Mediating governmentality during Covid – 19
A principal's task

Xinglian Xu
The University of Notre Dame Australia, 104 Broadway, Broadway, NSW 2007, Australia

ABSTRACT. This paper aims to explore differences in personality traits, focusing on the levels of primary psychopathy, between formal leaders of family and non-family companies as well as assessing differences in the job satisfaction levels of their employees. Moreover, we assess the relationship between the employees' perception of their formal leader's primary psychopathy levels and their job satisfaction levels in family firms. The empirical evidence is provided by a sample of 95 Portuguese employees, who responded to a questionnaire that included their perceptions of their formal leader's primary psychopathy level and job satisfaction measures. All respondents work in small and medium- sized private companies with no management responsibilities and under formal hieratical supervision. The initial idea that family firms' employees perceive lower levels of primary psychopathy in their formal leaders than non-family firms' employees was confirmed. However, employees of family and non-family firms did not differ in their job satisfaction levels. The results also support the notion that perceived levels of primary psychopathy in formal leaders are negatively associated with the employees' job satisfaction levels. These findings contribute to the research literature by addressing two aspects under-addressed in the comparison between family and non-family firms, while offering insights on the relationship between primary psychopathy in formal leaders and job satisfaction levels of employees working in family firms.

INTRODUCTION

More than two-thirds of all private companies are family-owned, employing

over 60% of the global workforce and accounting for more than 70% of the global GDP's economic impact (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2018; Neckebrouck et al. 2018; Pimentel et al. 2021). Family busi- nesses represent the prevailing form of enterprise worldwide and are widely acknowledged as significant contributors to economic prosperity and stability (Englisch et al. 2015). Given their pivotal role as actors and agents of socioeconomic development, family businesses have garnered increasing attention from the scientific community in recent years (Sageder et al. 2018).

Despite the substantial growth in research on family businesses, most studies have focused on identifying and elucidating the distinguishing aspects, behaviors, and pro- cesses that set family businesses apart from non-family businesses. These studies have examined variations in ownership (Pimentel and Rodrigues 2022), management (Zellweger and Astrachan 2008), leadership (Pérez-González 2006), career development (Schröder et al. 2011), job satisfaction (Pimentel 2018; Pimentel and Pereira 2022), organizational reputation (Deephouse and Jaskiewicz 2013), organizational justice (Pimentel et al. 2020), emotional regulation (Pimentel and Pereira 2022), and decision-making styles (Pimentel et al. 2018). Nevertheless, there remain several crucial organizational aspects that warrant further investigation, not only in comparing family and non-family businesses but also in enhancing our understanding of specific processes and aspects unique to family businesses. One such unexplored aspect is the relationship between the perceived personality traits of formal leaders, particularly primary psychopathy traits, and the job satisfaction levels of employees. The literature on leadership dynamics between formal leaders and employees within family businesses remains relatively sparse (Combs et al. 2018).

This study aims to contribute to a knowledge gap in the literature related to the un- derstanding of human capital management, focusing on the relationships between formal leaders and their employees, in family businesses by

(1) exploring and comparing per- sonality traits of formal leaders, targeting the perceptions of the employees regarding the levels of primary psychopathy in their formal leaders in family and non-family businesses,

(2) assessing the employees' job satisfaction levels in family and non-family businesses, and

(3) exploring the relationship between the employees perceived levels of primary psychopathy in formal leaders and their job satisfaction levels in family businesses.

By undertaking this comprehensive approach, and grounded on the principles of socioemo- tional wealth (i.e., the "affective endowments" of the owning family that derives from the family's controlling position in a particular firm (Berrone et al. 2012)) and on the dual-factor model of psychopathy, this study aims to advance the understanding of variables that have received less attention in the

comparison between family and non-family businesses, particularly the leaders' traits and levels of primary psychopathy, and to contribute with evidence to support the relationship between the perceived levels of primary psychopathy in formal leaders and the job satisfaction levels of employees within the context of family businesses.

This paper follows a structured approach. First, it presents and discusses the theoreti- cal foundations of the main concepts and variables under study, along with the theoretical derivation of hypotheses. Next, the sample and the used methods are characterized. Subsequently, the empirical results are presented. The obtained results are thoroughly dis- cussed, and their implications are explored. Finally, the research limitations are addressed, providing avenues for future investigations, and theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Primary Psychopathy In Formal Leaders

The constantly evolving dynamics of the organizational landscape have pushed com- panies to create conducive working conditions that promote effective management of this environment. In this pursuit for organizational improvement, previously under-addressed factors, such as personality traits of formal leaders, have garnered increasing interest (Ku- mari et al. 2022). In the same line, primary psychopathy, also referred to as successful psychopathy or corporate psychopathy, has recently begun to be discussed as a key factor of corporate misconduct (Laurijssen et al. 2023). Thus, the negative perception associated with primary psychopathy has sparked debates within the scientific community (Durand et al. 2017). Several studies have suggested that there were at least three times as many psychopaths in executive or chief executive officer roles than in the overall population (e.g., Babiak et al. 2010; Grijalva et al. 2015), significantly influencing the organizational context and its outcomes, impacting not only other formal leaders but also, and mostly, their employees.

Psychopathy has been defined by two main models:

(1) the triarchic model, proposed by Patrick et al. (2009), which comprises three distinct elements (boldness, meanness, and disinhibition), and

(2) the classical dual-factor model of psychopathy, which distinguishes between primary and secondary subtypes of the disorder (Vassileva et al. 2005).

The dual-factor model, adopted in this study, differentiates primary psychopathy, characterized by non-clinical states strongly related to affective and

interpersonal characteristics (e.g., callousness, lack of remorse and guilt, manipulation), from secondary psychopathy, related to the clinical and behavioral dimensions of psychopathy (e.g., impulsivity, irresponsibility, antisocial lifestyle). Irrespective of the model used, psychopathic traits can significantly impact the day-to-day interactions between leaders and employees, strongly influencing work performance and employee job satisfaction (Janssen and Yperen 2004). Additionally, primary psychopathy has been identified as an influential characteristic in the perception of higher-level executives, with individuals exhibiting higher levels of primary psychopathy being classified as high-potential employees (Neumann and Hare 2008). Furthermore, recent studies have revealed a positive association between primary psychopathy levels and reaching managerial positions (e.g., Hurst et al. 2019). Some researchers have used the term "successful" psychopaths to describe such individuals who have secured high-ranking positions in corporations (Raine et al. 2005).

While primary psychopathy has been extensively studied across various contexts (Madjar et al. 2019), its exploration within the context of family businesses remains notably scarce in the existing literature. In an endeavor to enrich this body of knowledge and grounded on the socioemotional wealth framework (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2007), specifically on the positive aspects of socioemotional wealth, such as the development of an organiza- tional culture based on a genuine concern with employees and the promotion of a pleasant working environment where employees are esteemed and cherished, often being treated as part of the family (Pimentel et al. 2021), we propose the following:

H1. Family firms' employees perceive lower levels of primary psychopathy in their formal leaders than non-family firms' employees.

Job Satisfaction

Employee job satisfaction is a critical aspect of organizational success, directly impact- ing employee well-being, productivity, and retention (Abdullah et al. 2021). The investment made by companies in the employees' well-being has garnered significant attention from organizational scholars and practitioners alike. Central to this endeavor is the concept of job satisfaction, which hinges upon the contentment experienced by employees within their work roles.

Locke (1976) posited a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction, conceiving it as an outcome emanating from the intricate interplay of cognitive processes and emotional experiences that emerge within the context of one's working conditions, including aspects such as perceived respect (i.e., in the form of praise and appreciation) and equitable compensation, as well as the quality of interpersonal relationships within the workplace. As such, job satisfaction denotes an employee's profound sense of fulfillment and triumph within their occupational milieu, thereby indicating that the individual is engaged in a role

and vocation that aligns with their personal preferences and is accompanied by appropriate recognition and remuneration for his/her efforts (Tepayakul and Rinthaisong 2018). Thus, job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings towards the work to be performed.

Bowling and Hammond (2008) posit that the significance of job satisfaction lies in its impact on work-related outcomes, such as employees' intentions to either remain within or leave the organization, as well as their engagement in desirable behaviors that contribute to contextual performance. Job satisfaction can promote the establishment of a harmonious relationship between the company and its employees (Ramlawati et al. 2021). Similarly, Aziri (2011) contends that job satisfaction plays a pivotal role in determining the effectiveness and efficiency of an organization. Within family firms, the presence of strong and enduring relationships often gives rise to situations in which employees experience dual connections, fostering positive relationships both with the family members, in most case acting as formal leaders, and the firm itself (Madden et al. 2017). These dual connections can contribute to enhancing the job satisfaction experienced by employees in family firms. We argue that this is attributed to the inherent disposition of family firms to demonstrate a strong commitment to respecting and fulfilling their obligations and promises made to employees, coupled with their deep concern for ensuring socioemotional wealth (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2007), including endeavors to establish and maintain a favorable reputation within the community. Based on these premises, we hypothesize that employees working in family companies exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction when compared to employees in non-family companies. Thus, our second hypothesis is as follows:

H2. Family firms' employees show higher levels of job satisfaction than non-family firms' employees.

Prior studies have identified aspects such as leadership effectiveness and organiza- tional support as prominent influences on employee job satisfaction (Judge et al. 2001). Additionally, the interplay of individual characteristics of formal leaders, such as personal- ity traits and work values, may further impact employees' job satisfaction over time. Thus, effective leadership and management practices emerge as a crucial aspect that significantly impacts job satisfaction. According to Ramlawati et al. (2021), supportive and empathetic leaders who provide clear direction, recognition, and opportunities for growth and devel- opment contribute to higher levels of employee satisfaction. Conversely, autocratic and unsupportive leadership can lead to job stress, dissatisfaction, and disengagement. Con- sequently, a leader's abusive workplace behavior can have a direct impact on employees, most notably by raising their levels of psychological distress and decreasing their levels of job satisfaction (Tepper et al. 2009), which in turn is associated with lower levels of job performance (Harris et al. 2007), and increasing turnover intentions (Tepper et al. 2009). Butler and Martin (2020)

suggest that job stress in employees working in family firms can cascade to the employer and their family members, resulting in increased intrapersonal and interpersonal conflicts. These conflicts can create a hostile work environment, ultimately reducing overall employee job satisfaction and performance. A pivotal study by Spencer and Byrne (2016) examined the correlation between personality traits of formal leaders (i.e., managers), psychopathic characteristics, and the subsequent job satisfaction levels of their employees.

While the study confirmed that top managers tend to exhibit higher levels of primary psychopathy, the results did not support the initial idea that lower-level employees would show high levels of intrinsic job satisfaction and moderate levels of extrinsic job satisfaction, regardless of their superiors' level of primary psychopathy. As evident, thus far, individual personality differences can exert a substantial impact on employee well-being, underscoring the significant influence that the leaders' personal traits can have on daily organizational operations. Moreover, the leader plays a pivotal role in fulfilling the individual and internal perspectives of each employee, aligning individual capabilities with organizational needs, and addressing the financial, physical, and interpersonal requirements of both parties (Cunha et al. 2014). Beyond merely influencing commitment to goals, this psychological aspect of the leader-contract bond significantly affects employee job satisfaction, with leaders' personality traits playing a decisive role in the perception of job satisfaction. Thus, it is possible to conclude that these are related, since effective leadership and management can sternly influence the employees' job satisfaction levels (Erniwati et al. 2020).

Although the existing literature supports this relationship (Nurlina 2022), it has not yet been empirically tested in the family business context. Grounded on the mentioned parallel findings and as an initial attempt to contribute to the literature on family business, we suggest that:

> H3. In family firms, the employees' perceived levels of primary psychopathy in formal leaders are negatively associated with their job satisfaction levels.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample And Data Collection

There is a diverse range of approaches utilized to operationally define family busi- nesses (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2007; Rutherford et al. 2008). In this study, the criterion of ownership and management control, as proposed by Chua et al. (1999), was adapted to formulate an operational definition. Accordingly, a company is considered a family business if at least 75% of the shares are owned by the family, and if the family exclusively holds responsibility for the company's management. This operational definition ensures that the family

effectively governs, controls, and manages the company (Pimentel et al. 2020).

To gather data on the employees' perception of primary psychopathy in formal leaders and job satisfaction levels, a cross-sectional research design was employed. As suggested by Spector (2019), this type of design is suitable for exploring relatively under-studied topics, such as the ones addressed in this study. Additionally, cross-sectional designs are particularly advantageous compared to experimental or longitudinal designs, especially when obtaining a high response rate (i.e., a large sample) is challenging (Spector 2019). Dur- ing the questionnaire development, measures were taken to mitigate common method bias, including enhancing scale items to eliminate ambiguity and minimizing social desirability bias in item wording (Podsakoff et al. 2012).

Participants completed an online questionnaire, which included the Portuguese ver- sions of the Levenson's Self Report Psychopathy Scale (Coelho et al. 2010) and the Min- nesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Ferreira et al. 2009). These instruments have undergone extensive validation and are widely used in research. Data from family businesses were collected in collaboration with the Portuguese Association of Family Businesses, which kindly shared the questionnaire access link with their associate members. For non-family company employees, the questionnaire link was disseminated via email using a publicly available mailing list of Portuguese companies.

The final sample consisted of 95 Portuguese employees (see Table 1). Of the 95 employ- ees who participated in this study, 42 were employees of family businesses, and 53 were non-family businesses' employees; 66% were female, with an average age of 34 years and working in the company for approximately 9 years. Most participants hold a bachelor's degree (49.5%), followed by the ones who have a high school diploma (33.7%), while 16.8% hold a master's degree. Regarding the formal employment contracts, 61.1% had a perma- nent contract, 24.2% a fixed-term contract, and 14.7% were on temporary-work contracts. Focusing on the 42 employees of family businesses, 42.9% were females, with an average age of 36 years and working in the company for 8 years; most had a high-school diploma (40%) and were on a permanent-employment contract (65%). The data were collected between April and August 2022 and all respondents were employees of privately-owned small and medium-sized companies. The participants were selected based on specific criteria, specifically working in Portugal, with no management responsibilities and under formal hierarchical supervision.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of sample demographic characteristics.

Variable	Groups	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	63	66.0%
	Male	32	34.0%
Age of the respondent	18–25 years	7	7.4%
	26–41 years	68	71.6%
	42–57 years	15	15.7%
	58 years and above	5	5.3%
Seniority	0–5 years	27	28.4%
	5–10 years	41	43.2%
	10–15 years	17	17.9%
	15 years and above	10	10.5%
Education level	High school diploma	32	33.7%
	Bachelor's degree	47	49.5%
	Master's degree	16	16.8%
Employment contract type	Temporary work contract	14	14.7%
	Fixed term work contract	23	24.2%
	Permanent work contract	58	61.1%

Measures

Levenson's Self Report Psychopathy Scale

The employees' perceptions of their formal leader's psychopathy levels were assessed using the Portuguese version of the Levenson's Self Report Psychopathy Scale, originally developed by Levenson et al. (1995). The scale is an inventory with 26 items that aims to capture a protopsychopathic interpersonal philosophy in adults from the general pop- ulation, specifically non-criminal individuals. The Portuguese version was adapted by Coelho et al. (2010) and consists of 19 items, supported by the original two-factor struc- ture (i.e., factor one corresponds to primary psychopathy and factor two to secondary psychopathy). However, as only primary psychopathy was of interest, the six items that specifically assessed secondary psychopathy were excluded. Since the original scale is a self-report measure, the instrument was adapted so that employees could respond based on their perception of their superiors. The 13 items (e.g., "For my formal leader most of his/her problems are due to the fact that other people just don't understand him/her", "For my formal leader, in today's world, he/she feels justified in doing anything he/she can get away with to succeed.", "My formal leader often admires a really clever scam") were rated on a 4-point rating scale, ranging from 1—"Strongly Disagree" to 4—"Strongly Agree". Cronbach's alpha was computed for reliability and its value was found to be 0.94. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed, and the results indicate an acceptable model fit (2/df = 2.63; TLI = 0.88; CFI = 0.89; RMSEA = 0.093).

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The employees' job satisfaction levels were assessed using the Portuguese version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, originally developed by Weiss et al. (1967), designed to measure an employee's satisfaction with his or her job. This instrument provides more specific information on the aspects of a job that an individual finds rewarding rather than more general measures of job satisfaction. The Portuguese version, adapted by Ferreira et al. (2009), consists of 20 items. The scale presents a two-factor structure (i.e., factor one corresponds to intrinsic satisfaction and factor two to extrinsic satisfaction). The 20 items (e.g., "The chance to work alone on the job", "The praise I get for doing a good job", "The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job") were classified on a five-point rating scale ranging from 1—"Very dissatisfied" to 5—"Very satisfied". Cronbach's alpha was computed for reliability and its value was found to be 0.93. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed, and the results indicate an acceptable model fit (2/df = 2.05; TLI = 0.81; CFI = 0.82; RMSEA = 0.078).

Demographic Data

In order to collect demographic data from the respondents, a short questionnaire was included in the survey. The questionnaire was comprised of five items: gender, age, seniority, education level, and employment-contract type.

RESULTS

The data were analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics (i.e., independent sample t-test and simple linear regression). Furthermore, SPSS Statistics 27 Software was utilized for data analysis, and a p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

To test our first hypothesis, means comparison and t-student test for independent samples were used (see Table 2). Results show that there are significant differences between the employees' perceived levels of primary psychopathy in formal leaders' family ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 0.41$) and non-family businesses ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 0.32$), $t(93) = -2.365$, $p = 0.02$, $d = 0.36$. Thus, the first hypothesis of the study was confirmed, suggesting that family firms' employees perceive lower levels of primary psychopathy in their formal leaders than non-family firms' employees.

Table 2. t-Test: Employees' perceived levels of primary psychopathy in formal leaders' family and non-family firms.

	t	*p*	*df*	Family Firms		Non-Family Firms	
				M	SD	M	SD
Primary psychopathy	−2.37	0.02 *	93	2.28	0.41	2.46	0.32

N = 95. * $p < 0.05$.

The results for our second hypothesis (see Table 3) reveal that there are no significant differences between the levels of job satisfaction of employees working in family firms (M = 3.58, SD = 0.68) and non-family firms (M = 3.51, SD = 0.73), t (93) = 0.457, p = 0.44, d = 0.71. Thus, our second hypothesis was not confirmed.

Table 3. t-Test: Job satisfaction levels of employees in family and non-family firms.

	t	*p*	*df*	Family Firms		Non-Family Firms	
				M	SD	M	SD
Job satisfaction	0.46	0.44	93	3.58	0.68	3.51	0.73

N = 95.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Main Findings

This study aimed to explore differences in personality traits, focusing on the levels of primary psychopathy, between formal leaders of family and non-family companies as well as assessing differences in the job satisfaction levels of their employees. Additionally, focus- ing on family firms, the relationship between the perceived levels of primary psychopathy in formal leaders and the employees job satisfaction levels was assessed.

The results support the first hypothesis, suggesting that family firms' employees perceive lower levels of primary psychopathy in their formal leaders than non-family firms' employees. While it is well recognized that family and non-family companies differ in many aspects, no previous research has demonstrated differences between these two organizational forms regarding the perceived levels of primary psychopathy in formal leaders. However, there are some known aspects that may help explain these results. First, family enterprises often exhibit a notable cohesion of shared values and trust among family members, fostering an extension of these attributes into their managerial practices (Firfiray and Gomez-Mejia 2021). Consequently, employees within such organizational settings may perceive their formal leaders as exhibiting diminished levels of primary psychopathy, largely attributable to an emphasis on long-term relationship cultivation and the well-being of family members and non-family

staff. Furthermore, the convergence of interests between owners and managers in family firms, both ardently pursuing sustained business pros- perity and success (Razzak et al. 2019), serves to mitigate the likelihood of formal leaders engaging in self-serving and manipulative behaviors typically associated with primary psychopathy. In addition to these aligned interests, and according to Lumpkin and Brigham (2011), family companies tend to demonstrate a predilection for long-term perspectives on business operations, underscored by a focus on continuity and intergenerational succession. This strategic orientation contributes to a more cautious approach in decision-making, thereby diminishing the inclination towards manipulative or exploitative conduct com- monly attributed to traits of primary psychopathy. An additional factor influencing the perception of formal leaders' psychopathy within family firms may lie in the heightened scrutiny to which managers are subjected by family members who are actively involved in company operations (Le Breton-Miller and Breton-Miller 2021). This augmented level of accountability may act as a deterrent against the manifestation of primary psychopathic tendencies among formal leaders. Moreover, it is plausible that family firms seek to recruit and promote individuals who harmonize well with the prevailing family culture and values. This inherent selection bias potentially yields a decreased representation of individuals exhibiting psychopathic traits in managerial positions compared to non-family compa- nies, where hiring decisions may predominantly hinge on qualifications and professional experience.

Regarding Hypothesis 2, proposing that family firms' employees show higher levels of job satisfaction than non-family firms' employees, the results show that no significant differences were found. These results were contrary to what was expected. According to Pimentel (2018), family firms tend to show a genuine concern for the well-being of their employees, and, as a result, they tend to exhibit higher job satisfaction levels. Also, Hauswald et al. (2016) argued that family companies are associated with security, loyalty, and stability, and are considered to be fairer, to be more concerned about the well-being of their employees, and are characterized by strong values that attract potential candidates and retain current employees. A possible explanation for our results is related to the notion that family firms may be perceived as exploitative because they abusively use family power and control to take advantage of employees to the detriment of labor and other key stakeholders. In fact, Kellermanns et al. (2012) refer to such behaviors as the "dark side" of family firms. It is worth noting that sometimes non-family firms are considered more attractive due to their investment in human capital management programs, with intentionally more stimulating rewards. However, this may be deceiving due to the excessive workload typically demanded by these types of companies (Neckebrouck et al. 2018). This phenomenon is important because employee job satisfaction can be initially influenced by these factors. Family firms have been observed to prioritize the recruitment and advancement of family members over other equally qualified candidates. This practice can lead to reduced workforce diversity, hindering the

organization's ability to benefit from a broad range of skills and perspectives. Additionally, nepotistic tendencies may undermine meritocracy and negatively impact the overall talent pool within the organization, potentially compromising long-term competitiveness. The predominance of family members in top management positions may result in perceived limited growth opportunities for non-family employees. Consequently, these individuals may experience reduced levels of motivation, engagement, and commitment to the organization. Such feelings of stagnation and limited prospects can contribute to elevated turnover rates, especially among non-family employees, thereby posing retention challenges for family firms. Family firms may allocate disproportionately fewer resources to train and develop non-family employees compared to their family counterparts. This disparity can hinder the organization's ability to foster a skilled and competitive workforce. Insufficient investment in training and development may not only impede employee growth but also inhibit the firm's capacity to innovate and adapt to evolving market demands.

As to Hypothesis 3, suggesting that the employees' perceived levels of primary psy- chopathy in formal leaders are negatively associated with their job satisfaction levels, the results support the hypothesis showing that the perceived of primary psychopathy in formal leaders have a significant and negative relationship with job satisfaction levels, while indicating that the employee' perception of primary psychopathy in formal leaders can explain 38% of the employees' job satisfaction levels. Although this was the first time that this relationship was explored and tested in the family business context, the results do not corroborate previous studies developed in the general organizational setting (Spencer and Byrne 2016), which did not find a clear and explicit relationship between these two variables. However, the results support a widely accepted notion that the personality traits of formal leaders can impact employee job satisfaction (Butler and Martin 2020). This can be explained based on the fact that formal leaders that exhibit elevated levels of primary psychopathy may encounter difficulties in empathizing with the concerns and needs of their employees. Moreover, formal leaders demonstrating traits of primary psychopathy may resort to manipulative strategies to further reach their personal objectives (Laurijssen et al. 2023), often at the expense of their employees' well-being. Consequently, this behavior can foster a toxic work environment where employees perceive themselves as exploited and undervalued, leading to a decline in overall job satisfaction. Additionally, leaders with primary psychopathy may exhibit favoritism towards certain employees based on personal relationships or self-interest, rather than objectively evaluating performance. This perceived unfair treatment can elicit feelings of resentment and further diminish job satisfac- tion among those who feel marginalized or subjected to mistreatment. One critical element in any work environment is trust, as employees rely on their leaders to make impartial decisions, provide support, and act in the best interest of the organization and its members (Horoub and Zargar 2022; Prentice 2022).

However, high levels of primary psychopathy can erode trust and create uncertainty surrounding the leader's true intentions. Furthermore, such leaders may propagate a tense and conflict-laden atmosphere within the organiza- tion, marked by perpetual power struggles, internal strife, and unresolved disputes. This contributes to a stressful work environment, detrimentally impacting employees' overall job satisfaction. Also, recognition and support are fundamental needs for employees, and they often seek acknowledgment and encouragement from their leaders. Nevertheless, a leader exhibiting primary psychopathic traits is less inclined to offer positive feedback, praise, or support, resulting in employees feeling unappreciated and unsupported (Tokarev et al. 2017). Consequently, employees working under the supervision of this type of leader may be more inclined to leave the organization due to the negative work environment. This high turnover rate may further undermine the morale of remaining employees and exacerbate the decline in job satisfaction throughout the organization.

Limitations And Future Research

This study, as with any empirical work, has several limitations that represent oppor- tunities for future research and that should be acknowledged to ensure a comprehensive understanding of its findings. The first limitation was that of the relatively small sample size, which constrains the generalizability of the results. While efforts were made to ensure rigor in the data collection and analysis processes, a larger and more diverse sample would enhance the robustness of the findings. A second limitation concerns the use of externally reported instruments relying on a single source of information. This reliance on a singular perspective raises potential issues of bias or social desirability, as respondents might have been reluctant to provide candid responses due to fear of reprisals from superiors. In future studies, employing a combination of self-reporting instruments and externally reported measures could offer a more balanced and nuanced assessment of the phenomena under investigation, thereby strengthening the validity of the results. An interesting avenue for future research lies in the examination of how employees' characteristics may moderate the impact of leaders with psychopathic traits. Prior studies have indicated that the negative effects of destructive leaders are influenced by the attributes of their employees (Harms et al. 2018). However, this notion is yet to be directly explored in the context of leaders exhibiting primary psychopathy traits. Future research endeavors should also consider exploring the interplay between leader psychopathy and employee characteristics, such as gender, age, educational and professional background, and other relevant factors. Un- derstanding how these factors may interact and shape the dynamics within organizational settings could provide valuable insights into leadership dynamics and contribute to the development of targeted interventions and management strategies. Yet, another

avenue for future research lies in conducting qualitative studies that delve into the 'why' and 'how' of employees' perceptions of the leaders' psychopathic traits, with a potential connection to the person-supervisor fit concept. Exploring how employees perceive and experience psychopathic traits in their leader within the framework of person-supervisor fit could shed light on the mechanisms that either exacerbate or mitigate the negative consequences associated with such traits.

By addressing these limitations and pursuing future research directions, scholars can deepen our understanding of the complex relationships between leadership traits, employee characteristics, and overall organizational dynamics. Such advancements in knowledge will not only contribute to the academic literature but also offer practical implications for leadership development, employee well-being, and overall organizational effectiveness.

Theoretical And Managerial Implications

The findings of this study can have significant practical implications, particularly in the realm of recruitment and leadership development within organizational contexts. This study sheds light on the impact of primary psychopathy traits exhibited by formal leaders and its potential consequences for employees in family and non-family firms. By recognizing and understanding the implications of leader's primary psychopathy traits, organizations can make more informed decisions in the recruitment and selection of leadership candidates, leading to more effective appointments and improved organizational outcomes. One noteworthy practical implication lies in the domain of recruitment and selection and leadership assessment and development. By incorporating the assessment of primary psychopathy traits in leadership recruitment and selection processes as well as in leadership development programs, companies may enhance their ability to identify leaders who are more likely to promote a harmonious work environment and foster a sense of employee well-being. This, in turn, can lead to higher levels of job satisfaction and, ultimately, improve overall organizational performance.

The insights derived from this study may also hold valuable implications for business school programs that encompass courses centered around family business. Integrating the findings of this research into the core concepts covered within these courses can enhance the educational experience and practical outcomes for students.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Muhammad Ibrahim, Dechun Huang, Muddassar Sarfraz, Larisa Ivascu, and Amir Riaz. 2021. Effects of internal service quality on nurses' job satisfaction, commitment and performance: Mediating role of employee well-being. Nursing Open 8: 607–19. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Aziri, Brikend. 2011. Job satisfaction: A literature review. Management Research and Practice 3: 77–86.

Babiak, Paul, Craig S. Neumann, and Robert D. Hare. 2010. Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk. Behavioral Sciences & the Law 28: 174–93.

Berrone, Pascual, Cristina Cruz, and Luis R. Gomez-Mejia. 2012. Socioemotional wealth in family firms: Theoretical dimensions, assessment approaches, and agenda for future research. Family Business Review 25: 258–79. [CrossRef]

Bowling, Nathan, and Gregory D. Hammond. 2008. A meta-analytic examination of the construct validity of the Michigan Organiza- tional Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale. Journal of Vocational Behavior 73: 63–77. [CrossRef]

Butler, Frank C., and John A. Martin. 2020. Struggling to Survive: Non-Family Member Employees, The Family, and Stress in Family Firm Startups. In Entrepreneurial and Small Business Stressors, Experienced Stress, and Well-Being. Edited by Pamela L. Perrewé, Peter D. Harms and Chu-Hsiang Chang. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 123–46.

Chua, Jess H., James J. Chrisman, and Pramodita Sharma. 1999. Defining the family business by behavior. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 23: 19–39. [CrossRef]

Coelho, Luísa, Rui Paixão, and José Tomás da Silva. 2010. O Levenson's Self Report Psychopathy Scale (LSRP). Psychologica 53: 413–21. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Combs, James G., Peter Jaskiewicz, Kristen K. Shanine, and David B. Balkin. 2018. Making sense of HR in family firms: Antecedents, moderators, and outcomes. Human Resource Management Review 28: 1–4. [CrossRef]

Cunha, Miguel, Arménio Rego, Rita Cunha, Carlos Cabral-Cardoso, and Pedro Neves. 2014. Manual de Comportamento Organizacional e Gestão, 7th ed. Lisboa: Editora RH.

Deephouse, David L., and Peter Jaskiewicz. 2013. Do family firms have better reputations than non-family firms? An integration of socioemotional wealth and social identity theories. Journal of Management Studies 50: 337–60. [CrossRef]

Durand, Guillaume, Erika Matsumoto Plata, and Ioana-Smărăndit, a Arbone. 2017. Negative attitudes towards psychopaths: The role of one's own psychopathic traits. Personality and Individual Differences 109: 72–76. [CrossRef]

Englisch, Peter, Carrie Hall, and James Astrachan. 2015. Staying Power: How Do Family Business Create Lasting Success? Global Survey of the World's Largest Family Business. Available online: https://www.ey.com/gl/en/services/strategic-growthmarkets/ family-business/ey-how-do-family-businesses-create-lasting-success (accessed on 21 June 2023).

Erniwati, S., Mansyur Ramly, and Roslina Alam. 2020. Leadership style, organizational culture and job satisfaction at employee performance. Point of View Research Management 1: 9–18.

Ferreira, Joaquim Armando Gomes, Rosina Fernandes, Richard F. Haase, and Eduardo R. Santos. 2009. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire–Short Form: Estudo de adaptação e validação para a população portuguesa. Psychologica 51: 251–81. [CrossRef] Firfiray, Shainaz, and Luis R. Gomez-Mejia. 2021. Can family firms nurture socioemotional wealth in the aftermath of COVID-19?

Implications for research and practice. BRQ Business Research Quarterly 24: 249–57. [CrossRef]

Gómez-Mejía, Luis, Katalin Takács Haynes, Manuel Núñez-Nickel, Kathyrn J. L. Jacobson, and José Moyano-Fuentes. 2007. Socioemo- tional wealth and business risks in family-controlled

firms: Evidence from Spanish olive oil mills. Administrative Science Quarterly 52: 106–37. [CrossRef]

Gómez-Mejía, Luis, Pankaj C. Patel, and Thomas M. Zellweger. 2018. In the horns of the dilemma: Socioemotional wealth, financial wealth, and acquisitions in family firms. Journal of Management 44: 1369–97. [CrossRef]

Grijalva, Emily, Daniel A. Newman, Louis Tay, M. Brent Donnellan, Peter D. Harms, Richard W. Robins, and Taiyi Yan. 2015. Gender differences in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin 141: 261. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Harms, Peter D., Dustin Wood, Karen Landay, Paul B. Lester, and Gretchen Vogelgesang Lester. 2018. Autocratic leaders and authoritarian followers revisited: A review and agenda for the future. The Leadership Quarterly 29: 105–22. [CrossRef]

Harris, Kenneth J., K. Michele Kacmar, and Suzanne Zivnuska. 2007. An investigation of abusive supervision as a predictor of performance and the meaning of work as a moderator of the relationship. The Leadership Quarterly 18: 252–63. [CrossRef]

Hauswald, Hannes, Andreas Hack, Franz W. Kellermanns, and Holger Patzelt. 2016. Attracting new talent to family firms: Who is attracted and under what conditions? Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 40: 963–89. [CrossRef]

Horoub, Ibrahim, and Pouya Zargar. 2022. Empowering leadership and job satisfaction of academic staff in Palestinian universities: Implications of leader-member exchange and trust in leader. Frontiers in Psychology 13: 1065545. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Hurst, Charlice, Lauren Simon, Yongsuhk Jung, and Dante Pirouz. 2019. Are "bad" employees happier under bad bosses? Differing effects of abusive supervision on low and high primary psychopathy employees. Journal of Business Ethics 158: 1149–64. [CrossRef]

Janssen, Onne, and Nico W. Van Yperen. 2004. Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal 47: 368–84. [CrossRef]

Judge, Timothy A., Carl J. Thoresen, Joyce E. Bono, and Gregory K. Patton. 2001. The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. Psychological Bulletin 127: 376. [CrossRef]

Kellermanns, Franz W., Kimberly A. Eddleston, and Thomas M. Zellweger. 2012. Article commentary: Extending the socioemotional wealth perspective: A look at the dark side. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 36: 1175–82. [CrossRef]

Kumari, Kalpina, Salima Barkat Ali, Masooma Batool, Lucian-Ionel Cioca, and Jawad Abbas. 2022. The interplay between leaders' personality traits and mentoring quality and their impact on mentees' job satisfaction and job performance. Frontiers in Psychology 13: 937470. [CrossRef]

Laurijssen, L. Maxim, Barbara Wisse, Stacey Sanders, and Ed Sleebos. 2023. How to neutralize primary psychopathic leaders' damaging impact: Rules, sanctions, and transparency. Journal of Business Ethics, 1–19. [CrossRef]

Levenson, Michael R., Kent A. Kiehl, and Cory M. Fitzpatrick. 1995. Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 68: 151. [CrossRef]

Locke, Edwin. 1976. The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Edited by

Marvin Dunnette. Chicago: Rand McNally College Pub. Co.

Lumpkin, G. Tom, and Keith H. Brigham. 2011. Long–term orientation and intertemporal choice in family firms. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 35: 1149–69. [CrossRef]

Madden, Timothy, Laura T. Madden, Jason A. Strickling, and Kimberly A. Eddleston. 2017. Psychological contract and social exchange in family firms. International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development 16: 109–12. [CrossRef]

Madjar, Nir, Nicole Segal, Gilad Eger, and Gal Shoval. 2019. Exploring particular facets of cognitive emotion regulation and their relationships with nonsuicidal self-injury among adolescents. Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention 40: 280. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Miller, Danny, and Isabelle Le Breton-Miller. 2021. Family firms: A breed of extremes? Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 45: 663–81. [CrossRef]

Neckebrouck, Jeroen, William Schulze, and Thomas Zellweger. 2018. Are family firms good employers? Academy of Management Journal 61: 553–85. [CrossRef]

Neumann, Craig S., and Robert D. Hare. 2008. Psychopathic traits in a large community sample: Links to violence, alcohol use, and intelligence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 76: 893. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Nurlina, N. 2022. Examining Linkage Between Transactional Leadership, Organizational Culture, Commitment and Compensation on Work Satisfaction and Performance. Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management 2: 108–22. [CrossRef]

Patrick, Christopher J., Don C. Fowles, and Robert F. Krueger. 2009. Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Developmental origins of disinhibition, boldness, and meanness. Development and Psychopathology 21: 913–38. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Pérez-González, Francisco. 2006. Inherited control and firm performance. American Economic Review 96: 1559–88. [CrossRef]

Pimentel, Duarte. 2018. Non-family employees: Levels of job satisfaction and organizational justice in small and medium-sized family and non-family firms. European Journal of Family Business 8: 93–102.

Pimentel, Duarte, and Ana Pereira. 2022. Emotion Regulation and Job Satisfaction Levels of EmployeesWorking in Family and Non-Family Firms. Administrative Sciences 12: 114. [CrossRef]

Pimentel, Duarte, and Raquel Rodrigues. 2022. Employee Silence and Entrepreneurial Orientation in Small and Medium-Sized Family Firms. European Journal of Family Business 12: 39–50. [CrossRef]

Pimentel, Duarte, Juliana Pires, and Pedro Almeida. 2020. Perceptions of organizational justice and commitment of non-family employees in family and non-family firms. International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior 23: 141–54. [CrossRef]

Pimentel, Duarte, Marc Scholten, and João Pedro Couto. 2018. Fast or slow? Decision-making styles in small family and nonfamily firms. Journal of Family Business Management 8: 113–25. [CrossRef]

Pimentel, Duarte, Pedro Almeida, Pedro Marques-Quinteiro, and Marta Sousa. 2021. Employer branding and psychological contract in family and non-family. Management Research 19: 213–30.

Podsakoff, Philip, Scott Mackenzie, and Nathan Podsakoff. 2012. Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. Annual Review of Psychology 63: 539–69. [CrossRef]

Prentice, Stephen. 2022. Job Satisfaction or Employee Engagement: Regardless of Which Comes First, Supportive Leadership Improves Them Both. Advances in Developing Human Resources 24: 275–85. [CrossRef]

Raine, Adrian, Terrie E. Moffitt, Avshalom Caspi, Rolf Loeber, Magda Stouthamer-Loeber, and Don Lynam. 2005. Neurocognitive impairments in boys on the life-course persistent antisocial path. Journal of Abnormal Psychology 114: 38. [CrossRef]

Ramlawati, Ramlawati, Eva Trisnawati, N. Yasin, and Kurniawaty Kurniawaty. 2021. External alternatives, job stress on job satisfaction and employee turnover intention. Management Science Letters 11: 511–18. [CrossRef]

Razzak, Mohammad Rezaur, Raida Abu Bakar, and Norizah Mustamil. 2019. Socioemotional wealth and family commitment: Moderating role of controlling generation in family firms. Journal of Family Business Management 9: 393–415. [CrossRef]

Rutherford, Matthew, Donald F. Kuratko, and Daniel T. Holt. 2008. Examining the link between "familiness" and performance: Can the F–PEC untangle the family business theory jungle? Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 32: 1089–109. [CrossRef]

Sageder, Martina, Christine Mitter, and Birgit Feldbauer-Durstmüller. 2018. Image and reputation of family firms: A systematic literature review of the state of research. Review of Managerial Science 12: 335–77. [CrossRef]

Schröder, Elke, Eva Schmitt-Rodermund, and Nicolas Arnaud. 2011. Career choice intentions of adolescents with a family business background. Family Business Review 24: 305–21. [CrossRef]

Spector, Paul. 2019. Do not cross me: Optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. Journal of Business and Psychology 34: 125–37. [CrossRef]

Spencer, Ryan James, and Mitchell Keith Byrne. 2016. Relationship between the extent of psychopathic features among corporate managers and subsequent employee job satisfaction. Personality and Individual Differences 101: 440–45. [CrossRef]

Tepayakul, Ruechuta, and Idsaratt Rinthaisong. 2018. Job satisfaction and employee engagement among human resource staff of Thai private higher education institutions. The Journal of Behavioral Science 13: 6881.

Tepper, Bennett J., Jon C. Carr, Denise M. Breaux, Sharon Geider, Changya Hu, and Wei Hua. 2009. Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 109: 156–67. [CrossRef]

Tokarev, Alexander, Abigail R. Phillips, David J. Hughes, and Paul Irwing. 2017. Leader dark traits, workplace bullying, and employee depression: Exploring mediation and the role of the dark core. Journal of Abnormal Psychology 126: 911. [CrossRef]

Vassileva, Jasmin, David S. Kosson, Carolyn Abramowitz, and Patricia Conrod. 2005. Psychopathy versus psychopathies in classifying criminal offenders. Legal and Criminological Psychology 10: 27–43. [CrossRef]

Weiss, David J., Rene V. Dawis, George W. England, and Lloyd H. Lofquist. 1967. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation). Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation 22: 120.

Zellweger, Thomas M., and Joseph H. Astrachan. 2008. On the emotional value of owning a firm. Family Business Review 21: 347–63. [CrossRef]