empathy, which they manipulate to derive pleasure from others' suffering. Similarly, dominance is often perceived as a trigger for sadistic behavior, yet this relationship is not well-documented in subclinical populations. This study addresses these gaps by investigating the relationships between empathy, dominance, and everyday sadism in educated males in Faisalabad, Pakistan. Educated males represent a unique demographic where the coexistence of intellectual awareness and antisocial tendencies can reveal important nuances about everyday sadism. In order to better understand daily sadism as a personality feature that is different from other types of hostility and antisocial conduct, this research will investigate these correlations.

Method

This study investigated the relationships between dominance, empathy, and sadistic tendencies using a correlational research approach. Within the target population, the design sought to investigate the connections between these factors. Male educated individuals from Faisalabad, Pakistan, between the ages of 20 and 40, made up the study's target group. The Government College Women University Faisalabad, Government College University Faisalabad, Legacy Tower, Kohinoor Plaza, and Hassan retail mall were among the universities, offices, and software companies in Faisalabad from which a convenience sample of 100 participants was drawn. The inclusion criteria of the participants included male participants aged 20–40 years; minimum educational qualification of intermediate level; self-identified sadistic tendencies as indicated by responses on the Comprehensive Assessment of Sadistic Tendencies (CAST-12); employed or unemployed males from both joint and nuclear family systems. However, participants diagnosed with psychiatric disorders (e.g., severe depression, anxiety disorders, schizophrenia); having history of substance abuse or dependency within the past year and/or cognitive impairments or language barriers were excluded from the study.

Assessment Measurements

Comprehensive Assessment of Sadistic Tendencies (CAST-12; Buckels et al. 2023)

A quick (12-item) test of sadistic personality is the Comprehensive Assessment of Sadistic Tendencies (CAST-12) scale. It includes subscales for three different types of sadism: vicarious sadism, direct verbal sadism, and direct physical sadism. CAST-12 total = mean of elements 1–12 ($\alpha=.87$).

The Order Dominance Scale (ODS; Jones et al. 2009)

Order Dominance Scale To determine how you might respond in specific social settings, the ODS is a 25-item scale. Two main hypotheses form the basis of the scale. Reversal Theory (Apter, 1982) and Broken Windows Theory (BWT) (Wilson & Kelling, 1982) both center on the notion that personality is bistable and that each individual can behave in one of two opposing states of each aspect of their personality. BWT holds that disorder leads to petty crime, which in turn may lead to increasingly serious criminal activity. This scale's dependability was determined to be 0.7527.

The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire (TEQ; Spreng et al. 2009)

Empathy Questionnaire, Toronto The TEQ consists of 16 items, of which 8 have negative scores and 8 have positive scores. You have greater than average empathy if your score is 45 or above. Your level of empathy decreases with a lower score. The TEQ is a solid and dependable tool for measuring empathy. Cronbach's Alpha was used to examine the dependability of internal consistency and was found to be adequate at 0.72.

Procedure

To begin the research, an institutional approval letter was obtained from the Ethical Review Committee (ERC) of the Department of Applied Psychology at GCWUF. To start the study process, GC and Faisalabad University were chosen. The chosen measuring tool's authors' consent was also obtained. Permission was also obtained from offices and institutions to gather data from the male population of Faisalabad. The individual's consent was obtained while they were being updated on research ethics (the study's goal, risk-benefit ratio, research responsibility, and a pledge to protect their privacy). In order to verify their interest and willingness to participate in the current study, informed consent was then performed. After that, a demographic sheet was completed with basic data. Scales of sadistic,

empathic, and order dominance were used. Once data collection is complete, express vocally your gratitude to the individual, administrators, department head, and office staff for their cooperation. The quantitative study was conducted in accordance with the American Psychological Association's (APA) recommended ethics, which include informed consent, anonymity, secrecy, and prior approval. The GCWUF-ethical Review Board provided an official ethical approval letter in the interim.

Results

Table 1

Summary of Demographic Characteristics of participants

		n	%
Age (group)	19-25	65	65
	25-35	35	35
Gender	Male	100	100
	Female		
Religion	Muslim	100	100
	Non-Muslim		
Social Economic Status	Elite	15	15
	Middle	77	77
	Lower	8	8
Residential Area	Rural	36	36
	Urban	64	64
Marital Status	Single	64	64
	Committed/Engaged	12	12
	Married	24	24
Education	Matric	1	1
	Inter	9	9
	Bachelors	71	71
	Master	19	19
Occupation	Student	52	52
	Unemployed	7	7
	Employed	41	41
Family Structure	Joint	54	54
	Nuclear	46	46

The demographic characteristics of the participants were displayed in Table 1. The participant's average was ($M= 33.67$ and $SD= 3.88$), All the participants were Muslims. 15% people belonged to Elite families, 77% people belong to middle families, and 8% people belong to lower families. Moreover, 36% people lived in rural areas, and 64% people lived in urban areas. 64% people were married, 12% were committed and 24% were married.

Table 2

Psychometric Properties of the study variable's Scales

Scales	Items (n)	α	M	SD	Range
Sadistic Tendencies Scale	12	.87	33.67	3.88	26-45
Toronto Empathy Scale	25	.72	37.13	7.33	20-54
Order Dominance Scale	16	.75	28.87	5.29	15-42

Note. Range displays the lowest and highest scores, M is the sample mean, and SD is the standard deviation. " α " stands for the scales' internal consistency. The " α " value ranges from $>.90$ (excellent) to $>.80$ (good), $>.60$ (acceptable), and $<.60$ (unacceptable/low).

The psychometric qualities of each scale utilized in this investigation were listed in Table 2. Table 1 lists the scales' psychometric characteristics that were employed in the

research. The Sadistic Tendencies Scale, consisting of 12 items, demonstrated strong internal consistency, with a Cronbach's α of .87, indicating high reliability. The mean score for this scale was 33.67 (SD = 3.88), with observed scores ranging from 26 to 45. The Toronto Empathy Scale, which comprises 25 items, showed acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach's α of .72. The mean score for this scale was 37.13 (SD = 7.33), with a score range of 20 to 54. Similarly, the Order Dominance Scale, consisting of 16 items, exhibited good internal consistency, with a Cronbach's α of .75. The mean score for this scale was 28.87 (SD = 5.29), with scores ranging from 15 to 42. These results imply that each of the three scales is valid and appropriate for evaluating the study's various components. The variability in mean scores and standard deviations reflects individual differences among participants, supporting the appropriateness of these measures for the study's objectives.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
1 Sadistic Behavior	100	33.68	3.89	-		
2 Empathy	100	37.14	7.33	.018	-	
3 Order Dominance	100	28.88	5.29	-.062	-.013	-

The descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for Sadistic Behavior, Empathy, and Order Dominance. The results indicate a small positive correlation between Sadistic Behavior and Empathy ($r = 0.18$, $p < 0.01$), suggesting that individuals with higher levels of Sadistic Behavior tend to report slightly higher levels of Empathy. Furthermore, a moderate negative correlation was found between Sadistic Behavior and Order Dominance ($r = -0.62$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that individuals with higher Sadistic Behavior scores tend to exhibit lower levels of Order Dominance. Lastly, Empathy was found to be weakly negatively correlated with Order Dominance ($r = -0.13$, $p < 0.01$), suggesting a minimal inverse relationship between these constructs. These findings highlight the potential role of Empathy and Order Dominance in understanding Sadistic Behavior tendencies. The significant negative correlation between Sadistic Behavior and Order Dominance underscores the possible mitigating influence of structured and dominance-related traits on sadistic tendencies. All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed), with the magnitude of the correlations ranging from weak to moderate.

Table 4
Regression co-efficient of Empathy and Order Dominance

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95%CI
Constant	34.6	2.9	--	11.6	.00	[28.97,40.55]
Empathy scale	.009	.55	.01	.17	.86	[.098, .116]
Order dominance	.47	.75	.12	.61	.54	[.194, .102]

The regression analysis examined the relationship between empathy, order of dominance, and the dependent variable. The overall model's constant was significant ($B = 34.65$, $SE = 2.98$, $t = 11.65$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [28.97, 40.55]), indicating that the dependent variable's predicted baseline value is 34.65 when all predictors are at zero. For the empathy predictor, the unstandardized coefficient ($B = 0.009$, $SE = 0.55$, $t = 0.173$, $p = .865$, 95% CI [0.098, 0.116]) was not statistically significant. The standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.015$) indicates a very small and non-significant relationship between empathy and the dependent variable. Similarly, for the order dominance predictor, the unstandardized coefficient ($B = 0.47$, $SE = 0.75$, $t = 0.613$, $p = .543$, 95% CI [0.194, 0.102]) was also not statistically

significant. The standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.120$) suggests a small, non-significant positive relationship between order dominance and the dependent variable.

Overall, neither predictor (empathy or order of dominance) significantly contributed to the model in predicting the dependent variable. However, the standardized coefficients suggest that order of dominance has a slightly stronger (but still non-significant) relationship with the dependent variable compared to empathy. In conclusion, while empathy and order of dominance were hypothesized to predict sadism, the lack of significant findings suggests that these variables may not directly influence sadistic tendencies in the current sample. Future research may explore other factors, such as aggression, psychopathy, or more refined measures of dominance, to better understand the predictors of sadism.

Table 5

Mean comparison of demographic variables on Sadism, Empathy and Dominance

Variable	Urban		Rural		t(98)	p	Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD			
Sadism	33.68	3.75	33.64	4.17	-.060	.537	0.010
Empathy	37.0	6.45	37.37	8.78	.236	.058	0.048
Order dominance	29.8	5.36	27.37	4.68	-2.18	.548	0.482

Note. Rural= 36%, Urban= 64%. Cohen's d measures the effect size by comparing two means and their standard deviations. Effect size ranges (small = <0.50, medium= 0.50, large=>0.50), n= number of cases.

* $p < 0.05$.

Table 5 revealed residential area exhibited significant mean differences on Sadism $t(98) = .60$, $p < 0.05$, Empathy = .236 ($p < 0.05$), and Order Dominance = 2.18, ($p < 0.05$). Findings showed that urban educated men exhibited high score on Sadism ($M = 33.68$), $SD = 3.75$), compared with rural educated males ($M = 33.64$), $SD = 4.17$), The value of Cohen's d was 0.010.

Discussion

The present study explored the relationship between empathy, order dominance, and everyday sadistic tendencies among educated males in Faisalabad. Everyday sadism, a personality trait reflecting pleasure derived from inflicting or witnessing harm was examined in its subclinical, non-criminal context. Our findings revealed surprising patterns in the associations among the variables, diverging from some existing literature while aligning with others in nuanced ways.

Table 3.1 presented the demographic characteristics of participants of study. Research participant's average age was ($M = 24.38$ and $SD = 3.55$). 100% participants were male and Muslim. 15% participants were from elite class, 77% was from middle class and 8% percent was from lower class. Moreover, participants from rural area are 36% and from urban area are 64%. Also, the marital status of 64% participants was single, 12% was engaged or committed while 24% were married. Qualification of 1% participants was matric whereas 9% was intermediate, 71% was bachelors and 19% was doing masters. 41% participants were employed, 7% was unemployed and 52% was students. Lastly, 46% of the participants belong to nuclear family system and 54% were of joint family system. Table 3.2 indicated the psychometric properties of all the scales used in the present study. The cronbach's alpha value for Sadistic Tendencies Scale ($\alpha = .87$), Toronto Empathy Scale ($\alpha = .72$), Order Dominance Scale ($\alpha = .75$).

Contrary to our hypothesis, empathy and sadistic tendencies were positively correlated. This suggests that individuals with higher sadistic tendencies may also exhibit heightened empathy. These findings diverge from traditional studies where empathy, particularly cognitive empathy, has been negatively associated with antisocial and sadistic

behavior (Bojanic & Dinic, 2018). However, other research posits that individuals with sadistic tendencies may possess high levels of affective empathy, enabling them to recognize and exploit others' emotions for personal satisfaction. This highlights the dual-edged nature of empathy in facilitating both pro-social and antisocial behaviors.

Our results indicated a negative relationship between order dominance and sadistic tendencies, rejecting the hypothesis that dominance would trigger sadistic behavior. These findings suggest that individuals with strong dominance traits may not necessarily exhibit everyday sadism, possibly due to their focus on control and structure rather than harm for pleasure. This result contradicts studies linking dominance to aggressive or controlling behaviors but aligns with the notion that dominance may manifest in non-sadistic, leadership-oriented forms. Urban participants scored slightly higher on sadistic tendencies compared to rural participants. However, the differences were minimal and not significant, as indicated by the small effect sizes. This suggests that sadistic tendencies may not vary drastically across residential contexts in this sample.

Implications

These findings challenge the conventional understanding of sadistic behavior by showing that empathy can co-exist with sadistic tendencies, supporting emerging perspectives that sadistic individuals may manipulate their empathic awareness. The negative association between dominance and sadism underscores the complexity of these traits and their context-dependent expression. Practically, these insights are valuable for workplace and interpersonal contexts, where everyday sadism may manifest as bullying, trolling, or exploitative behavior. Understanding these dynamics can inform interventions to promote healthier social interactions.

Limitations and Suggestions

The study focused solely on educated males in Faisalabad, limiting the generalizability of findings to other demographics, genders, and regions. While standardized tools like CAST-12, TEQ, and ODS were used, they might not fully capture the complex interplay between empathy, dominance, and sadism. The study's design limits causal interpretations of the relationships among variables. One of the major limitations of this study is the scarcity of non-Western research. Most existing literature is based on Western populations, which may not adequately scan be fully generalized to diverse cultural settings. It is suggested to include diverse populations to enhance generalizability, investigate other potential predictors of everyday sadism, such as impulsivity, narcissism, or contextual factors and use longitudinal designs to explore causal pathways and situational triggers of sadistic behavior in future researches.

Conclusion

The present study examined the relationship between empathy, order dominance, and everyday sadistic tendencies among educated males in Faisalabad, revealing unexpected findings that deviate from certain aspects of the existing literature while providing support for other theories. The positive correlation between empathy and sadistic tendencies challenges traditional views on empathy's role in antisocial behavior, suggesting that affective empathy may enable individuals to exploit others' emotions for personal satisfaction. The negative relationship between order dominance and sadism suggests that individuals with dominant traits may be more focused on control than on deriving pleasure from harm. Finally, the minimal difference in sadistic tendencies between urban and rural participants suggests that residential context may not play a significant role in the expression of sadism in this population. These results contribute to a more nuanced understanding of everyday sadistic

tendencies and highlight the importance of further exploration into the complex factors that influence such behaviors.

References

- Amrhein, R. L. (2018). A psychometric investigation of the Comprehensive Assessment of Sadistic Tendencies (CAST): Evidence from factor analysis and item response theory [Master's thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign]. <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/101098>
- Anderson, A. E., & Marcus, D. K. (2019). A bifactor model of meanness, coldheartedness, callousness, and sadism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 137, 192–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.09.006>
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., Blais, J., Hosker-Field, A., Methot-Jones, T., Gauthier, N. Y., Volk, A., Holden, R. R., & D'Agata, M. T. (2016). Unpacking more “evil”: What is at the core of the dark tetrad? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 90, 269–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.009>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Campbell, W. K. (1999). The intrinsic appeal of evil: Sadism, sensational thrills, and threatened egotism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 210–221. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_4
- Buckels, E. E. (2018). *The psychology of everyday sadism* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia). <https://doi.org/10.14288/1.0369056>
- Buckels, E. E. (2021). *Development and validation of the Comprehensive Assessment of Sadistic Tendencies (CAST)* [Unpublished manuscript]. University of Winnipeg.
- Bojanic, V., & Dinic, B. M. (2018). The relationship between empathy, impulsivity, and the Dark Tetrad of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 123, 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.013>
- Bowlby, J., & Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1969). Attachment and loss: Volume 1. Attachment. Basic Books.
- Book, A., Visser, B. A., & Volk, A. A. (2016). Unpacking more "evil": What is at the core of the dark tetrad? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 90, 269–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.009>
- Buckels, E. E., Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). Behavioral confirmation of everyday sadism. *Psychological Science*, 24, 2201–2209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613490749>
- Buckels, E. E., Kerelluke, T., & Trapnell, P. D. (2018). Sadistic humor [Unpublished raw data]. University of Winnipeg.
- Bates, J. E., Pettit, G. S., Dodge, K. A., & Ridge, B. (1991). Socialization mediators of the relation between socioeconomic status and child conduct problems. *Child Development*, 62(5), 975–994. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131146>
- Buckels, E. E., Trapnell, P. D., Andjelovic, T., & Paulhus, D. L. (2019). Internet trolling and everyday sadism: Parallel effects on pain perception and moral judgment. *Journal of Personality*, 87, 328–340. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12393>
- Buckels, E. E., Trapnell, P. D., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Trolls just want to have fun. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.016>
- Bulut, T. (2020). Emotional processes as the basis of distinguishing sadism and psychopathy [Doctoral dissertation, University of Belgrade]. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.26626.61124>
- Buckels, E. E. (2023). Multifaceted assessment of sadistic tendencies. In P. K. Jonason (Ed.), *Shining light on the dark side of personality: Measurement properties and theoretical advances* (pp. 194–204). Hogrefe.

- Cikara, M., Bruneau, E. G., & Saxe, R. (2014). Us and them: Intergroup failures of empathy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(2), 149–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414524005>
- Chester, D. S. (2017). The role of empathy in sadistic behavior. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 146, 1026–1034. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000326>
- Fedoroff, J. P. (2008). Sadism, sadomasochism, sex, and violence. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 53(10), 637–646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370805301004>
- Greitemeyer, T. (2015). Everyday sadism predicts violent video game preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 75, 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.11.035>
- Jones, K. (2009) The Order Dominance Scale: Construction and Reliability Analysis. Unpublished honours thesis. University of Kwa-Zulu Natal, Pietermaritzburg.
- Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Development and validation of the Basic Empathy Scale. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29(4), 589–611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2005.08.010>
- Kaplan, S.E., McElroy, J.C., Ravenscroft, S. P., & Shrader, C. B. (2007). Moral judgment and causal attributions: Consequences of engaging in earnings management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74, 149–164. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-006-9226-y>
- Knight, R. A. (1999). Validation of a typology for rapists. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57(6), 773–782. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.57.6.773>
- LeBreton, J. M., Binning, J. F., & Adorno, A. J. (2006). Subclinical psychopaths. In J. C. Thomas & D. L. Segal, (Eds.), *Comprehensive handbook of personality and psychopathology* (Vol. 1, pp. 388–411). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Myers, W. C., Burket, R. C., & Husted, D. S. (2006). Sadistic personality disorder and comorbid mental illness in adolescent psychiatric inpatients. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, 34, 61–71. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.585.3221&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Milyavskaya, M., Inzlicht, M., Hope, N., & Koestner, R. (2019). Saying “no” to temptation: Want-to motivation improves self-regulation by reducing temptation rather than by increasing self-control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115(3), 500–516. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000153>
- Mitsopoulou, E., & Giovazolias, T. (2015). Personality traits, empathy, and bullying behavior: A meta-analytic approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 21, 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.01.007>
- Nitschke, J., Osterheider, M., & Mokros, A. (2009). Sadistic personality disorder revisited. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 27(2), 254–268. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.864>
- O’Meara, A., Davies, J., & Hammond, S. (2011). The psychometric properties and utility of the short sadistic impulse scale (SSIS). *Psychological Assessment*, 23, 523–531. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022400>
- Paulhus, D. L., & Dutton, D. G. (2016). Everyday sadism. In V. Zeigler–Hill, & D.K. Marcus, (Eds.), *The Dark Side of Personality: Science and Practice in Social, Personality, and Clinical Psychology*, American Psychological Association.
- Pfattheicher, S., & Schindler, S. (2015). Misperceiving sexual interest in others: The role of everyday sadism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(8), 1095–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215592677>
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 15(2), 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007>

- Southard, A. C., Nose, K., Pollock, C., Mercer, S. H., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). The dark side of personality: Predicting maladaptive outcomes with subclinical psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 87*, 153–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.07.041>
- Spreng, R. N., McKinnon, M. C., Mar, R. A., & Levine, B. (2009). “The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire.” *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*(1), 62-71
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1992). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge University Press
- Trémolière, B., & Djeriouat, H. (2016). The sadistic trait predicts minimization of intention and causal responsibility in moral judgment. *Cognition, 146*, 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2015.09.014>
- Wispé, L. (1986). The distinction between sympathy and empathy: To call forth a concept, a word is needed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(6), 1144-1150. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.6.1144>