



**BRITISH ACADEMY
OF MANAGEMENT**

BAM
CONFERENCE

3RD-5TH SEPTEMBER

ASTON UNIVERSITY BIRMINGHAM UNITED KINGDOM

This paper is from the BAM2019 Conference Proceedings

About BAM

The British Academy of Management (BAM) is the leading authority on the academic field of management in the UK, supporting and representing the community of scholars and engaging with international peers.

<http://www.bam.ac.uk/>

**The Development and Validity of the
Psychopathy Measure–Management Research Versions 1 & 2**

BAM Conference, September 2019. Track 18: Organisational Psychology

Author Clive R. Boddy, University of Tasmania: clive.boddy@utas.edu.au

Abstract

This paper describes the development of the measures and evidence for the validity of the constructs of corporate psychopathy characterised in the Psychopathy Measure–Management Research Version (PM-MRV) and the Psychopathy Measure–Management Research Version 2 (PM-MRV2). The grounding of the papers in the most respected work on psychopathy is described. Content validity is established by comparison to corresponding items in similar research measures. The paper then describes how both characterisations have predictive accuracy, reliability in use and practical value.

Introduction

A key challenge in the building and sustaining of high-performance organisations is in accurately identifying which leaders represent the worst type of leader that organisational groups may choose to utilise towards achieving their ambitions. One type of toxic leader is the corporate psychopath and this paper describes two measures which may be utilised in identifying the presence of such people. The Psychopathy Measure–Management Research Version and Psychopathy Measure–Management Research Version 2 were developed as indicators of the presence of psychopathic management and leadership in the workplace. This was to enable comparisons to be made between organisational environments containing psychopathic management to those free from psychopathic management to help establish the influence of such management on workplace variables such as conflict, bullying, job satisfaction, withdrawal, and employee exit behaviour.

The substance and make-up of psychopathy measures has been marked by disagreement and contention with regards to the boundaries and features of the condition and a resolution of these issues is far from settlement (Lilienfeld et al., 2014, Crego and Widiger, 2016). The procedure for establishing the validity of a measure involves a continuous exercise, much like the scientific endeavour itself, and there is generally no categorical distinction between valid and invalid. Rather there is a process of gradually refining the case for a measure’s validity (Westen and Rosenthal, 2003). The aim of this current paper is to outline the current state of the validation of the Psychopathy Measure–Management Research Version (PM-MRV) and the Psychopathy Measure–Management Research Version 2 (PM-MRV)

Validity from Grounding the Measures in the Most Authoritative Literature

The PM-MRV2 measure has a deep relationship to primary psychopathy. This level of grounding in the theoretical and research literature is associated with being a good starting point for reliability and validity in a measure. As recommended in outlines of measure development (Hinkin, 1995, Hinkin, 1998) the items within the PM-MRV measure were developed deductively from a review of the most authoritative theoretical and empirical literature. This helps to assure content validity from the start of the process of measure development. This development from existing work is in line with the usual understanding of how science progresses via the adaptation and refining of ideas to take scholarship into different areas of investigation. Scientific progress encompasses the idea that science is a collective enterprise of researchers who build on and further each other's work over successive generations (Ilkka, 2015).

The PM-MRV is based on the psychopathy literature up to 2007 as it was developed in 2007/2008 as the first "other report", rather than "self-report" measure of workplace psychopathy. The PM-MRV2 is also deeply grounded in the psychopathy literature but ignores the substantial volume of criminal characterisations of psychopathy and builds instead on Cleckley's characterisation as this is the most authoritative source. Nonetheless there are still correspondences with other measures of psychopathy because many alternative measures also rely on Cleckley's original 16 element characterisation of psychopaths. A strong conceptual and theoretical relationship between the PM-MRV and PM-MRV2's measures and psychopathy, particularly as expressed in its "successful", "primary", "industrial" and "corporate" definitions, is therefore evident.

The PM-MRV2 measure avoids contamination with criminal characterisations of psychopathy because it is designed for use in a corporate or organizational setting. Criminal characterisations of psychopathy such as the PCL-R reportedly (Hare gives a summary of the traits of psychopathy in his book (Hare, 1993)) contain elements such as juvenile delinquency, revocation of conditional release (recidivism), criminal versatility, impulsivity, early behavioural problems and poor behaviour control. However, if these elements are included in the definition of psychopathy, then assuming a 75% cut off score for psychopathy on that measure (as is commonly reported), then non-criminal psychopaths are almost never going to be identified as psychopaths.

This is important because Cleckley states that most psychopaths do not end up in prison and Hare writes (p.115) that psychopaths who come to the public's attention only represent the tip of the iceberg, while most psychopaths live among us in society (Hare, 1993). Therefore, if criminal characterisations of psychopathy are used as the standard for identifying psychopaths then logically they will fail to identify most psychopaths.

The PM-MRV2 was adopted for use in corporate environments to try and overcome this problem. In recognition of this, other psychopathy researchers estimate that such an explicit focus on the interpersonal and affective features of psychopathy may make the measure well-suited to use in business research (Smith and Lilienfeld, 2013). Measures are needed which avoid contamination with criminal characterisations of psychopathy

Content Validity

Content related validity is the validity gained from a measure having appropriate content regarding the construct it is meant to be measuring, for example construct validity can be said to be a type of content validity. This is because construct validity relates to whether the items in a measure relate to the underlying theoretical concepts and relationships, for example, to whether psychopathy relates to bullying or not. As discussed above, the PM-MRV2 characterisation is strongly grounded in the most consequential and significant psychopathy literature, which is an important first step in developing a valid measure. Much of this literature is in turn based on Cleckley who is reported to have developed the most authoritative definition of what constitutes a psychopath as well as the criteria that are most commonly included in definitions of psychopathy (Crego and Widiger, 2016).

Therefore, measures based on Cleckley's authoritative work will logically encapsulate the most valid and reliable psychopathy measures. This content validity is supported by work undertaken by different researchers on their own robust measure of psychopathy, the CAPP (Kreis et al., 2012). All the items within the PM-MRV (see Table 1) have close correspondence with CAPP items which were rated as being highly or very highly proto-typical of psychopathy by 132 psychopathy experts. For example, in the PM-MRV being an 'accomplished liar' corresponds closely to being 'deceitful/dishonest' in the CAPP. The latter item was rated as 6.27 out of a maximum score of 7 in terms of being typical of psychopaths. Similarly, in the PM-MRV2 the item 'is totally egocentric' corresponds with the CAPP item 'Self-centred/egocentric'. This latter item was rated as 6.48 out of a maximum score of 7 in terms of being typical of psychopaths.

Similarly, all the ten characterisations within the PM-MRV2 (see Table 2) appear to be highly or very highly prototypical of psychopathy, as assessed by the 132 psychopathy experts who gauged the proto-typicality of corresponding items in the CAPP. This means that the PM-MRV2 has content validity as would be expected of a characterisation so profoundly based on the psychopathy literature, and particularly on Cleckley's work.

Construct Validity

In terms of construct validation one aim of this can be to embed the measure of a construct into a nomological network; a network of linked ideas and concepts. In other words the aim is to establish the relationship of a measure to other variables with which the measure should theoretically be related in a positive, neutral or negative manner (Cronbach and Meehl, 1955). Construct validation is thus always theory dependent, and a statement about the validity of an instrument is a statement concerning to what extent the measure's observed associations with other variables match theoretical predictions about how it should be associated with those variables (Westen and Rosenthal, 2003).

Construct validity is therefore typically established by investigating the correlations between a measure of a construct and other measures that should, theoretically, be associated with the measure (Westen and Rosenthal, 2003). One element of this is the predictive validity of a measure. Predictive validity concerns whether a measure predicts performance on related criteria. For example bullying and psychopathy have long been linked and in research using the PM-MRV2 and the similar but preceding PM-MRV, high correlations or associations between bullying and corporate psychopathy have been found (Boddy, 2011b, Boddy, 2014, Malovany, 2014). This adds to the evidence that there exists a good degree of construct validity for both PM-MRV characterisations of corporate psychopathy.

Face Validity

The PM-MRV measures have face validity. Face validity, concerns whether the measure appears to be assessing the construct that is being studied. The construct of corporate psychopathy has been conceptualised as being close to that of the “successful psychopath” the “sub-clinical psychopath”, the “industrial psychopath” (Babiak, 1995) or the “primary psychopath” as outlined by, for example, Levenson (Levenson, 1992, Levenson, 1993).

In line with the literature the nascent concept of successful psychopaths is taken to mean those psychopaths that have no criminal convictions (Yang et al. 2005). Some of these may work in corporations, called ‘white-collar’ psychopaths (Vien and Beech, 2006) and these are the primary concern of research using the PM-MRV measures. The concept of the successful psychopath (Lynam, 1997), denotes those who are able to operate in society and who are not incarcerated or likely to be incarcerated. The concept of the unsuccessful psychopath is taken to mean those psychopaths who have criminal convictions (Yang et al., 2005, Widom, 1977, Cooke and Michie, 2001). Therefore, the PM-MRV measures contain no items relating to the criminality of subjects because they seek to identify the presence in management of the more successful type of psychopath.

One element of face validity which has been demonstrated by the PM-MRV concerns the question of how much a one per cent 'of workers' or a circa 3.9% of managers incidence rate of corporate psychopaths, corresponds to a 'working with' incidence rate. The essential point is that the incidence of employees who work with a corporate psychopath is a multiple of the incidence of corporate psychopaths in any corporation. Therefore, if 1% of employees are corporate psychopaths, and assuming that people can accurately report on 5 to 15 other employees whom they know well in the organization they work for, then we can theoretically expect reported incidence rates of working with corporate psychopaths to vary between around 5% and 15 %.

The finding from one Australian study (2011) that 13.4% of research participants rated someone in their corporation as behaviourally psychopathic thus falls within the expected incidence levels. Previous Australian research using the PM-MRV, found that about 5.75% of employees were working with someone who could be classed as a corporate psychopath and the figure for ever having worked with a corporate psychopath was 32.1% in this Australian sample (Boddy, 2011c).

Similar research in 2011 in the UK among a more specifically defined sample of 304 white collar workers gives a figure of 10.9% of employees who currently worked with a corporate psychopath. This means that the findings from two independent Australian samples and the British sample all fit within the theoretically expected range. This again indicates that a valid and reliable measure is being used.

Concurrent Validity

If a measure is validated by a comparison with a currently existing criterion, then concurrent validity exists. Factorial evidence for criterion validity would include a clustering of items into one factor, where this is a finding that supports the theory-based grouping of items. Construct validity refers to the extent to which a measure captures a specific theoretical construct or trait.

As discussed above, concurrent validity is whether a measure relates to similar measures already in existence. Concurrent validity is the degree to which a test corresponds to an external criterion that is known concurrently (i.e. occurring at the same time) (McLeod, 2007). The PM-MRV2 has just been tested quantitatively against the PM-MRV measure of psychopathy in Australia in 2019. The correlation between the two was elevated and this was also at a highly statistically significant level, indicating concurrent validity. Additionally, there is evidence for criterion related or concurrent validity from historical and qualitative research. For example, further evidence for the validity of the PM-MRV measures comes from when they are used to identify psychopaths in history such as Hermann Goering, who was diagnosed as a psychopath in 1946 at the Nuremberg War Trials. The PM-MRV measures (along with four other measures of psychopathy) correctly identify Goering as a psychopath.

Similarly when used to analyse possible psychopaths in business history such as Robert Maxwell, whom Hare, an expert in criminal psychopathy reportedly identified as a possible psychopath (BBCNews, 2004). The PM-MRV again shows that Maxwell fulfils all the PM-MRV characteristics of psychopathy (Boddy, 2016). The PM-MRV thus appears to be a useful predictor or identifier of corporate and political psychopaths. In other words, it demonstrates accuracy and validity in use.

Also in terms of concurrent validity, the two elements from personality research which consistently relate to psychopathy are agreeableness and conscientiousness e.g. (Seibert et al., 2011) and research using both the PM-MRV and PM-MRV2 found correspondingly high levels of disagreeableness and a lack of conscientiousness in psychopathic managers e.g. (Boddy, 2011a, Malovany, 2014, Boddy, 2017). This again supports the validity of both measures.

Reliability, an element underpinning validity, implies internal consistency which means that items in a scale should be positively related to one another (Todd et al., 2004). In research, the inter-item correlations for the PM-MRV were all positive meaning that the individual items relate well to each other and the construct of the corporate psychopath has good levels of internal consistency and reliability. Researchers report that a measure of good internal consistency is achieved when Cronbach's alpha exceeds .70 and mean inter-item correlations exceed .15 (Falkenbach et al., 2007). Cronbach's alpha is taken as a measure of internal consistency and reliability and an alpha coefficient measures how correlated each question item is with each of the other question items in the scale being used, the logic of this being that if the items in the scale are all related then it is an internally consistent scale (Tharenou et al., 2007).

Using these criteria the PM-MRV measure used for identifying corporate psychopaths scored well with an alpha of 0.93 (Boddy et al., 2010); such a high level may have been predicted based on the utilising of such a well-grounded measure, (i.e. a measure with a high level of content validity, because it was designed by taking into account the views of experts in the field) (Green and Tull, 1978). Further, all the inter-correlations exceeded 0.15 (i.e. all positive) revealing high internal consistency (Boddy 2010b). All items in the PM-MRV have similar average inter-correlations, which is what is expected where they belong to a similar domain (Hinkin, 1998).

Psychologists state that as a rule the most crucial measure of reliability is the end product of the psychological test itself (Jensen 1959); in other words, whether it appears to make intuitive sense, has face reliability and face validity. In research using the PM-MRV and PM-MRV2 the measures of corporate psychopathy used have face reliability and face validity present (Boddy et al., 2015). The results make sense in that they are what would be expected from the literature. The PM-MRV has a great deal of this crucial measure of validity; results are exactly in line with theoretical expectations and finds lower job satisfaction, decreased well-being, and higher stress among those who work alongside corporate psychopaths.

Reliability

In terms of reliability (which underlies validity) the PM-MRV displays good internal consistency and good reliability in test-retest situations. In terms of test-retest reliability, the PM-MRV has been administered at three different points in time, twice in Australia in 2008 and 2019 and once in the UK in 2011. Where measures of other behaviour were the same (and therefore comparable) across research exercises, for example in terms of corporate social responsibility, bullying and corporate psychopathy, then the results were very similar, and in some cases almost identical. This indicates that the PM-MRV measure is highly reliable. Use of the PM-MRV2 also produces similar results across the qualitative studies in which it has been used. Subjects identified in three different studies were all involved in unethical behaviour, fraud and were all reportedly bullying.

Discussion

Within Cleckley's paradigm of psychopathy, entailing, as it does that most psychopaths are not criminalised, then a measure of psychopathy that entails criminality is neither logical nor valid. Similarly, from Cleckley's point of view and from Cooke and Michie's point of view, as most psychopaths are not criminals then a measure of psychopathy which includes criminal elements, is an inappropriate measure. This is one compelling reason why the PM-MRV measures do not contain criminal, anti-social or impulsive elements.

Traditionally psychologists have worked at the individual level of analysis, rating for example a person on a self-reported or individually observed psychopathy measure and then investigating levels of other behaviour in that person. Babiak for example, observed a single workplace psychopath and wrote a case study paper about those observations (Babiak, 1995). However, the approach adopted by the PM-MRV measures, whereby employees rate their current supervisor on a measure of psychopathy in order to identify the presence of corporate psychopathy in the workplace, was able to generate larger sample sizes of psychopathic managers. This approach to psychopathy research also entails taking a wider and more holistic perspective than the "individual" approach usually adopted by psychologists. For example research using the PM-MRV does not investigate whether corporate psychopaths engage in counterproductive work behaviour themselves (as individuals) (O'Boyle et al., 2012) but rather whether those who work with them do (Boddy, 2014).

Psychologists usually research personality and individual effects at the singular level, investigating for example whether being taller will, on average, result in reaching a higher organizational position or whether being Machiavellian will entail the Machiavellian person having lower levels of job satisfaction than other employees. This approach is fine as far as it goes but it ignores wider and perhaps more interesting results.

This singular approach can be likened to Sir Alexander Fleming noticing the mould that had fallen into, and was growing on, the jelly in one of his culture plates, but concentrating only on the mould, perhaps concluding that the bacteria on the plate had no influence on the mould and the mould was undisturbed. The key finding was that the mould appeared to have an inhibitory effect on the surrounding growth of bacteria. Fleming called the mould *Penicillin notatum* (AmericanChemicalSociety, 1999). The subsequent development of Penicillin is noted as being one of the greatest breakthroughs in modern medicine. Like this approach to noticing events external to the mould, the PM-MRV's approach to researching corporate psychopaths involves looking at how their personality affects other employees rather than the psychopaths themselves. Corporate psychopaths may, for example, be perfectly satisfied with their abusive and bullying approach to their subordinates. A psychopathy researcher may therefore conclude that there is no relationship between corporate psychopathy and job satisfaction. However, in fact the job satisfaction of everyone in close contact with the corporate psychopath diminishes greatly (Boddy and Taplin, 2016, Boddy, 2010).

This more holistic approach to research has slowly been adopted by psychologists and for example psychology researchers asked employees to measure their supervisor's abusive and corporate psychopathy traits as well as self-report measures of their own job satisfaction and turnover intention. They found that corporate psychopathy was positively and significantly correlated with abusive supervision and turnover intentions and negatively correlated with employees' job satisfaction (Mathieu and Babiak, 2016). There is no evidence known to this author, of psychopathy researchers using this methodological approach before 2010 when a person from the USA, corresponding by e-mail, requested a copy of the PM-MRV measure. After being sent the PM-MRV this person later admitted that the usually went by a different name and that they worked for a company called Multi-Health Systems. They thus acquired a copy of the 2008 PM-MRV questionnaire on corporate psychopathy (and job satisfaction, withdrawal, workload, constraints, bullying and unfair supervision) which utilised this method of research. Since then the psychopathy researchers associated with the principals of Multi-Health Systems have used the methodological approach several times, also looking at job satisfaction, withdrawal, and abusive supervision, although not citing work using the PM-MRV in doing so. This implies that the approach initiated by the PM-MRV is worthwhile, otherwise why emulate it?

Findings using this "other-report" approach from different researchers yield directionally identical results as does research using the PM-MRV. Recent work by psychologists has supported many of the PM-MRV author's original conjectures about the probable dark behaviour of psychopaths in the workplace (Boddy, 2015a, Boddy, 2006). For example, that corporate psychopaths would generate high levels of distress has been supported (Mathieu et al., 2012).

That job satisfaction would be significantly related to the presence of corporate psychopaths was proposed (Boddy, 2006) and supported by research (Boddy, 2010) and further investigated and supported by recent findings from psychology (Mathieu et al., 2014) to the extent that corporate psychopathy is a main determinant of job satisfaction (Boddy and Taplin, 2016).

Similarly that employee well-being would be significantly correlated to the presence of corporate psychopaths has been proposed, demonstrated (Boddy 2013) and then further supported in more recent research using a similar methodological approach (Mathieu et al., 2014). Recent research also supports the early estimation (Boddy, 2006) that corporate psychopaths would be involved in fraud (Jeppesen et al., 2016).

Findings using the PM-MRV measures have face validity because the presence of PMR-MV psychopaths (among samples of white collar workers and managers) correlates with theoretical expectations. Withdrawal, job satisfaction, organisational constraints, bullying, workload, well-being and counter-productive work behaviour all correlate significantly with corporate psychopathy (Boddy and Taplin, 2015, Boddy, 2015a, Boddy, 2015b).

The measures are also associated with high levels of staff turnover and lowered levels of trust in management as well as perceived management credibility (Boddy et al., 2015). The PM-MRV measures also successfully identify political psychopaths like Goering and highly psychopathic businessmen like Maxwell. The PM-MRV was designed to be accurate in a corporate setting; it validly predicts expected outcomes and dependably identifies known successful, corporate and political psychopaths. While acknowledging that questions of construct validity are never completely or entirely settled, for all practical purposes it is apparent that the PM-MRV can be used with confidence in management research to identify the presence of corporate psychopaths. The measure demonstrates validity in use and has predictive accuracy and practical usefulness – the two most important demonstrators of a construct's validity (Cronbach and Meehl, 1955).

As an idea for further validation research, it may continue to prove to be the case that the brain connectivity and chemistry of all types (successful and criminal) of psychopathic individuals are similar in terms of their lack of emotional response and intellectualisation of emotional stimuli. Indeed some psychology researchers have already suggested that the most robust measure of psychopathy, given the competing and contested definitions and measures available, may well be through brain scans rather than behavioural measures (Hulbert and Adeli, 2015). Further research could help establish what the more accurate measures of psychopathy are, by comparing measures with evidence from brain scans.

The following tables ((1&2) compare the items in the PM-MRV and PM-MRV2 with the corresponding items in the CAPP (Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality) to illustrate how typical these characteristics are deemed to be of psychopaths. As rated by Kries et al., all the characterisations within the PM-MRV measures appear to be highly or very highly prototypical of psychopathy, as assessed by psychopathy experts gauging the proto-typicality of related items in the CAPP. This means that the PM-MRV measures have content validity as would be expected of characterisations so deeply grounded in the psychopathy literature. How deeply grounded is illustrated in Table 3, which compares Cleckley's characterisations of psychopathy with the PM-MRV measures.

Table 1: PM-MRV- CAPP Item Correspondence

PM-MRV Characteristics displayed	Corresponding CAPP Items	CAPP Item Prototypicality Score (Kreis et al., 2012) Scale = 1 (low) to 7 (high prototypicality)
Glibness and Superficial Charm: <i>(Such behaviour as being smooth and slippery, friendly and extroverted on first meeting them, being an entertaining speaker, and being very persuasive when it suits them).</i>	Insincere (Superficial, Slick, Evasive)	6.26
	Garrulous (Glib, Verbose, Pretentious)	4.50
Are Accomplished Liars <i>(Such behaviour as being able to lie convincingly when they need to, being good at bullshitting and being able to talk themselves out of trouble when found to be lying).</i>	Deceitful (Dishonest, Deceptive, Duplicitous)	6.27
Are Manipulative and Conning <i>(Such behaviour as being good at conning and using people, having well developed political/networking skills and being good at seducing other people).</i>	Manipulative (Devious, Exploitative, Calculating)	6.44
	Uncaring (Inconsiderate, Thoughtless, Neglectful)	5.93
Have A Grandiose Sense of Self-Worth <i>(Such behaviour as bragging about themselves, downplaying their own personal problems and blaming others for them, behaving like they feel that they are above the rules).</i>	Self-Aggrandising (Conceited, Self-important, Condescending)	6.14
	Self-Centred (Ego-centric, Self-absorbed, Selfish)	6.48
	Sense of Uniqueness (Sense of being Extraordinary, Exceptional, Special)	5.58
Display a lack of remorse about how their actions harm other employees <i>(Such behaviour as saying that they feel bad about their own harmful actions but don't act as though they really do feel bad, blaming others for trouble they cause themselves, having no shame over their ruthlessness in pursuing their careers at any cost.).</i>	Lacks Remorse (Unrepentant, Unapologetic, Unashamed)	6.56
	Detached (Remote, Distant, Cold)	5.64
Are Emotionally shallow, calculating and cold <i>(Such behaviour as not being affected by someone close dying or suffering, making dramatic displays of emotion that don't look real or heartfelt, claim friendship with you but being unconcerned with your welfare).</i>	Lacks Emotional Depth (Unemotional, Indifferent, Inexpressive)	6.40
	Uncommitted (Unfaithful, Undevoted, Disloyal)	5.37
Display a lack of empathy – they don't show any capacity to experience the feelings of others <i>(Such behaviour as openly making fun of others, being able to fire people without worrying about it, being selfish, being emotionally or verbally abusive)</i>	Unempathic (Cruel, Uncompassionate, Callous)	6.49
	Aggressive (Threatening, Violent, Bullying)	5.64
Refuse to take responsibility for their own actions <i>(Such behaviour as always having an excuse when things go wrong, blaming others for their own mistakes, claiming responsibility for the good work that other employees do).</i>	Unreliable (Undependable, Untrustworthy, Irresponsible)	5.99
	Self-justifying (Minimizing, Denying, Blaming)	6.03

Table 2: PM-MRV2 - CAPP Item Correspondence

PM-MRV2 Characteristics displayed	Corresponding CAPP Items	CAPP Item Prototypicality Score (Kreis et al., 2012) Scale = 1 (low) to 7 (high prototypicality)
1. Superficial Charm and Apparent Intelligence: The subject appears to be friendly and easy to talk to, agreeable, makes a positive first impression and is apparently a genuine person who is socially at ease.	Insincere (Slick, Superficial, Evasive)	6.26
2. Untruthful and Insincere: The subject lies and is a convincing liar because of their apparent sincerity and honesty.	Deceitful (Dishonest, Deceptive, Duplicitous)	6.27
3. A Cheating Personality: The subject cheats, fails to live up to promises, cons, seduces and deserts others. They are good at organizational politics, claim the good work of others as their own and would probably steal, forge, commit adultery or fraud if they could get away with it.	Manipulative (Devious, Exploitative, Calculating)	6.44
	Uncaring (Inconsiderate, Thoughtless, Neglectful)	5.93
4. Is Totally Egocentric: The subject is egocentric and self-centred, cannot love or care for others and can only discuss love in intellectual terms. They are totally indifferent to the emotions or fate of their colleagues.	Self-Centred (Ego-centric, Self-absorbed, Selfish)	6.48
	Self-aggrandizing (Conceited, Self-important, Condescending)	6.14
5. Has no remorse about how their actions harm other employees: The subject denies responsibility for their own poor behaviour and accuses others of responsibility for failures that they themselves cause. If they admit any fault then they do so without any regret or humiliation. They put their career advancement above their colleagues.	Lacks Remorse (Unrepentant, Unapologetic, Unashamed)	6.56
6. Emotionally Shallow: The subject can readily demonstrate a show or display of emotion but without any true feeling. They cannot experience true sadness, woe, anger, grief, joy or despair and are indifferent to the troubles of others.	Lacks Emotional Depth (Unemotional, Indifferent, Inexpressive)	6.40
	Detached	5.64
7. Unresponsive to personal interactions: The subject doesn't respond to kindness or trust in the ordinary manner. They can display superficial reactions but do not have a consistent appreciation for what others have done for them. They are indifferent to the feelings of others and can openly make fun of other people	Uncommitted (Unfaithful, Undevoted, Disloyal)	5.37
	Un-empathetic (Cruel, Uncompassionate, Callous)	6.49
8. Refuse to take responsibility for their own actions: The subject initially appears to be reliable and dependable but can then act unreliably and with no sense of responsibility or regard for any obligations to others.	Unreliable (Undependable, Untrustworthy, Irresponsible)	5.99
9. Calm, poised and apparently rational: The subject does not display neurotic or irrational characteristics. They are always poised and not anxious or worried even in troubling or upsetting circumstances which would disturb or upset most other people.	Lacks Anxiety (Unconcerned, Unworried, Fearless)	5.11
10. Lack of self-blame and self-insight about own behaviour: The subject blames their troubles on other people with elaborate and subtle rationalisations. They do not think of blaming them self, even when discovered in bizarre, dishonest or immoral situations that would promote despair or shame in other employees.	Self-justifying (Minimizing, Denying, Blaming)	6.03

The close correspondence between the Cleckley characterisations and the items in the PM-MRV measures can be clearly seen in the table (3) below. As discussed, the PM-MRV was developed after a reading of the psychopathy literature as it existed in 2007 when the measure was first developed.

However, once the misleading nature (i.e. the almost totally criminal and institutionalised orientation) of much of the psychopathy literature was fully realised, then the PM-MRV2 was developed by almost exclusively relying on Cleckley's authoritative source material and on personal experience. The PM-MRV2 was a deliberate attempt to develop an essential measure of psychopathy focussing on underlying attributes rather than symptoms.

Cleckley also included other characteristics in his original list of psychopathic behaviour but these would be difficult to capture in a workplace environment and/or employee surveys and so were not included in the PM-MRV items. These characterisations included; poor judgement/failure to learn from experience, fantastic and uninviting behaviour with or sometimes without drink, rare suicide attempts, an impersonal sex life and a failure to follow a life plan.

Table 3: Cleckley’s Characterisations of Psychopathy Compared to the PM-MRV & PM-MRV2.

Cleckley’s Original Key Criteria for Psychopathy (Cleckley, 1941/1988). (A List of the Characteristics of Psychopaths Living in Society)	The PM-MRV	The PM-MRV2
Superficial Charm and good intelligence. Friendly, easy to talk to, agreeable, makes a positive first impression, genuine and socially at ease.	Glibness and Superficial Charm: <i>(Such behaviour as being smooth and slippery, friendly and extroverted on first meeting them, being an entertaining speaker, and being very persuasive when it suits them).</i>	Superficial Charm and Apparent Intelligence
Untruthfulness and insincerity. A convincing liar because of unpretentiousness and apparent sincerity and honesty.	Are Accomplished Liars <i>(Such behaviour as being able to lie convincingly when they need to, being good at bullshitting and being able to talk themselves out of trouble when found to be lying).</i>	Untruthful and Insincere
Inadequately motivated antisocial behaviour which is impulsive. Cheats, fails, cons, deserts and annoys others. Steals, forges, commits adultery and fraud.	Are Manipulative and Conning <i>(Such behaviour as being good at conning and using people, having well developed political/networking skills and being good at seducing other people).</i>	A Cheating Personality
Pathological egocentricity and incapacity for love. Egocentric. Self-centred. Cannot love others and can only discuss it in intellectual terms. Indifference to the fate of others.	Have A Grandiose Sense of Self-Worth <i>(Such behaviour as bragging about them-selves, downplaying their own personal problems and blaming others for them, behaving like they feel that they are above the rules).</i>	Is Totally Egocentric
Lack of remorse. Denies responsibility for own actions and accuses others of responsibility. If admits fault then does so without regret or humiliation.	Display a lack of remorse about how their actions harm other employees. <i>(Such behaviour as saying that they feel bad about their own harmful actions but don’t act as though they really do feel bad, blaming others for trouble they cause themselves, having no shame over their ruthlessness in pursuing their careers at any cost.).</i>	Has no remorse about how their actions harm other employees
Affective (Emotional) poverty. Can readily demonstrate the show of emotion but without true feeling. Cannot experience true sadness, woe, anger, grief, joy or despair.	Are Emotionally shallow, calculating and cold. <i>(Such behaviour as not being affected by someone close dying or suffering, making dramatic displays of emotion that don’t look real or heartfelt, claim friendship with you but being unconcerned with your welfare).</i>	Emotionally Shallow
Interpersonal unresponsiveness. Doesn’t respond to kindness or trust in the ordinary manner. Can display superficial reactions but not consistent appreciation for what others have done for him.	Display a lack of empathy – they don’t show any capacity to experience the feelings of others <i>(Such behaviour as openly making fun of others, being able to fire people without worrying about it, being selfish, being emotionally or verbally abusive).</i>	Unresponsive to personal interactions
Lack of insight. Cannot see himself as others do. Blames his troubles on others with elaborate and subtle rationalisations.	Refuse to take responsibility for their own actions <i>(Such behaviour as always having an excuse when things go wrong, blaming others for their own mistakes, claiming responsibility for the good work that other employees do).</i>	Refuse to take responsibility for their own actions
Absence of irrational thinking. Apparently normal emotions, healthy ambitions and good personal standards.		Calm, poised and apparently rational
Absence of nervousness. Free from minor neurotic characteristics. Poised, not anxious or worried even in troubling circumstances.		Lack of self-blame and self-insight about own behaviour

Conclusions

In conclusion this paper has provided substantiation of the validity and reliability of the PM-MRV measures of corporate psychopathy. The psychopathy measures – management research versions 1 and 2 (PM-MRV/ PM-MRV2) respectively comprise eight and ten of the most highly prototypical characteristics of psychopathy. The characteristics are deeply grounded in the most authoritative literature on psychopathy and this ensures their content validity. These characteristics closely correspond with those found in Cleckley’s original delineation of psychopathy and closely resemble other Cleckley-based psychopathy measures such as those within the Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL-R) and the Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality (CAPP). Much of this literature is in turn based on Cleckley who is reported to have developed the most authoritative definition of what constitutes a psychopath as well as the criteria that are most commonly included in definitions of psychopathy (Crego and Widiger, 2016). A strong conceptual and theoretical relationship between the PM-MRV and PM-MRV2’s measures and psychopathy, particularly as expressed in its “successful”, “primary”, “industrial” and “corporate” definitions, is therefore evident.

The measures are suitable to use in corporate settings because they avoid contamination with the criminal conceptualisations of psychopathy that resulted from the early study of psychopaths in prison populations. In recognition of this, other psychopathy researchers estimate that such an explicit focus on the interpersonal and affective features of psychopathy may make the PM-MRV measure well-suited to use in business research (Smith and Lilienfeld, 2013).

The PM-MRV measures also have construct validity and reliability in use because their repeatedly matched relationships with other variables such as bullying, and job satisfaction are entirely in line with predictions from theoretical expectations. Evidence for the concurrent validity of the measures comes from when they are used to identify psychopaths in history such as Hermann Goering, who was diagnosed as a psychopath in 1946 at the Nuremberg War Trials. The PM-MRV and PM-MRV 2 (along with four other measures of psychopathy) correctly identify the subject as a psychopath. The measures demonstrate validity in use and exhibit predictive accuracy and practical usefulness – the two most important demonstrators of a construct’s validity (Cronbach and Meehl, 1955).

Practical Considerations

The PM-MRV measures were not designed as definitive clinical measures of individual psychopathy but rather as characterisations indicative of the presence of psychopathy in those in managerial/leadership positions. This was to enable the study of work environments where psychopathy in management was present compared to when it wasn’t. The measures do not replace proper clinical diagnoses.

Nonetheless managers indicated as high in psychopathy using the PM-MRV measures have demonstrated ruthless, bullying, abusive, parasitic, dishonest, manipulative and threatening personalities. This is what would be expected of workplace psychopaths. Evidence of financial fraud, CV/resume fraud, blackmail, and death threats has been uncovered.

Researchers who may use these measures for their own research should note that anyone who scores highly on these measures and thus demonstrates sub-clinical/sub-criminal psychopathy in the workplace should be treated with great caution. They should not be confronted by individuals acting in isolation and attempts to thwart them should be co-ordinated and well-planned. Suitable defence measures should be in place such as the presence of fraud squad police officers or, at the very least, organisational security personnel.

Further research concerning the concurrent validity of both measures could be undertaken to further examine correlations and correspondences between different measures of corporate psychopathy and measures of related personalities such as narcissists and Machiavellians. For example, it would be interesting to compare the level of correlation between the primary psychopathy dimension of Levenson's self-report measure of psychopathy (Levenson, 1993, Levenson, 1992, Levenson et al., 1995) with observer (other report) measures of the same person's psychopathy.

References

- AMERICANCHEMICALSOCIETY 1999. *The Discovery and Development of Penicillin 1928-1945*, The Alexander Fleming Laboratory Museum, London.
- BABIAK, P. 1995. When Psychopaths go to Work: A Case Study of an Industrial Psychopath. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 44, 171 - 188.
- BBCNEWS. 2004. *Is your boss a 'corporate psycho'?* [Online]. London. [Accessed Accessed on 29/04/2006 at <http://news.bbc.uk/go/pr/fr/-/hi/business/3392233.stm>].
- BODDY, C. R. 2006. The Dark Side of Management Decisions: Organisational Psychopaths. *Management Decision*, 44, 1461 -1475.
- BODDY, C. R. 2010. *Corporate Psychopaths in Australian Workplaces: Their Influence on Organizational Outcomes*. Curtin University of Technology.
- BODDY, C. R. 2011a. Corporate Psychopaths, Bullying and Unfair Supervision in the Workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100, 367 - 379.
- BODDY, C. R. 2011b. Corporate Psychopaths, Bullying and Unfair Supervision in the Workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100, 367 - 379.
- BODDY, C. R. 2011c. *Corporate Psychopaths: Organisational Destroyers*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- BODDY, C. R. 2014. Corporate psychopaths, conflict, employee affective well-being and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121, 107-121.
- BODDY, C. R. 2015a. Organisational Psychopaths: A Ten Year Update. *Management Decision*, 53, 2407-2432.
- BODDY, C. R. 2015b. Psychopathic Leadership. A Case Study of a Corporate Psychopath CEO. *Journal of Business Ethics*, On-line first, 1-16.
- BODDY, C. R. 2016. Unethical 20th Century Business Leaders: Were some of them Corporate Psychopaths? The Case of Robert Maxwell. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 12.
- BODDY, C. R. 2017. Psychopathic leadership a case study of a corporate psychopath CEO. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145, 141-156.
- BODDY, C. R., LADYSHEWSKY, R. & GALVIN, P. G. 2010. The influence of Corporate Psychopaths on corporate social responsibility and organizational commitment to employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97, 1 - 19.
- BODDY, C. R., MILES, D., SANYAL, C. & HARTOG , M. 2015. Extreme Managers, Extreme Workplaces: Capitalism, Organisations and Corporate Psychopaths. *Organization*, 2, 530 - 551.
- BODDY, C. R. & TAPLIN, R. The Influence of Corporate Psychopaths on Job Satisfaction and its Determinants. *In: LANGE, T., ed. Sustainable HRM and Employee Well-Being. An International Research Symposium., November 4th/5th 2015 Australian Catholic University, Sydney, Australia.*
- BODDY, C. R. & TAPLIN, R. 2016. The Influence of Corporate Psychopaths on Job Satisfaction and its Determinants. *International Journal of Manpower*, On-line first.
- CLECKLEY, H. 1941/1988. *The Mask of Sanity*, Augusta Georgia, Private Printing for Educational Use by Emily Cleckley (Formerly first published by C.V. Mosley Co.in 1941).
- COOKE, D. J. & MICHIE, C. 2001. Refining the construct of psychopathy: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment*, 13, 171 - 188.
- CREGO, C. & WIDIGER, T. A. 2016. Cleckley's psychopaths: Revisited. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 125, 75-87.
- CRONBACH, L. J. & MEEHL, P. E. 1955. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 281 - 302.
- FALKENBACH, D., POYTHRESS, N., FALKI, M. & MANCHAK, S. 2007. Reliability and Validity of Two Self-Report Measures of Psychopathy. *Assessment*, 14, 341 - 350.

- GREEN, P. E. & TULL, D. S. 1978. *Research for Marketing Decisions*, Prentice-Hall.
- HARE, R. 1993. *Without Conscience: the Disturbing Word of the Psychopaths Among Us*, New York, Guildford Press.
- HINKIN, T. R. 1995. A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of management*, 21, 967-988.
- HINKIN, T. R. 1998. A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational research methods*, 1, 104-121.
- HULBERT, S. & ADELI, H. 2015. Spotting psychopaths using technology. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, 26, 721-732.
- ILKKA, N. 2015. Scientific Progress. In: ZALTA, E. N. (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- JEPPESEN, K. K., LEDER, C. & FUTTER, A. 2016. Auditors' experience with corporate psychopaths. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 23.
- KREIS, M. K., COOKE, D. J., MICHIE, C., HOFF, H. A. & LOGAN, C. 2012. The Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality (CAPP): content validation using prototypical analysis. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 26, 402-413.
- LEVENSON, M. R. 1992. Rethinking psychopathy. *Theory & Psychology*, 2, 51-71.
- LEVENSON, M. R. 1993. Psychopaths are Not Necessarily Impulsive, etc. A Reply to Feelgood and Rantzen. *Theory & Psychology*, 3, 229-234.
- LEVENSON, M. R., KIEHL, K. A. & FITZPATRICK, C. M. 1995. Assessing Psychopathic Attributes in a Noninstitutionalized Population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 151 - 158.
- LILIENFELD, S. O., WATTS, A. L., FRANCIS SMITH, S., BERG, J. M. & LATZMAN, R. D. 2014. Psychopathy Deconstructed and Reconstructed: Identifying and Assembling the Personality Building Blocks of Cleckley's Chimera. *Journal of personality*.
- LYNAM, D. R. 1997. Pursuing the Psychopath; Capturing the Fledgling Psychopath in a Nomological Net. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 425 - 438.
- MALOVANY, E. 2014. *An Enquiry Into Corporate Psychopathy: The Unheard Voice of Follower Experience (Doctoral Thesis)*. Capell University, USA.
- MATHIEU, C. & BABIAK, P. 2016. Corporate psychopathy and abusive supervision: Their influence on employees' job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 91, 102-106.
- MATHIEU, C., BABIAK, P., JONES, D. N., NEUMANN, C. & HARE, R. D. 2012. What Are The Effects Of Psychopathic Traits In A Supervisor On Employees' Psychological Distress? *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 16, 91 - 94.
- MATHIEU, C., NEUMANN, C. S., HARE, R. D. & BABIAK, P. 2014. A dark side of leadership: Corporate psychopathy and its influence on employee well-being and job satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 59, 83-88.
- MCLEOD, S. A. 2007. *What is Validity?*. [Online]. Available: www.simplypsychology.org/validity.html [Accessed 2008].
- O'BOYLE, E. H., FORSYTH, D. R., BANKS, G. C. & MCDANIEL, M. A. 2012. A Meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and Work Behavior: A Social Exchange Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 557 - 579.
- SEIBERT, L. A., MILLER, J. D., FEW, L. R., ZEICHNER, A. & LYNAM, D. R. 2011. An Examination of the Structure of Self-Report Psychopathy Measures and Their Relations With General Traits and Externalizing Behaviors. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 2, 193-208.
- SMITH, S. F. & LILIENFELD, S. O. 2013. Psychopathy in the workplace: The knowns and unknowns. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18, 204 - 218.
- THARENOU, P., DONOHUE, R. & COOPER, B. 2007. *Management Research Methods*, Cambridge.

- TODD, B., R., BIEBER, S. L. & GRANDJEAN, B. D. 2004. Confirming the reliability of a theory-based questionnaire. *American Journal of Health Studies*, Accessed on-line at www.encyclopedia.com at 6.44pm Western Australian Time on 11th April 2008.
- VIEN, A. & BEECH, A., R. 2006. Psychopathy: Theory, Measurement, and Treatment. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 7, 155 - 174.
- WESTEN, D. & ROSENTHAL, R. 2003. Quantifying construct validity: Two simple measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 608-618.
- WIDOM, C. S. 1977. A Methodology for Studying Noninstitutionalized Psychopaths. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 45, 674 - 683.
- YANG, Y., RAINE, A., LENCZ, T., BIHRLE, S., LACASSE, L. & COLLETTI, P. 2005. Volume Reduction in Prefrontal Gray Matter in Unsuccessful Criminal Psychopaths. *Biological Psychiatry*, 57, 1103 - 1108.