PSYCHOPATHY IN MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOUR AND BULLYING AT WORK: HEARING SOME UNHEARD VOICES FROM PAKISTAN

Ashique Ali Jhatial[1], Ghulam Ali Jariko[2], Abida Tahrani[3] & Yasmeen jam[1]
[1]*Institute of Commerce, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan*
[2]*Sindh Development Study Centre, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan*
[3]*Sindh Development Study Center, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan*
[4]*Department of Political Science, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan*

ABSTRACT
Theoretically, psychopathy is defined as a disorder of personality that is characterized by lack or severe underdevelopment of super-ego, any attachment and any inhibiting mechanisms that would deter a normal person from rendering any antisocial, immoral or wrong behavior. Modern corporate leaders go far beyond their mandate and adopt coercive leadership style in accomplishment of organizational goals. Leaders more often act like psychopaths and bully their subordinates. Existing research, mainly investigated specific characteristics, behaviors or traits of psychopathy in North America, Europe and other advanced countries by ignoring the case of developing countries especially Pakistan. Hence there is urgent need to undertake such research in Pakistani corporate sector for fine-tuning the existing theory. Furthermore, previous research focused on a particular population, such as violent individuals, or incarcerated criminals, lacking universality of their applications which requires replication of such research in modern corporate workplaces. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with variety of management and non-management employees in public and private sector organisations in Pakistan. This investigation reveals that corporate leaders possess elite and bureaucratic mind-set and retain unquestionable authority. This article reveals that the perpetrator and victim of bullying both need medical and counseling facility. Lastly, it is suggested that government and organisations should have and enforceable laws and explicit policies to prevent health-endangering bullying behaviors at work.
Key words: Modern management trends, Psychopathy, workplace bullying, voices, semi-structured interviews, Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

Psychopathy is considered to be a personality disorder which is normally characterized by lack or underdevelopment of super-ego, any attachment and any inhibiting mechanisms that would deter a normal person from rendering any antisocial, immoral or wrong behavior. Modern corporate leaders and managers go far beyond their mandate and adopt coercive leadership style in accomplishment of organizational goals. Leaders more often act like psychopaths and bully their subordinates. On the contrary, management theory and practice, in present-day, have experienced constant growth and profoundly aided and abetted business corporations, governments, not-for profit organisations and religious institutions in decision making and accomplishment of the tasks. Management research, on the other, contributes great body of knowledge that equally benefits societies, governments, businesses and not-for profit organisations across the world.

Samuel C. Certo (1997) defined management as: "process of reaching organizational goals by working with and through people and other sources". According to Certo, managers play central role in making things happen according to plans, time scheduled and budget allocated. Moreover, in order to work with groups, teams and individual

employee managers do several activities which are known as functions of management such as planning, organizing, influencing and controlling. Accomplishment of organizational goals are the key elements of managerial responsibility for which they plan in advance, organize resources, influence people at work and direct them accordingly. Influencing function of management refers to motivating, leading, directing or stimulating manpower in the organisation (Certo, 1997). Although the modern management theorists and philosophers (for example, Max Weber, F.W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, Mary Follet, Douglas McGregor, Elton Mayo, Peter Drucker and others) have laid down the very foundations of management theory and practice, yet the management practice in real corporate world is similar to military strategies and tactics where managers settle on coercive leadership style.[1] As a matter of fact, managers in real life profoundly embrace heroic and patriotic militaristic styles and lead organizations or departments in a militaristic way.

Management paradigms such as William Ouchi's Theory Z and Douglas McGregor's (1960) Theory Y communicate trust and the motivation of employees. As a result, antisocial, manipulative and coercive leadership style on the part of manager and any immoral act on the part of employee are remotely possible. Yet, there is possibility that a psychopathic and conscienceless with no integrity could have devastating effects on a firm as did Jeffrey Skilling at Enron in 2000. Skilling facilitated accounting manipulation and deception about earnings that led to Enron's collapse (Langbert, 2010). On the contrary, growing body of empirical literature

reports managerial belief in McGregor's Theory X. This theory hypothesizes that employees inherently dislike work, they are lazy employees and if they have chance they would avoid to do work. In that case, Theory X recommends managers to apply coerciveness to get work done. Managers go beyond their authority and mandate by not only applying coercive force but use abusive and negative behaviour at workplace.

The significant number of studies has examined the linkage of negative behaviour of manager or immediate boss with employees' low job satisfaction and organizational commitment and employees intend to quit (Lam, Hui and Law, 1999). Much recent research of (Avey, West, and Crossley 2008; Cheung, Wu, Chan, and Wong 2009) reported that there are several ways that boss/manager behave like a military general and show harsh, abusive and militaristic behaviour to demoralize employees. Previous research also reveals that those of the bosses who behave badly at work hardly earn respects of employees (Einarsen, Aasland and Skogstad 2007). According to Tepper, Duffy and Shaw (2001) managers commonly adopt very tough posture to exert coercive influence on employees for the accomplishment of task and objectives.

The prevalence of workplace bullying by management and presence of corporate psychopaths has widely been reported across the government, private and multinational companies irrespective of the size and type of firm and country context (Cowie et al. 2002; Johnson 2009). Workplace bullying and psychopathy have earned serious academic and research attention across developed and developing countries like Canada (Daiski 2004), the UK (Lewis 2006; Quine 2001; Randle 2003; Hutchinson et al. 2006), the USA (Griffin 2004; Simons 2006; Stanley et

---

[1] Bracker, J. (1980), 'The historical development of the strategic management concept' *Academy of Management Review*, 5:2, 219-224.

al. 2007), Australia (Curtis et al. 2007; Hutchinson et al. 2005; Rutherford and Rissel 2004), New Zealand (McKenna et al. 2003) Pakistan (Lee and Saeed 2001; Ahmer et al. 2009) and Turkey (Yildirim & Yildirim 2007). However, much of the research effort has remained yet in developed countries by ignoring the contexts of developing countries including Pakistan. Very limited research on the subject under investigation has been reported in nursing profession in Pakistan (Ahmer et al. 2009). As a result, the previous research affords very limited generalization of findings to other professions which raises number of academic questions for further investigation.

The central argument of this paper is that Pakistani organisations are inherently structured on bureaucratic and militaristic lines which afford 'manager or boss' unquestionable delegation of power permitting workplace bullying and miss-use of power to prevail. Similar expressions could be found in the studies of Khilji (2002, 2003). Furthermore, the societal norms are considered to be paternalistic, collectivist and hierarchical with high power distance where supervisor or boss enjoys unchallengeable power to his/her level of comfort (Aycan et al. 2000; Hofstede, 1980; Islam, 2004; Khilji, 2003). Bullied subordinates hardly complain or demand compensation bearing in mind the dire consequences with absence of organizational justice and conflict resolution procedures. Workplace bullying and abuse of authority is structural and correlated to employees' silence and absence of merit of justice (Khilji, 2003). Government sector enterprises in Pakistan have earned much defame as nepotistic and also have widely been criticized for having culture of *sifarish* (i.e. connection), cronyism and sycophancy which encourage

bribery and under-table transactions (Khilji, 2003; Islam, 2004).

Research gap
A careful review of literature on the subject of workplace bullying and psychopathy associated with managerial authority identified very limited research published in Pakistani context (Ahmer et al. 2009). Consequently, this study undertakes exploratory study by employing semi-structured interview with core-informants in government, private (local) sector and multinational companies. The findings of this study aimed to contribute to greater understanding of bullying behaviour and presence of corporate psychopaths at workplace in Pakistan. Also, this study expects to pinpoint the perpetrator and victim in most cases through demographic variables-age, gender, position in the organisation.

Literature review
This section presents key research on the managerial attitudes, psychopathic behavior and incidences of workplace bullying.

Management Behaviour
In pursuit of organizational goals, managers are vested with powers of planning, organizing, directing and leading staff members and activities at work. To large extent, managerial actions, engagements and accomplishments makeup management behavior. Empirical evidence supports the view that managers more often seek refuge in coercive leadership style and adopt inflexible and hard attitude which they assume adequate way to scare manpower and get work done. An increasing number of research studies investigated relationship of positive and negative behavior of immediate boss. Previous Studies identified that employees' job attitudes such as satisfaction commitment, turnover, and

retention are strongly related to the positive and negative behavior of manager (Bacharach & Aiken, 1979; Lam, Hui & Law, 1999). The findings of the research of Fleishman & Harris (1998) report that if supervisor is with low Consideration and high Structure leadership style then employees' grievances and turnover intentions will be high.

More recently Einarsen, Aasland and Skogstad (2007) identified that destructive management behavior at workplace violates the legitimate organizational objectives and overall employee dissatisfaction goes high. Similarly, Schaubroeck et al. (2007) contributed similar findings by reporting destructive leadership style strongly related to employees' stress, dissatisfaction and quitting organization. Tepper, Duffy & Shaw (2001) suggested that if employees' are high on conscientiousness and agreeableness personality dimensions that would moderate the relationship between abusive supervision at workplace. Similar findings were reported by Smith & Canger, (2004). Authors found out that supervisor traits of agreeableness, emotional stability and extroversion with low level of conscientiousness were found significantly related with subordinate ratings of satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intensions.

Personality psychologists have developed strong evidence on employees' personality traits and found direct link with personal and work-related factors. Jenkins (1993) reported that personality traits help in prediction of employees' satisfaction, commitment, turnover and retention. Judge, Locke, & Durham (1997) developed core self-evaluations to measure dispositional traits including self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control and emotional stability to measure job satisfaction at workplace. In more recent investigation researchers

suggest that four dispositional traits are best predictors of overall satisfaction and performance at workplace [Allen, Weeks & Moffitt (2005), Bauer et al. (2006) and Vinson, Connelly & Ones (2007)].

More recent investigations have reported a number of ways that a boss or manager show abusive, destructive or sadistic behaviour at work which directly affects employees' satisfaction and commitment. For example, Tepper (2000) and Hornstein (1996) investigated offensive and abusive behavior of managers at workplace. Studies found out that the managers who espouse coercive leadership style apply offensive and abusive behaviour with the belief that one example of rude and hard posture set precedent for rest of employees. Similar findings were reported by some other studies by calling managers as health endangering (Kile, 1990); petty tyrants (Ashforth, 1994); bullies (Namie & Namie, 2000); derailed (Schackleton, 1995); intolerable (Lombardo & McCall, 1984) and harassing (Brodsky, 1976). Furnham & Taylor (2004) investigated the prevalence of bullies and psychopaths at workplace. Authors reported that bullies and psychopaths are the fact of modern workplaces. Some other studies reported presence of bullies and psychopaths among white-collar jobs (Bobich, 2006).

Psychopathy

Since last few decades, psychopathy has received enormous academic and research attention in management science. Previously, psychopathy was considered to be hardcore subject of mainstream Psychology and Psychiatry. In past couple of decades, it has attracted attention of management theory, practice and research. Since then, an increasing body of empirical knowledge appeared in high impact factor journals and reported strong, positive, and significant correlations between the ethical issues of

bullying and unfair supervision in the workplace and the presence of corporate psychopaths. The main measure for bullying is identified as being the witnessing of the unfavorable treatment of others at work. Unfair supervision was measured by perceptions that an employee's supervisor was unfair and showed little interest in the feelings of subordinates (Boddy, 2011).

Theoretically, psychopathy is defined as a disorder of personality that is characterized by lack or severe underdevelopment of super-ego, any attachment and any inhibiting mechanisms that would deter a normal person from rendering any antisocial, immoral or wrong behavior (Bobich, 2006). In his book *Without Conscience*, Robert Hare described psychopathy as a combination of emotional and social deviance symptoms. With respect to the former, psychopaths do not experience emotions; they are socially deviant in the sense that they need excitement and have poor behavioral controls; they are impulsive; and they are antisocial. Hare (1993) further explained characteristics of psychopaths lacking guilt, remorse, or empathy.

In general, corporate psychopaths will emphasize emotional but not social deviance traits. Psychopaths could be found from higher level management to no-management employees. Due to the limited psychiatric appraisals people get to higher level executive jobs despite negative performance reviews (Babiak et al, 2010). The psychopaths who succeed in the corporate world are a select group who can manage the gaps in their personality structure. Only about 1 percent of the general population is psychopathic, and a 2010 study found that three to six percent of corporate employees may be responsible for the majority of ethical breaches in corporations. Furthermore, corporate psychopathy tends to be concentrated at

the higher levels of organizations. Several emotional aspects of psychopathy positively correlate with performance appraisal dimensions, such as communication skills, creativity, and strategic thinking (Babiak et al, 2010). Previous studies also report that psychopathic patterns could emerge from managerial roles such as good communication skills, creativity, and strategic thinking. It is not unusual for top management to support psychopathic employees because of their apparent creativity and sharpness. As they are uncovered by co-workers, workplace psychopaths become embroiled in conflict.

Psychopaths at work may experience trouble with teamwork for the same reason. Literature indicates that psychopaths keep on changing their minds and keep on saying one thing to one person and something different to someone else. They tend to be flattering of higher-ups and show up rude and abusive attitude to lower-ranking employees. Psychopaths lack empathy, emotion and conscience, they have no qualms about harming their employer or their boss. Not all want to climb the corporate ladder; many seek power or the thrill of manipulating others (Langbert, 2010). A candidate who is flattering to a higher level interviewer but condescending toward a lower level interviewer may be psychopathic.

This study has applied Robert Hare (1993) PCL-R instrument to rank top ten factors of psychopathy in management at workplace. The PCL-R was developed as a tool to measure psychopathic and antisocial behavior of individuals which is known as Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R). Originally, the PCL-R consists of a 20-item symptom rating scale that allows qualified examiners to compare a subject's degree of psychopathy of convicted or criminals. It is accepted by many in the field as the

best method for determining the presence and extent of psychopathy at workplace.

Workplace bullying

Growing empirical evidence suggests bullying behaviour has unleashed negative impact on interpersonal relations, emotional, physical health and well-being of employees (Einarsen et al. 2003). Workplace bullying is defined as 'repeated unreasonable actions of individual/group directed towards employee/group intentionally to intimidate and create a risk to the health and safety of the employees' (Quine 1999). The definition demonstrates workplace bullying as an abuse or misuse of power by which perpetrator intimidates, degrades, offends, or humiliates a subordinate or peer. The instances of undermining an individual's right to dignity at work or acts like unwarranted criticism, blame without factual justification, being treated differently than the rest of work group manifest bullying behaviour. A workplace condition where someone is being shouted at, being the target of practical jokes and excessive monitoring or is socially isolated.

According to bullying behaviour can be very hidden and indirect, making it hard to recognize as aggression (Einarsen et al., 2003; Rayner and Keashly, 2005). Bullying attitudes at work may include threats to professional status, such as belittling remarks, persistent criticism, humiliation, intimidation and inaccurate accusations (Moayed et al., 2006; Quine, 2001; Zapf and Einarsen, 2005). As a result, employees' social and formal status may come under threat their through verbal and physical threats and aggression, and by spreading rumours (Yildirim and Yildirim, 2007). According to the findings of Moayed et al. (2006) and Zapf and Einarsen (2005) workplace social isolation through withholding information, not returning

phone calls and emails and ignoring a person are also forms of bullying. Similar findings were also shared by Quine (2001) and Yildirim and Yildirim (2007). Authors suggested that unreasonable workload, unrealistic deadlines and excessive monitoring of their work. Additionally, Zapf and Einarsen (2005) research considered it part of bullying if employees are assigned meaningless tasks, tasks that are beneath the professional capacity of employees or level of competence or by removing key areas of responsibility.

There is stream of research which investigated the dimension of controlling employees at work. Recent investigations of Hoel and Beale (2006), Hutchinson et al.(2006) and Ironside and Seifert (2003) identified that managers attempt to control employees through bullying practices. Western European, North American and Australian literature on the subject show that an overwhelming majority of victims of bullying were bullied by their managers (Ironside and Seifert, 2003; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007). These findings have alarming implications for employees of advanced countries with a view that bullying managers may have organizational support (Hoel and Beale, 2006). Nursing, under Florence Nightingale, developed as a very hierarchical system where submission was 'expected, encouraged, indeed, demanded' (Reverby, 2005). According to Daiski (2004) and Hutchinson et al. (2006) suggested that managers use bullying behaviours to reinforce rules and norms, and to neutralize nurses who are challenging the status quo. This indicates that bullying is used as tool to maintain order and to reinforce existing power structures (Daiski, 2004; Hutchinson et al., 2006).

Hoel and Salin (2003) investigated authoritarian and *laissez-faire* leadership styles believed to create an environment

in which bullying flourishes. According to Schaubroeck et al. (2007) authoritarian leadership style strongly related to employee stress, dissatisfaction and intention to quit. Tepper et al. (2001) found that personality dimensions such as conscientiousness and agreeableness moderate the relationship between abusive supervision at workplace employee's decision to stay. In one study of nurses in the UK, 59 per cent of the respondents said they were bullied by a manager (Quine, 2001). Other studies from Australia (Hutchinson et al., 2005), New Zealand (McKenna et al., 2003), the UK (Lewis 2006) and the USA (Rowe and Sherlock, 2005) revealed managers contribute to bullying at work. Some leaders adopt bullying tactics as part of their repertoire of methods to get their employees to work harder (Lewis, 2006).

Review of literature suggests that research focus so far has remained in developed and Western countries as result they lack generalization of the findings in cross-country work-settings including Pakistan. Since, there is very limited research ever undertaken in Pakistan on the subject under investigation of this article authors deem is appropriate to do exploratory study in first place. Consequently, this study undertakes exploratory study by employing semi-structured interview with core-informants in government, private (local) sector and multinational companies. The findings of this study aimed to contribute to greater understanding of bullying behaviour and presence of corporate psychopaths at workplace in Pakistan.

Research methodology
Sample: Banking, information technology & communications (ICT) and tertiary education institutions (e.g. degree awarding colleges and universities) participated in this study.

Initially twelve organisations were contacted through emails and follow-up emails, however, seven agreed to participate. Date, time and place for data collection were fixed on telephone with participants. Senior executives, human resource managers, collective bargaining agents and non-management employees were among the participants. A total of fifty interviews were conducted. Table 1 depicts demographic information of sample interviewees such as age group, gender, experience, levels of management position and business sector.

Method of data collection: Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. First, we provided a definition of management behavior, psychopathy and bullying to inform participants. More description about the objectives of research was provided to the participant(s) on request. In order to gather data, authors prepared a checklist of managerial attitudes, psychopathic characteristics and bullying behavior. For psychopathy, we employed Hare's Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL-R) (Hare, 1993).

Procedure of data analysis: In order to minimize any negative impact on the participants the ethical protocols and guidelines were followed by authors. All the participants gave their informed consent freely without any intimidation or coercion and their confidentiality was guaranteed. Participants were provided with checklist of managerial bullying characteristics and PCL-R with explanation. Each of the participants was asked to identify the top ten characteristics of his/her manager and then rate that factor accordingly.

Results and discussion
In the initial stage of analyses, three main categories from interview transcriptions/narratives were generated. On the bases of commonalities in the

personal experiences and stories of respondents, the emerging patterns and themes were separated and interpreted. The analyses revealed several contextual factors other than discussed in the previous literature which are the major findings of this study. Following sections present detailed discussion of results and relevant theoretical, practical and managerial contributions.

Demographics

Table 1 demonstrates the information of sample interviewees' age, gender, experience and occupational status and their respective organizational affiliation.

The majority of participants' age ranges between 25 and 45. Main focus in data collection was set to have equal representation of male and female participants to minimize the gender bias. As a result, we had 24 male and 26 female interviews conducted. Similarly the participants' position in the organisations was also key demographic variable and thus we had addressed it very fairly by having interviewees from all management and non-management groups including CBAs were among the participants.

Table 1   Demographic detail of sample interviewees

Demographics	Specifications	Public (n)	Private (n)	MNCs (n)	Total (n)
Age	25 to 35 years	8	5	6	19
	36 to 45 years	10	4	4	18
	46 to 60 years	5	4	4	13
Gender	Male	10	8	6	24
	Female	10	7	9	26
Experience	Up to 10 years	11	8	10	29
	11 to 20 years	5	5	4	14
	21 to 30 years	3	2	2	7
Position in the organization	MLM	6	5	3	14
	FLM	7	5	4	16
	Non-management group	7	6	7	20

Managerial bullying characteristics

Table 2 presents rating of participants on managerial bullying characteristics. The bureaucratic mind-set of the manager or boss was highly rates by the participant followed by delegation of unquestionable power/authority on second position. Majority of the participants explained their rating in following words: *manager misuse of power is considered as right of boss or it is source of pride, and status. Managers show likeness for sycophancy, sifarish (connection or guanxi) and cronyism.* This finding is coherent to that of Khilji (2002, 2003) and Islam (2004). The

interviewees rated subordinates are threatened to loss of job, bonus or transfer at third. Participants believed that if they say 'no' to the manager or do not comply with the 'orders' employees may get threatened to face consequences. The threats of disciplinary action were rated in fourth position. Participants expressed their feeling in words as: *managers fabricate complaints, set unrealistic deadlines or keep high expectations from subordinates.* Managerial bullying acts also include passing belittling remarks for employees ethnic, religious and education, alumni affiliations.

Table 2   Ranking of top ten managerial bullying characteristics

Managerial bullying characteristics	Ranking
Bureaucratic mind-sets of boss	1
Unquestionable power/authority	2
Intimidation for loss of job, promotion, demotion, increment/bonus, transfer	3
Threats of disciplinary actions	4
Belittling remarks (i.e. ethnic/religious)	5
Sifarish/connection based recruitment, promotion, transfer, etc.	6
Fabrication of complaints	7
Unrealistic deadlines	8
Placing unreasonable expectations	9
False accusations	10

The majority of participants talked about the managerial or co-workers' derogatory remarks regarding affiliation of employees with national political parties. This is surprising to note that managers and colleagues even freely pass racial, ethnic, tribal, religious and communal remarks and make fun of all that. Amongst the common bullying and hurting factors political rivalries, exerting political influence, cronyism, sycophancy, nepotism, bribe and corruption, leg-pulling, backbiting are prevalent at workplace across business sectors.

Interviewees were also asked about the impact of bullying behaviour on their health, family life and performance at work. The victims of bullying experience significant physical and mental health problems such as high stress; post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), financial problems due to absence, quitting the job/organisation, reduced self-esteem, sleeplessness, or digestive problems. The breakdown of trust in a bullying environment may mean that employees will fail to contribute their best work and it also causes deterioration of relationship between supervisor-subordinate relationships. While bullying is the behaviour of an individual or a group, characteristics of organizations contribute to this behaviour (Ironside and Seifert, 2003). Solutions to the problem of bullying lie in identifying and eliminating organizational factors that allow bullying to flourish (Hutchinson et al. 2006; Lewis, 2006).

Top Ten Psychopathic characteristics
Table 3 presents top ten managerial characteristics found in management practice at work. Participants were provided with the list of The Hare's PCL-R 20 and asked to identify top ten traits of his/her manager and rate accordingly.

Table 3 PCL-R checklist

PCL-R	Description	Ranking

Grandiose and self-worth	Greatly inflated idea of one's abilities and self-esteem, arrogance and a sense of superiority.	1
Fails to accept responsibility for own actions	Denial of responsibility and an attempt to manipulate others through this.	2
Glibness and superficial charm	Smooth-talking, engaging and slick.	3
Cunning/manipulative	Uses deceit and deception to cheat others for personal gain.	4
Lack of remorse or guilt	No feelings or concern for losses, pain and suffering of others, coldhearted and unempathic.	5
Callous/lack of empathy	A lack of feelings toward others; cold, contemptuous and inconsiderate.	6
Shallow affect / emotional poverty	Limited range or depth of feelings; interpersonal coldness.	7
Needs stimulation/prone to boredom	An excessive need for new, exciting stimulation and risk-taking.	8
Pathological lying	Shrewd, crafty, sly and clever when moderate; deceptive, deceitful, underhanded and unscrupulous when high.	9
Parasitic lifestyle	Intentional, manipulative, selfish and exploitative financial dependence on others.	10

Participants were given adequate explanation on PCL-R checklist, further questions were answered and then they were asked to identify top ten characteristics from the list that they most often experience in his/her managers at work. Also, participants were given explanation regarding the symptoms of psychopathy that they may have experienced in managerial attitude especially lack of a conscience or sense of guilt, lack of empathy, egocentricity, pathological lying, repeated violations of social norms, disregard for the law, shallow emotions, and a history of victimizing others.

Grandiose and self-worth has been rated highest by the respondents. As a result, this particular characteristic occupies top position in the list. One of the participants stated: his/her *boss considers himself/herself only asset of the organisation whereas all other staff members are liability on the organisation.* Another respondent said:

my manager most often talks about his ability and professionalism and compares with the rest of the staff at their presence. Moreover he likes us to agree with him on this. And of course he leaves no chance to embarrass us in public. Another characteristic from the PCL-R ranked second is the manager's attitude of not accepting the responsibility of his/her actions. One participant expressed her feelings in following words: *although my manager is friendly and helping, nevertheless, she more often deny the wrong decisions and her failures by saying that I am manager and I need to pass order and you need to comply with and accomplish the task accordingly, so it your failure not mine.*

Glibness and cunningness have been ranked third and fourth respectively by the respondents. These findings indicate that corporate managers engage employees in their smooth-talking and manipulate them easily. Employees

being subordinates may avoid saying no to the boss or may not afford conflict. These findings are consistent with that of Khilji (2002, 2003). Lack of remorse or guilt and lack of empathy have been ranked fifth and sixth in the list respectively, by majority of respondents. One employee said his manager always says that he is feelings-free and care-free. The same employee said his manager then repeats words like: work, work and work. Other characteristics have been presented in table 3 according to the rating of the respondents.

Limitations of the study

This is an exploratory phase of research which bears a number of limitations in terms of qualitative data, analysis and conclusions drawn. Data collected through semi-structured interviews from government, private and multinational organizations. Limitations of this study require academic community to contribute a rigorous quantitative research on large scale at cross-section and cross-industry to examine corporate psychopaths and bullying behavior in Pakistan. In particular, Pakistan-focused research will allow researchers to revisit and revise existing knowledge through the consideration of new contextual variables. Fine-tuning existing theories will allow researchers to develop more generalizable theories at cross-national level. This is an exploratory study and no substantive conclusions have been made as a result more rigorous and quantitative study with sophisticated application of Structural Equation Modelling SEM/AMOS/Smart PLS and other techniques of data analysis.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper attempted to explore extant literature on corporate psychopaths and workplace bullying factors. The major objectives of this study were set to identify and differentiate prevalence of psychopathy in managerial behavior and workplace bullying across business sectors in Pakistan. Study employed semi-structured interviews for data collection with sixty senior to junior managers and non-management employees including representatives of trade unions. Participants identified top ten bullying attitudes and psychopathic factors in their immediate manager or boss. Similarly, participants identified and ranked bullying attitudes and psychopathic factors according to the personal experience. Participants were also asked about the consequences of psychopathic and bullying behavior of manager. Junior level managers and non-management employees shared disturbing experiences. Majority of participants shared their feelings like bullying behavior is health-endangering, causes huge stress and low performance at work. Participants believe authoritativeness and coercive leadership style are widely prevalent across business organisations and subordinates do not afford saying no to boss. Managers consider themselves as assets and employees as liabilities. Managers leave no chance of embarrassing employees, especially in public. Although, more recently government of Pakistan has promulgated legislation to protect women employees from any kind of workplace bullying and harassment, however, there appears need of a concerted effort and general legislation applicable to protect stakeholders at work. The workplace bullying is all-pervading regardless of organizational type and perpetrator and victim is also free of gender, age and status. Since, psychopathy and bullying are detrimental to the physical and psychological wellbeing of both the victim that leads to increased sick time and absenteeism. Organisations and management should have appropriate medical facility for all employee and

special counseling programmes may be more positive and beneficial in a negative and tense working environment. Government and organisations should have anti-harassment and bullying behaviour laws and explicit policy to protect general working class.

REFERENCES

Ahmer, S., Yousafzai, A.W., Siddiqi, M., Faruqui, R., Khan, R., and Zuberi, S. (2009). Bullying of Trainee Psychiatrists in Pakistan: A Cross-Sectional Questionnaire Survey', *Acad Psychiatry* 33:335-339.

Avey, J. B., West, B. J. & Crossley, C. D. (2008). The associationbetween ethnic congruence in the supervisor–subordinate dyad and subordinate organizational position and salary. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 81:551–566.

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R . N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G. & Khursid, A. (2000)'Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A ten-country comparison'. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49 (1):192–220.

Babiak, P. , Neumann, C. & Hare, R. (2010). "Corporate Psychopathy: Talking the Walk", *Behavioral Sciences and Law,* 28: 174-193.

Bobich, Z. (2006). The general theory of psychopathy, *American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry,* 27(4).

Boddy, C., R. (2011). Corporate Psychopaths, Bullying and Unfair Supervision in the Workplace, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 100, 3:367-379.

Certo, C. Samuel (1997). *Modern Management,* New Jersey, Prentice-Hall International, Inc.

Cheung, Millissa F. Y. Wu, Wei-Ping, Chan, Allan K. K. Wong, May M. L. (2009).Supervisor–Subordinate Guanxi and Employee Work Outcomes: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics* 88:77–89.

Cowie, H., Naylor, P., Rivers, Smith, P.K., and Pereira, B. (2002) 'Measuring workplacebullying' *Aggression and Violent Behavior*,7(1):33-51.

Curtis, J., Bowen, I. & Reid, A. (2007) You have no credibility: nursing students' experiences of horizontal violence. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 7: 156–163.

Einarsen, S. & Mikkelsen, E.G. (2003) Individual effects of exposure to bullying at work. In *Bullying And Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C.L., eds). Taylor & Francis, New York. pp. 127–144.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C.L. (2003) The concept of bullying at work: the European tradition. In *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C.L., eds). Taylor & Francis, New York. pp. 3–30.

Glendinnig, P.M. (2001). Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American workplace. *Public Personnel Management, Vol. 30,* pp. 269-285.

Hare, R. (1993). *Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths Among Us.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Hofstede, G. (1984) *Cultures consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hutchinson, M., Vickers, M., Jackson, D. & Wilkes, L. (2005) 'I'm gonna do what I wanna do.': organizational change as a legitimized vehicle for bullies. *Health Care Management Review*, 30 (4):331–336.

Hutchinson, M., Vickers, M., Jackson, D. & Wilkes, L. (2006) Workplace bulling in nursing: towards a more critical organizational perspective. *Nursing Inquiry*, 13:118–126.

Ironside, M. & Seifert, R. (2003) Tackling bullying in the workplace: the collectivedimension. In *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (Einarsen, S.,Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C.L., eds). Taylor & Francis, New York. pp. 383–398.

Islam, N. (2004) 'Sifarish, Sycophants, Power and Collectivism: Administrative Culture in Pakistan', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 70(2):311-330.

Ismail, H. Z. (1999) 'Impediments to Social Development in Pakistan', *The Pakistan Development Review,* 38: 4 Part II pp. 717-738.

Jhatial, A. A., Cornelius, N., Wallace, J. (2009) 'Human resources management practices in postcolonial and post-9/11 climate: Empirical evidence from Pakistan', *Conference Proceedings,* British Academy of Management, Conference, Brighton, UK. ISBN number: 0-9549608-5-8.

Jhatial, A.A., Syed, N.S., Qureshi, M.B., and Halepota, J.A. (2009) 'Managing employee turnover and retention: The role human resource management practices and organisational culture', *Journal of Grassroots*, Vol. No. XL.

Khilji, S.E. (2002) 'Modes of Convergence and Divergence: An Integrative View of Multinationals in Pakistan', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 13(2):232–53.

Khilji, S.E. (2003) 'To Adapt or Not to Adapt? Exploring the Role of National Culture inHRM' *The International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 3(2):121–44.

Keashly, L., & Harvey, S. (2005). Emotional Abuse in the Workplace. In S. Fox and P. E.Spector (Eds.) *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets* (pp. 201-235), American Psychological Association: Washington, DC.

Langbert, Mitchell B. (2010). "Managing Psychopathic Employees", *Cornell HR Review*. Paper 1 http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/chr r/1

Lewis, M.A. (2006) Nurse bullying: organizational considerations in the maintenance and perpetration of health care bullying cultures. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 14:52–58.

Lewis, S.E. & Orford, J. (2005) Women's experiences of workplace bullying: changes in social relationships. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 15:29–47.

Moayed, F.A., Daraishen, N., Shell, R. & Salem, S. (2006) Workplace bullying: a systematicreview of risk factors and

outcomes. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, **7** (3):311–327.

Quine, L. (2001) Workplace bullying in nurses. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 6:73–84.

Randle, J. (2003) Bullying in the nursing profession. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 43 (4):395–401.

Raynor, C., & Keashly, L. (2005). Bullying at work: A perspective from Britain and North America. In S. Fox and P. E. Spector (Eds.) *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets* (pp. 271-296), American Psychological Association: Washington, DC.

Salin, D. (2003). Way of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating, and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations, 56:* 1213-1232.

Johnson, S.L. (2009) International perspectives on workplace bullying among nurses: a review. *International Nursing Review* 56:34–40

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). Stressor-emotion model. In S. Fox and P. E. Spector (Eds.) *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets* (pp. 151-174), American Psychological Association: Washington, DC.

Xin, Katherine R. & Pelled, Lisa Hope (2003). Supervisor–subordinate conflict

and perceptions of leadership behaviour: a field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1).

Yildirim, A. & Yildirim, D. (2007) Mobbing in the workplace by peers and managers: mobbing experienced by nurses working in health care facilities in Turkey and its effect on nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 16:1444–1453. Young, I.M. (1990) Five faces of oppression. In *Justice and the Politics of Difference* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, pp. 39–65.

Zapf, D. & Einarsen, S. (2003). Individual antecedents of bullying: victims and perpetrators. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper (Eds.). *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace. International Perspectives in Research and Practice,* (pp.165-184). London: Taylor & Francis.

Zapf, D. & Einarsen, S. (2005) Mobbing at work: escalated conflicts in organizations. In *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets* (Fox, S. & Spector, P.E., eds). American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, pp. 237–270.

Zapf, D., Einarsen, S., Hoel, H. & Vartia, M. (2003) Empirical findings on bullying in the workplace. In *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (Einarsen, S.,Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C.L., eds). Taylor & Francis, New York, pp. 103–126.