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Abstract

Psychopathy is a personality disorder characterized by a high lack of empathy (Hare, 1991), behavioral problems, problems in interpersonal relations, and mood-related issues. In psychopathy, interpersonal interactions are shaped and driven by antisocial behaviors, with the person displaying low affectivity, and acting superficially and acrimoniously in interpersonal relations (Rubio et al., 2014). The majority of studies on psychopathy focus on personality. In this study, we investigated the relationship of the personality types of employees with the level of psychopathy. In this context, answers were sought to the following questions:

a) Does the level of psychopathy of employees vary according to civil status?
b) Does the level of psychopathy of employees vary according to gender?
c) Does the level of psychopathy of employees vary according to the position in which they are working?
d) Is there a relationship between the level of psychopathy of employees and their personality traits?
e) Do the personality traits of employees indicate their level of psychopathy?

The study was performed with the participation of 237 individuals working at different levels and positions within the private sector in the city of Kayseri. Of these individuals, 18% (42) were upper level managers, 25% (60) were mid-level managers, and 57% (135) were employees. Study data were collected using a personal information form, a Ten Item Personality Inventory, and the Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale. Study data were analyzed using the t-test, analysis of variance (ANOVA) correlation and regression methods. Based on the study results, it was determined that the psychopathy levels of employees did not vary according to gender or their current position, while it varied according to civil status. In addition, the level of psychopathy showed a negative relationship with sub-dimensions of personality; extroversion, compatibility, responsibility, and
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emotional balance. A number of recommendations were proposed based on these study results.

1. Introduction

In his book titled “Without Consciousness,” Hare, a scientist well-known for his studies on psychopathy, described that we live in a society based on camouflage, and that traits associated with psychopathy – namely egocentrism and lack of thoughts or concerns for others etc… – are becoming increasingly tolerated, and even valued, by society. Consequently, psychopaths are not just found in prisons, but sometimes also in meeting rooms (Hare, 2002). Psychopaths have little difficulty in finding their way into politics, security forces, government, academia, and other social structures (Babiak & Hare, 2007).

According to Hare (1994), psychopaths are found in all cultures, societies, and races. Hare (1994; as cited by Engeler, 2005) describes that everyone encounters such individuals in daily life. In fact, such encounters serve to break certain assumptions and taboos in our minds, shaking our preconceived beliefs that psychopaths are only found in clinics or prisons. In this context, it is necessary to provide a clearer definition and description of what psychopathy is.

2. Psychopathy

2.1. Studies on the Definition Psychopathy

Studies on the definition of psychopathy began in the 1930s, with the American Psychological Association (APA) defining individuals exhibiting aggressive behaviors as sociopaths. These studies reached an important stage with Cleckley’s (1988) book entitled “The Mask of Sanity.” According to Cleckley, psychopaths share the following traits:

- A superficial charm and good intelligence- the lack of delusions of unrealistic thoughts.
- The absence of psychoneurotic symptoms- Lack of confidence- Lying, insincerity.
- Lack of consciousness and shame- Inadequacy- Inability to learn from experience and poor judgment.
- Pathological selfishness and inability to love- A general lack of emotional responses.
- Lack of insight- Irresponsible behavior in interpersonal relations.
- Fantastic behaviors (sometimes accompanied by alcohol or substance use).
- Suicidal behavior, in rare instances- Random sexual life- Inability to draw a life plan.

Based on these criteria from Cleckley, Hare developed the Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R) (Hare, 1991; Hare et al., 2000). According to Hare, psychopathy is a personality disorder characterized by a high lack of empathy (Hare, 1991), behavioral problems, problems in interpersonal relations, and mood-related issues. In psychopathy, interpersonal interactions are shaped and driven by antisocial behaviors, with the person displaying very low affectivity, and acting superficially and acrimoniously in interpersonal relations (Rubio et al., 2014). According to Hare (1994), psychopaths are soft-spoken and superficial individuals. They tend to be verbally talented and articulate individuals. They are often witty persons who speak cheerfully and entertainingly, and express themselves in a better light than they really are. They often describe implausible stories in a very convincing manner. Owing to these traits, they can easily deceive others and build relations with them. According to Hare, psychopathy is associated with several dimensions, with each dimension further consisting of certain characteristics (Hare, 2003):
• Interpersonal Characteristics
  - Superficial charm—An exaggerated sense of self-value
  - Pathological lying—Tricking and using others.

• Emotional Characteristics
  - The lack of remorse or a sense of guilt—Emotional health problems
  - Lack of affection/empathy.
  - Tendency to seek blame in others.

• Life-Style Characteristics
  - Constant need for stimulation, tendency to become easily bored—Parasitic life-style.
  - Absence of realistic long-term goals—Impulsivity, irresponsibility.

• Antisocial Characteristics
  - Weak behavior control—Early behavior-related problems.
  - Criminal acts during childhood and adolescence—Predisposition to crime.
  - Behavior that might lead to the revocation of conditional release/discharge.

Psychopaths have a surprisingly high sense of self-importance, and tend to be narcissistic and self-centered, viewing themselves as the center of the universe; they consequently believe that they have the right to live by their own rules. Their lack of remorse and guilt is particularly noteworthy. They feel no sadness or uneasiness regardless of how harmful their psychopathic behaviors are towards others. When asked about this, they clearly and calmly state that they feel no remorse whatsoever. Their lack of remorse and conscience is closely associated with their efforts to constantly rationalize their psychopathic behavior. They usually have a list of excuses and justifications ready to explain their behavior. They easily evade any personal responsibility, and sometimes completely deny what is happening and what they have been doing. Psychopaths generally exhibit an impulsivity that involves unplanned and unpremeditated harmful behaviors/actions towards others; when asked about such behavior/actions, they simply say that they felt like doing so. This impulsivity stems from a desire for instant gratification. They will repeatedly and suddenly quit work, end relationships, change their plans, completely change their homes, and hurt others. Many psychopaths eventually spend time in prison, while many others never do. Although not all psychopaths commit criminal acts that cause them to end up in prisons, most of them will commit unethical acts that are harmful towards others (Engeler, 2005).

2.2. Differences from antisocial personality disorder (ASPD)

Antisocial personality disorders are characterized mostly by behavioral disorder, while psychopathy tends to be characterized by disorders relating to mood and interpersonal relations. While not all individuals diagnosed with ASPD possess the criteria for diagnosis of psychopathy, most individuals diagnosed as psychopaths are also diagnosed with ASPD. ASPD is a diagnosis system that focuses mostly on general antisocial characteristics and behaviors, and evaluates the consequences of antisocial behaviors. Psychopathy, on the other hand, is characterized by emotional dysregulation and antisocial behaviors that manifest themselves through low empathy, low level of guilt, lack of remorse, and lack of emotional attachment towards others (Cunningham & Reidy, 1998).

One of the most important distinguishing characteristics of psychopathy is the presence of abnormal and inadequate emotional responses, which is generally designated as “emotional inadequacy.” Psychopaths are emotionally distant towards others, while also lacking any sensitivity or concern for the emotions of others (Herpertz & Sass, 2000). Psychopaths are generally easily angered individuals, who exhibit aggressive, impulsive, irresponsible behavior; who lack any emotional depth; who are cold-hearted, selfish, and remorseless; and who lack any empathy or concern for others. In light of these general traits, it can be seen that psychopaths are predisposed to committing crimes. One of their most important characteristics is purposive, impulsive, and aggressive behavior (Hare, 1970).

2.3. Psychopathy and personality

After psychopathy began to be assessed using self-report scales, the number of studies evaluating the interaction of psychopathy with five factor model personality traits also began to increase. In a study performed by Lynam,
Whiteside, and Jones (1999) with the Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale and the Five Factor Personality Scale, it was determined that the compatibility dimension had a negative relationship with the first factor, while the compatibility and responsibility dimension had a negative relationship with the second factor, and the emotional balance dimension had a positive relationship with the second factor (Lynam, Whiteside & Jones, 1999). In another study conducted by Paulhus and Williams (2002) using the Hare Self-Report Psychopathy Scale, it was determined that the level of psychopathy among youth had a negative relationship with the compatibility, responsibility, and emotional balance dimensions of the five factor personality scale (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

As described above, studies on the relationship between psychopathy and personality usually provide different results, thus drawing attention to the factor structures differences between different psychopathy assessment methods.

2.4. Psychopathy and occupational life

Psychopaths can be alcoholics, bullies, and violent. Psychopaths enjoy harming and bullying others. And they are generally anti-social although the kind that flourish in the corporate world do not evidence these characteristics (Langbert, 2010). In his book entitled “The Mask of Sanity,” Cleckley (1988) described with various examples that the external appearance of psychopathic individuals were not related or proportional to the severity of their disorder. In addition, he observed that these individuals can skillfully maintain an ordinary external appearance. According to Cleckley, even the most severe psychopath can possess the appearance of a person with normal mental health, and can be fairly successful in his/her occupational life for short, and sometimes extended, periods of time. In the same work, one of the cases described by Cleckley (1988) was “The Psychopath as a Business Man”. Cleckley noted that this individual does not exhibit noticeable psychopathic characteristics such as deception, excessive alcohol consumption, risk-taking behavior, and impassivity. In addition, this individual even contributes to his working environment, and is sufficiently hard-working for his job and task. In contrast to the common definition of a psychopath as a violent criminal, Cleckley described that psychopaths can become part of social life as successful individuals. In other words, psychopathy is not solely associated with people who commit criminal acts and deviant behaviors, but can also be observed in socially successful individuals. While psychopaths who can function within society will still exhibit psychopathic characteristics, they will also exhibit less antisocial behavior (Noyan, 2008).

Corporate psychopaths are placed on workplace four times more prevalently compared to the general population (Babiak, Neumann and Hare, 2010). This rate even rises up 10% among the managers (Dutton, 2012). Their coworkers have defined the psychopaths as creative, strategic, having good communication skills, but at the same time as having low management skills, not being good member of a team, appraising lower performance. Corporate psychopaths as those people working in corporations who are self-serving, opportunistic, ego-centric, cool-hearted, manipulative, ruthless and shameless but who can be charming, grandiose and ambitious (Boddy 2005; Bernstein et al. 2000). Hare emphasizes that the symptoms of white collar psychopaths differ from those of the more general syndrome. White collar psychopaths tend to be less anti-social than blue collar psychopaths (Hare, 1999). In general, corporate psychopaths display emotional but not social deviance traits. They cause conflicts and turnover in organizations (Langbert, 2010). So they threat to business performance and to corporate social responsibility because they put their own interests before those of the corporation or of society (Boddy, 2005).

Due to the fact that an increasing number of psychopathic individuals have begun to participate in business life in recent years, and parallel to the increasing number of studies on this subject around the world, the current study aims to evaluate the relationship between personality traits and the level of psychopathy. In this context, we sought answers to the following questions:

a) Does the level of psychopathy of employees vary according to civil status?

b) Does the level of psychopathy of employees vary according to gender?

c) Does the level of psychopathy of employees vary according to the position in which they are working?

d) Is there a relationship between the level of psychopathy of employees and their personality traits?

e) Do the personality traits of employees indicate their level of psychopathy?
3. Methods

3.1. The study method

In order to determine the level of psychopathy and personality types of employees in different positions, this study was performed using the convenience sampling method. The scale items were prepared and organized online for administration through the internet, and then forwarded to white collar employees in private sector organizations in Kayseri, Turkey.

3.2. Study Participants

A total of 237 persons participated in the study. Of these participants, 96 (40.5%) were female, while 141 (59.5%) were male. In addition, 17% (42) of the study participants were upper level managers, while 25% (60) were mid-level managers, and 58% (135) were employees.

3.3. Study Scales

The scales and forms used during this study included a Personal Information Form, Ten Item Personality Inventory, and Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale.

3.3.1. Personal information form

The Personal Information Form was prepared by the researchers. The form included questions regarding the gender, age, current organization, type of organization, and current position of the study participants.

3.3.2. Ten Item Personality Inventory (TIPI):

The original inventory was developed by Gosling et al. (2003), while its Turkish adaptation was prepared by Atak (2012). The inventory consists of ten items and five factors. During the adaptation study performed for this scale, the results for the language validity analysis (correlation varying between 0.92-0.97), the exploratory factor analysis (five factors and ten items; explained variance 65.21%), the confirmatory factor analysis (X2/SD: 2.20, GFI 0.95, AGFI 0.92, CFI 0.93, NNFI 0.91, RMR 0.04 and RMSEA 0.03), as well as the results of the item analysis, scale reliability, and the five factor model were all found to be suitable for the Turkish people. The internal consistency results (openness to experience 0.83, compatibility 0.81, emotional balance 0.83, responsibility 0.84 and extroversion 0.86), as well as the reliability analysis results based on the test-retest method (n=54; openness to experience 0.89, compatibility 0.87, emotional balance 0.89, responsibility 0.87, and extroversion 0.88), indicated that the scale had an acceptable reliability.

3.3.3. Levenson Self Report Psychopathy (LSRP) Scale

The scale assesses primary and secondary psychopathy. Primary psychopathy is associated with the lack of both emotional and cognitive empathy; however, it is not related to a personality disorder. Secondary psychopathy, on the other hand, is unrelated to empathy, but shows a positive correlation with personality disorders. Studies have shown that the LSRP has a higher correlation with certain psychopathy scales while having a medium-level correlation with others. The validity and reliability study for the Turkish version of the scale was performed by Engeler and Yargıcı (2004). The scale consists of 26 items, with 16 of these assessing primary psychopathy, while ten of the items assess secondary psychopathy. The primary psychopathy items had very good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.82$). On the other hand, the alpha value for the secondary psychopathy items was 0.63. For the primary psychopathy items $\alpha = 0.76$, while the test-retest was $r = 0.77$. For the secondary psychopathy items $\alpha = 0.52$, while the test-retest was $r = 0.68$. In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha value was 0.73.
3.4. Data Collection and Analysis

The scales used for data collection were forwarded to the 237 study participants through the internet, and analyses were performed on the obtained data. The t-test was applied to the collected data in order to determine the variation in personality type and level of psychopathy according to the gender and civil status variables. One-way analysis of variance was performed to determine the variation according to the current position variable. In order to identify the source of the difference determined through the analysis of variance (ANOVA), the Tukey test was employed, which is an advanced statistic technique. A correlation analysis was performed to determine the degree to which the personality type could explain the level of psychopathy. In this study, “p” value <0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

4. Findings

In this section, we present the findings obtained based on the statistical analyses performed on the collected data. The obtained results are provided according to the order of the study question listed above. The distribution of the study sample is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Status</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maried</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Widow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives Separately</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 1, 148 (62%) of the employees who participated to this study were married, while 81 (34%) were single, five were divorced/widowed, and three lived alone. In addition, 57 % of the study participants were employees, while 25% were mid-level managers, and 18 % were upper level managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Psychopathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>-0.447</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Psychopathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Psychopathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>48.03</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 2, which shows the variation in psychopathy levels according to gender among the study participants, the arithmetic mean of the male participants for primary psychopathy was $\bar{x} = 26.22$, while the arithmetic mean of the female participants for primary psychopathy was $\bar{x} = 25.87$. The t value ($t = 0.447, p > 0.05$), which was calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups, demonstrated no significant intergroup differences at a level of 0.05. According to Table 2, the arithmetic mean of the male participants for secondary psychopathy was $\bar{x} = 21.80$, while the arithmetic mean of the female participants for secondary psychopathy was $\bar{x} = 22.11$. The t value ($t = 0.543, p > 0.05$), which was calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups, demonstrated no significant intergroup differences at a level of 0.05. A comparison of the arithmetic means for total psychopathy revealed that the arithmetic mean of the male participants was $\bar{x} = 48.03$, while the arithmetic mean of the female participants was $\bar{x} = 47.98$. The t value ($t = 0.041, p > 0.05$), which was calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups, demonstrated no significant intergroup differences at a level of 0.05. Based on these findings, it was determined that primary, secondary and total psychopathy scores did not differ significantly between males and females.

Table 3. Analysis of variance results regarding the variation in psychopathy levels among participants according to position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>47.9852</td>
<td>8.72292</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle L.M.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48.7333</td>
<td>7.97000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper L.M.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47.0952</td>
<td>8.55059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 3, which shows the variation in the psychopathy levels of the study participants according to their current position, the arithmetic mean for total psychopathy was $\bar{x} = 47.98$ among employees, $\bar{x} = 48.73$ among medium level managers, and $\bar{x} = 47.10$ among upper level managers. The f value (f = 0.460, p > 0.05), which was calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean group scores, showed no significant intergroup difference at a level of 0.05. It was thus determined that the level of psychopathy did not vary significantly between employees, mid-level managers, and upper level managers.

Table 4. t test results regarding the variation in psychopathy levels among participants according to civil status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Psychopathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>-2.634*</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Psychopathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>-1.966</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Psychopathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>46.79</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>-2.833*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 4, which shows the variation in the psychopathy levels of the study participants according to their civil status, the arithmetic mean for primary psychopathy was $\bar{x}=25.32$ among married individuals, and $\bar{x}=27.48$ among single individuals. The t value ($t=-2.634$, $p<0.05$), which was calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups, demonstrated a significant intergroup difference at a level of 0.05. Table 4 also shows that the arithmetic mean for secondary psychopathy was $\bar{x}=21.46$ among married individuals, and $\bar{x}=22.61$ among single individuals. The t value ($t=-1.966$, $p>0.05$), which was calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups, demonstrated no significant intergroup differences at a level of 0.05. On the other hand, the arithmetic mean for total psychopathy was $\bar{x}=46.79$ among married individuals, and $\bar{x}=50.09$ among single individuals. The t value ($t=-2.833$, $p<0.05$), which was calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups, demonstrated a significant intergroup difference at a level of 0.05. According to these results, single individuals displayed higher primary and total psychopathy levels than married individuals.

Table 5. Correlation between the personality types of the participants and their psychopathy levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>0.175**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.349**</td>
<td>0.313**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Emo. Balance</td>
<td>0.381**</td>
<td>0.213**</td>
<td>0.612**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emo. Openness</td>
<td>0.404**</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Primary Psy.</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>-0.250**</td>
<td>-0.240**</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Secondary Psy.</td>
<td>-0.194**</td>
<td>-0.186**</td>
<td>-0.398**</td>
<td>-0.500**</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>0.368**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Total Psy.</td>
<td>-0.141*</td>
<td>-0.167**</td>
<td>-0.375**</td>
<td>-0.419**</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.885**</td>
<td>0.759**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** 0.01

According to Table 5, which illustrates the correlation between personality types and psychopathy levels, extroversion, compatibility, responsibility, and emotional balance exhibited a negative and significant relationship with secondary psychopathy and total psychopathy ($r=-0.194, -0.141, -0.186, -0.167, -0.398, -0.375, -0.500, \text{ and } -0.419$, respectively), while responsibility and emotional balance also exhibited a negative and significant relationship with primary psychopathy ($r=-0.250$ and $-0.240$, respectively). According to these results, higher extroversion, compatibility, responsibility, and emotional balance were associated with lower secondary and total psychopathy among employees, while higher responsibility and emotional balance was associated with lower primary psychopathy.

Table 6. Regression table illustrating the predictive level of personality traits for total psychopathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.450*</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>.66261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2=0.203$

An evaluation of Table 6 indicates that personality traits have significant predictive power for psychopathy ($R=0.450$, $R^2=0.203$, $p<0.05$). According to these findings, personality traits account for 20.3% of the variance in psychopathy levels. In other words, 20.3% of the variance in psychopathy levels stem from personality traits.
5. Conclusion and Discussion

In this study that investigates the personality types and psychopathy levels of managers and employees, we first evaluated whether the relevant variables – including gender, civil status and current position – led to any differences in psychopathy levels. In addition to this, we investigated whether there was any significant relationship between the personality traits of the participants and their psychopathy levels. Studies on psychopathy are generally performed on men, with only a few studies having been performed to assess psychopathy levels among women. Studies on psychopathy describe that male psychopaths are more common than female psychopaths (Hart et al., 1995; Jackson et al., 2002; Warren et al., 2003; Salekin et al., 1997; Hare et al., 2000). In studies performed on forensic psychiatry cases, on cases with violent tendencies, and on other patient groups, women generally receive lower scores on the Hare Psychopathy Self-Report Scale than men. In another study, women received lower scores in both the overall scale and the sub-scales, with none of the women displaying characteristics of psychopathy (Fort et al., 1996). According to the findings of our study, there were no significant differences between men and women with respect to primary, secondary, and total psychopathy scores (p>0.05).

One of the findings of our study is regarding the effect of civil status. According to the findings, single individuals exhibited significantly higher psychopathy levels than married individuals (p<0.05). This observation suggests that environmental factors might play a role in the shaping and development of psychopathy. Studies indicate that psychopathy is affected by both genetic and environmental factors. According to genetic studies, the gray areas of the brains of psychopathic individuals display certain abnormalities (Gregory, 2012). Studies evaluating environments causes, on the other hand, describe that psychopathy is more common among individuals raised in larger families and in city centers. The significantly lower level of psychopathy observed among married individuals in our study might be explained with the feelings of compassion and responsibility that develop as a result of marriage.

One of the aims of our study was to determine whether there is a significant differences between the position at which a person works and his/her psychopathy levels. We examined whether the levels of psychopathy varied significantly between individuals who described themselves as employees, mid-level managers, and upper level managers, and determined that there were no significant differences between these three groups. This result contradicts most findings in the literature. A study performed by Babiak, Neumann, and Hare (2010) on 203 company managers had determined that managers had three time higher psychopathy levels compared to the normal sample. As such, the ratio of psychopathy in the normal sample was 1%, while this ratio was 3% among managers. A study performed by Board and Fritzon (2005) compared the profiles of criminals at a forensic hospital in the United Kingdom with the profiles of CEOs, and determined that the CEOs had higher psychopathy levels. In another study, the highest levels of psychopathy were observed among CEOs, lawyers, and media employees, while groups with the lowest levels of psychopathy were caretakers, nurses, and therapists.

The current study determined that although mid-level managers had higher levels of psychopathy than employees and upper level managers, this difference was not statistically significant. This situation might ultimately be due to method-related problems or cultural reasons.

a- Since the scales were administered through the internet, the study participants themselves selected and determined the position in which they currently work. In this context, the difference between mid-level and upper level management might not have been properly understood by study participants.

b- It is likely that some of upper level managers who participated to our study were not in decision-making positions as important and critical as that of CEOs. For this reason, the levels of psychopathy among these upper level managers was not as high as that of CEOs.

To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first and only one to have been conducted in Turkey in this field. For this reason, it is not possible to compare the results of the current study with other studies conducted in Turkey, and to interpret our findings accordingly. Although the level of psychopathy was higher among managers who participated in the current study, this difference was not significant. This observation might have stemmed from cultural characteristics specific to Turkey. As such, the prevailing collectivistic characteristic of Turkish society, as well as the paternalism that is often observed among managers, could have contributed to this overall picture. Further studies performed in Turkey and other countries with different cultural characteristics could assist in
shifting light on the underlying reasons for these observations. Although our results did not correspond with the findings of the literature, the current study may still contribute to the literature owing to the fact that it is the first study to use the Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale on a non-clinical sample.
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