

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

11-29-2017

Corporate Psychopathy: Examining the Relation Between Corporate Psychopaths and Employee Work-Life Balance

Stephen Michael Schenck

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Schenck, Stephen Michael, "Corporate Psychopathy: Examining the Relation Between Corporate Psychopaths and Employee Work-Life Balance" (2017). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1753.
<https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/1753>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by University of Memphis Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of Memphis Digital Commons. For more information, please contact khhgerty@memphis.edu.

CORPORATE PSYCHOPATHY: EXAMINING THE RELATION BETWEEN
CORPORATE PSYCHOPATHS AND EMPLOYEE WORK-LIFE BALANCE

by

Stephen Michael Schenck

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

Major: Psychology

The University of Memphis

December 2017

Acknowledgements

First off, I want to thank my Dad who inspired me to complete this thesis. It was my Dad whose behavior I watched when interacting with his manager that gave me the idea for my thesis. This thesis is as much his as it is mine. I love my dad.

I also would like to thank Dr. Frank Andrasik, the chair of my committee for allowing me the opportunity to complete this thesis. I also want to thank my other committee members Dr. Robert Cohen and Dr. Rodney Vogl for serving on my committee and offering valuable advice that I will never forget.

Finally, I want to thank Dr. Clive Boddy for providing The Psychopathy Measure-Management Research Version as well as the necessary tools to use the measure. Without Dr. Boddy's expertise I would not know how to design my study to obtain enough information about corporate psychopaths.

Abstract

Schenck, Stephen Michael. The University of Memphis. December 2017. Corporate Psychopathy: Examining the Relation Between Corporate Psychopaths and Employee Work-Life Balance. Frank Andrasik Ph.D.

The thesis examined Corporate Psychopaths (CP) since their impact on an organization can be large. Particularly, this thesis focused on the relationship between managers perceived to be CPs and work and personal life balance. It was hypothesized that employees who perceive their supervisors to be high in characteristics of CP will report (a) less satisfaction with work and personal life balance and (b) increased levels of psychological distress on measures of depression, anxiety, and stress. A US based sample was collected using MTurk because companies are hesitant to allow research on CPs. Workers who reported having a CPs as a manager reported lower satisfaction scores when compared to those having a normal manager. It was also found that those who reported having CPs reported slightly higher scores for depression and stress, than those with normal managers. Findings from this study may have direct relevance to human resources on how to address and resolve employee-supervisor conflicts.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
Corporate Psychopaths	2
Impact on an Organization	4
Structures that Benefit Corporate Psychopaths	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Method	8
Participants	8
Materials	14
Procedure	20
Results	22
Results Hypothesis 1	22
Results Hypothesis 2	24
Secondary Analysis	26
Secondary Analysis: Work to Family	26
Secondary Analysis: Family to Work	27
Secondary Analysis: Scores Derived from the DASS-21	29
Discussion	32
Implications	34
Limitations	35
References	37
Appendix	43
A. Supervisor Measure	43
B. Emotional State Measure	45
C. Work and Personal Life Inventory	47
D. Productivity Measure	49
E. HPQ Scoring Directions	51
F. Demographics	55
G. “Off Hours” Work-Related Technology Usage Scale	58
H. Demographics of Work Environment 1	60
I. Demographics of Work Environment 2	61
J. Informed Consent	63
K. Do Not Qualify Statement	65
L. Debriefing	66
M. Work with Dysfunctional Manager	67
N. Previous Supervisor Measure	68

O. Previous Emotional State Measure	70
P. Previous Work and Personal Life Inventory	72
Q. Previous “Off Hours” Work-Related Technology Usage Scale	74
R. Previous Demographics of Work Environment 1	76
S. Previous Demographics of Work Environment 2	77
T. Questions About Change	78

List of Tables

Table 1	11
Table 2	12
Table 3	13
Table 4	14
Table 5	22
Table 6	23
Table 7	25
Table 8	27
Table 9	28
Table 10	30
Table 11	31
Table 12	32

CORPORATE PSYCHOPATHY: EXAMINING THE RELATION BETWEEN CORPORATE PSYCHOPATHS AND EMPLOYEE WORK-LIFE BALANCE

Being on the receiving end of an abusive supervisor at work can markedly influence employees' efforts to balance their home lives and relationships with partners, families, and significant others directly. An abusive supervisor can contribute to employees feeling emotionally drained, which can in turn lead to job burnout, and subsequently contribute to employees having difficulty balancing work-family in both directions (i.e., work to family and family to work) (Carlson, Ferguson, Hunter, & Whitten, 2012). This often results in employees becoming emotionally drained and "bringing" their work problems home, which can negatively impact family life, bringing their family problems to work, or both. Thus, abusive supervisors can influence relationships between employees and their significant others, both directly and indirectly. When interactions with an abusive supervisor create tension within a relationship, this can result in the employee questioning their role within their family, which can further impact family dissatisfaction (Carlson, Ferguson, Perrewe, & Whitten, 2011).

The above is mentioned to emphasize the varied types of influence an abusive supervisor can have within the workplace. The rest of the paper focuses on corporate psychopaths, which is considered by researchers to be more severe than having an abusive supervisor (Babiak, Neumann, & Hare, 2010; Boddy, 2011). The question arises, if these types of issues, ever present feelings of not being able to "escape" from the grasp of one's boss, job burnout, being emotionally drained and work-personal life conflict, occur with abusive supervisors (Tepper, 2000), what type role does a corporate psychopath play in work and personal life balance as well as emotional distress?

The major thrust of research on corporate psychopathy has centered on the worker within

the work setting (and not the larger impact), focusing more specifically on overall productivity, job satisfaction, and emotional well-being of the employee (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Babiak, Neumann, & Hare, 2010; Boddy, 2010; Matheiu, Neumann, Hare, & Babiak, 2013). The overall theory behind this study is derived from Urie Bronfenbrenner's *Ecological Models of Human Development*, specifically, the microsystems of development (1994). The purpose of this study is to examine the direct environment the perceived corporate psychopath creates and how this relates to the employees' work and personal life balance.

The aim of this paper was to examine more fully the impact of corporate psychopathy on employees' work and personal life balance. Online survey tools were used to accomplish this aim, as this potentially affords the desired level of anonymity needed to allow employees to answer more openly and minimize concerns related to managers seeing the results (Matheiu et al., 2013; Jonason, et al., 2012; Jones & Hare, 2015). This thesis utilized techniques like those that have been employed in other recent research addressing this topic (Jones & Hare, 2015; Jonason, et al., 2012; Matheiu, et al., 2013). What follows next is a discussion of the core focus of this study—corporate psychopathology.

Corporate Psychopaths

Babiak and Hare (2006) describe psychopathy as a personality disorder that is characterized as having: total lack of conscience and empathy. In their seminal book, Babiak and Hare (2006) both point out meaningful differences between a person being diagnosed as Antisocial Personality Disorder versus being judged as psychopathic or sociopathic:

Antisocial personality disorder (APD) is a broad diagnostic category found in the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition (DSM-IV). Antisocial and criminal behaviors play a major role in

its definition and, in this sense, APD is similar to sociopathy. Some of those with APD are psychopaths, but many are not. The difference between psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder is that the former includes personality traits such as lack of empathy, grandiosity, and shallow emotion that are not necessary for a diagnostic of APD. APD is three or four more times common than psychopathy in the general population and in prisons (2006, p. 19).

Psychopaths employed within a business setting are commonly referred to as corporate psychopaths and more importantly are viewed as individuals who use a combination of aggression and manipulation as their primary tool for achieving their goals (Babiak & Hare, 2006).

Babiak and Hare (2006) describe corporate psychopaths as “master manipulators”, in that they are adept at seducing their “prey” (i.e., employees or employers) to identify with CPs, permitting them to more easily achieve the CPs’ desired goals within the company. Psychopaths accomplish their personal goals by learning what current or recent issues their prey have experienced and then feigning empathy, which involves various strategies, such as stating they too have experienced or are currently experiencing the exact same issues.

In an organization, corporate psychopaths are known to use various means of influence (tactics) to create confusion, manipulate employees, make jobs difficult, and influence the overall emotional well-being of employees (Jonason, et al., 2012). Corporate psychopaths typically utilize one or both of the following two types of influence (or tactics) on employees: “hard” tactics (i.e., manipulation, aggression) and “soft” tactics (i.e., ingratiation, personal appeals) (Jonason et al., 2012). Corporate psychopaths are more likely to employ “hard” tactics over “soft” ones. Having a set agenda within an organization, they often opt for harder tactics in

order obtain their desired results more quickly, resorting to aggression or direct manipulation if it will help them achieve an immediate task (Babiak & Hare, 2006). Soft tactics are typically used when first entering the organization to gain favor and to raise the overall appeal throughout the organization. Corporate psychopaths, thus, are particularly skilled at “reading” situations and applying the appropriate tactics to obtain what they desire at that moment in time (Babiak & Hare, 2006).

It is important to note that corporate psychopaths typically only target people (prey) that are considered in positions of power or influence. Boddy (2011) states that they will use these behaviors, described by Babiak and Hare (2006), to help create chaos and organizational change to diverge attention from their true intent. This allows for corporate psychopaths to enact whatever plan they have, to achieve a desired goal. Boddy (2011) additionally states that corporate psychopaths are typically very unorganized but use their skills of influence (tactics) to cover up their limitations. Per Boddy (2010), corporate psychopaths will, when circumstances warrant, escalate their level of abuse to create confusion and make the jobs for other employees difficult, through poor training, to hide their true intent.

Impact on an Organization

Corporate psychopaths can be especially destructive within the business setting because of their ability to change their behaviors as situations dictate. Their impact on a company includes but is not limited to: the type of sector, corporate social responsibility, affect, and work and personal life balance (Boddy, 2010, 2014; Matheiu et al., 2013).

Matheiu et al. (2013) examined the impact of corporate psychopaths on employee well-being and job satisfaction in both private and public-sector jobs, with key differences emerging. While superiors who were viewed as corporate psychopaths had minimal impact upon employee

well-being in the private sector, adverse effects were greater for workers in the public sector. However, in both sectors, a significant relation was found in regard to job satisfaction. Employees who labeled their superiors as corporate psychopaths were much more likely to have lower scores on measures of job satisfaction (Matheiu et al., 2013).

Corporate psychopathy has also been found to influence other important organizational aspects, such as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Boddy, 2010). CSR refers broadly to how the company acts in accordance to the law and ethics (Carroll, 1999). CSR is perceived to be lower when employees view corporate psychopaths to have more of an impact in their organization. CSR is conversely thought to be higher when the employees perceive corporate psychopaths to have less of an impact in their organization (Boddy, 2010).

Boddy (2014) also examined whether corporate psychopathy was associated with heightened conflict, employee's negative affective well-being, and counterproductive workplace behavior, and found all three of these to be the case. The strongest impact occurred with respect to employee's negative affective well-being. When affect is low and negative, workers are more likely to engage in counter-workplace behavior (Boddy, 2014).

Work and personal life balance¹ is defined as being able to keep work responsibilities from taking time away from one's personal life (home life) and keeping one's personal life from spilling over into work (Beauregard, 2014; Michel & Clarke, 2010; Pelino, 2012; Pitichat, 2013; Sturges & Guest, 2004). Optimal work and personal life balance is something younger workers entering the workforce are increasingly stressing as highly important to them (Sturges & Guest,

¹ The literature commonly uses the term work-life balance, however work and personal life conflict better depicts the issue. Therefore, work and personal life conflict will be used throughout this paper. In addition, the use of conflict is meant to refer to the imbalance between work and personal life. The use of balance refers to the optimal state an employee strives for.

2004). This consideration, in fact, has become one of the major reasons for determining whether individuals now entering the workforce remain with their employer (Sturges & Guest, 2004).

Structures that Benefit Corporate Psychopaths

Achieving the desired work and personal life balance has become increasingly difficult due to a blurring of the lines between work and nonwork due to advances in technology (Dén-Nagy, 2014), which can leave employees feeling as if they cannot escape the hostile work environment their supervisor(s) created (Tepper, 2000). Forty-seven percent of respondents from the LinkedIn Research Network of 148 firms in North America and Europe stated that support of mobile technology is an important part of growth per a survey conducted by Forrester Consulting commissioned by Cisco (2011). When companies begin to urge the use of communication technologies outside of work, this begins to serve as a predictor of a negative imbalance between work and personal life (Wright, Abendschein, Wombacher, O'Connor, Hoffman, Dempsey, Krull, Dewes, & Shelton, 2014). In addition to the fact that use of communication technologies outside of work predicts an imbalance in work and personal life, it is also been shown to be a predictor of lower job satisfaction (Wright et al., 2014).

Work and life outside of work are on the same continuum but with the reliance on technology, this has allowed employers to stay connected to employees nearly all the time, which in turn leaves employees struggling to maintain an optimal balance between work and life outside of work (Dén-Nagy, 2014; Michel & Clarke, 2010; Pelino, 2012; Pitichat, 2013). This added use of technology can open the door to allow corporate psychopaths to exert even greater control over the worker (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Jonason et al., 2012, Tepper, 2000), serving as yet another way for one's work life to impact one's personal life (i.e., causing an imbalance in work and personal life) (Carlson et al., 2012; Matheiu et al., 2013).

Another structure that benefits corporate psychopaths is the fact that graduates are working more than what has traditionally been the norm, in terms of hours worked² (Sturges & Guest, 2004). Technology has become a tool to allow for working past the normal hours (Dén-Nagy, 2014; Michel & Clarke, 2010; Pelino, 2012; Pitichat, 2013). Upon graduation, individuals state that working no more than 40 hours a week is one of the important criteria for remaining at a job (Sturges & Guest, 2004). Sturges and Guest reported that once beginning a job, graduates' mindsets change as they realize the need to initially work more than 40 hours a week to become noticed. Once noticed, however, they state they plan to decrease the hours worked per week. That, in fact, does not typically turn out to be the case, as graduates tend to work approximately 45.7 hours a week initially, and after working for 18 months will steadily increase this average to approximately 49.8 hours a week (Sturges & Guest, 2004). In this same study, the authors examined the level of satisfaction of work and personal life balance between recent graduates and graduates who had worked 18 months. Fifty-seven percent of the recent graduates stated they were happy with their work and personal life balance, but their happiness with work and personal life balance decreased over time. By the time an employee accrued 18 months of experience, Sturges and Guest found that only 39% were satisfied with their work and personal life balance. Sturges and Guest further found higher work and personal life conflict were not associated with lower organizational commitment.

Purpose of the Current Study

The proposed thesis sought to extend the research on corporate psychopathy into work and personal life conflict. More specifically, the purpose of the current study was to examine the relation between employees' perception of corporate psychopathy in supervisors and the work

² The term normal hours refer to working more than 40 hours and is based on fulltime as defined by healthcare.gov please see <https://www.healthcare.gov/glossary/full-time-employee/>

and personal life balance of employees. This research also examined certain specific psychological realms, including depression, anxiety, and stress, to better understand the negative role corporate psychopaths may play in the lives of employees. This contrasts with past research that has focused more broadly on emotional well-being.

The following hypotheses were proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Employees who perceive their supervisors to be high in characteristics of CP will report less satisfaction with work and personal life balance.

Hypothesis 2: Employees who perceive their supervisors to be high in characteristics of CP will report increased levels of psychological distress on measures of depression, anxiety, and stress (the previous research has primarily looked at affective well-being overall).

Method

Participants

Most of the information pertaining to corporate psychopathology has been obtained through indirect contact with employees, made possible using online survey tools, such as Amazon Mechanical Turk (Jonason, Slomski, & Partyka, 2012; Jones & Hare, 2015; Matheiu et al., 2013). This has been viewed as both necessary and prudent because companies are quite reluctant to open their doors to research that addresses “corporate psychopathy” due to the associated stigma, fear of fallback from the employees and their managers, ethical concerns when labeling someone a corporate psychopath, and a host of related concerns (Babiak et al., 2010; Farhr & Chen, 2014; Tepper, 2000). Perhaps the most salient of these concerns is fear of litigation from employees being labeled or viewed as a corporate psychopath or some variant of this description (Babiak et al., 2010).

In addition, companies do not always see the inherent value of conducting research

addressing corporate psychopathy. For example, consider the fact that some of the characteristics associated with “psychopathic features (e.g., callousness, grandiosity, manipulateness) may relate to the ability to make persuasive arguments and ruthless decisions” (Babiak, Neumann, & Hare, 2010, p. 176), and thus are viewed from a positive perspective when the financial bottom line is paramount. This may also translate to good job performance reviews when seen from the company’s perspective. Lowman (1989), however, has discussed exceptions to the above concerns where features of psychopathy are acknowledged as being problematic (i.e., law enforcement, fire departments, nuclear plant operators, military, and transportation workers).

Participants were obtained from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Most of the population on MTurk comes from the United States (46.8%) and India (34.0%), with the remainder (19.2%) dispersed over various other countries (Ipeirotis, 2012). MTurk was specifically selected as the most appropriate medium for this type of study, as it affords the desired level of anonymity needed to allow employees to answer without fearing reprisals from managers who may see their results (Jones & Hare, 2015; Jonason, et al., 2012; Matheiu, et al., 2013). MTurk workers have been shown to be just as reliable if not more so than the traditional college population used for social science research (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011).

Participation in this study was restricted to those individuals who resided in the United States. To qualify, participants needed to be currently employed and have a supervisor/manager that regularly assigned them a task or with whom they interacted on at least three different days in a 7-day period. This study examined both part-time and full-time employees, using the following definitions (Full-Time Employee, 2016): Full-time refers to “Any employee who works an average of at least 30 hours per week for more than 120 days in a year. Part-time employees work an average of less than 30 hours per week”. In addition, respondents could not

be using MTurk as their only source of income because this is a job that people can do at home without a supervisor. The study was viewable only to those who had completed at least 500 Human Intelligence Tasks (HITs). HITs refer to surveys or various other tasks workers complete in MTurk. They must also have had at least 95% of those completions approved by other researchers for whom they have completed tasks, which meant that 95% of the tasks a person completes is acceptable work. Specification of a completion rate of 95% or more minimized the number of individuals who had required multiple attempts to complete tasks or had a history of providing work that was considered unusable. Participants were allotted 60 minutes and were paid \$2 for their time. This payment is judged to be appropriate based on prior findings that a payment of \$1.89 per hour was necessary for harder tasks (non-survey HITs) (Horton & Chilton, 2010).

Data were collected from 259 participants (154 Males, 104 Females, & 1 Other) in this study, with most of the participants being white/Caucasian (75%), single/never married (53%), and ranging in age from 20 -70 ($M = 33.73$, $SD = 8.57$; see Table 1).

Table 1		
Demographic of Sample Collected ($N=259$)		
	<i>N</i>	%
Sex		
Male	154	59.5
Female	104	40.1
Other	1	0.40
Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian	195	75
Black/African American	34	13
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	1
Asian	20	8
Other	8	3
Marital Status		
Married	103	40
Widow	1	0
Divorced	13	5
Single/Never Married	138	53
Separated	4	2

Of the 259 participants only 42% ($n = 109$) had children, with 56% having at least one child under the age of 18. Most of participants had 1-2 children (84%; see Table 2 below).

Table 2		
Family Size of Those Who Have Children ($N = 109$)		
	<i>N</i>	%
Number of Children		
1	46	42
2	46	42
3	9	8
4	7	6
5 or More	2	2
Number of Children Under 18		
1	61	56
2	36	36
3	4	4
4	5	5

Most of the managers the participants rated were male (67%). The managers rated were mostly white/Caucasian (84%), with an estimated age range of 23-70 ($M = 45.51$, $SD = 9.78$; see Table 3).

Table: 3		
Demographics of Management (N = 259)		
	<i>N</i>	%
Sex		
Male	173	68
Female	86	32
Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian	218	84
Black/African American	23	9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	.5
Asian	6	2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	.5
Other	10	4

Most of the participants that completed this study worked in the Information Technology and retail fields (32%; see Table 4).

Table 4:
Current Employment of the Participants (*N* = 259)

	<i>N</i>	%
Accounting	15	6
Admin & Clerical	21	8
Banking	8	3
Engineering	6	2
Government	9	4
Health Care	22	9
Human Resources	3	1
Information Technology	46	18
Education	14	5
Manufacturing	19	7
Retail	37	14
Sales & Marketing	29	11
Transportation	3	1
Other	27	10

Materials

The survey items were managed through Qualtrics, a survey building website (Qualtrics, Provo, UT). Qualtrics is free survey builder software that is used for a variety of experiments.

MTurk was used strictly as a recruiting and payment tool for this study.

Management Measure: The Psychopathy Measure-Management Research Version (PM-MRV; Boddy, 2011; aka Management Scale; See Appendix A), an 8-item measure, was used to assess whether a corporate psychopath was present in the work setting of the employer. Each item is rated on a 3-point scale, anchored by “not displayed” (0) to “displayed” (2), with total

scores ranging from 0 to 16. Scores obtained on the PM-MRV were broken down as follow: scores of 8 or less indicated the presence of a normal manager, 9-12 indicated the presence of a dysfunctional manager, and scores 13 or greater revealed the presence of a corporate psychopath (Boddy, 2011).

The PM-MRV appears to have acceptable content related validity, because the items are derived from the *Psychopathy Checklist* by Cleckley (1988) and a thorough review of literature on psychopathy (Boddy, 2011). The reliability (internal consistency) of the PM-MRV has a Cronbach's alpha level of .93 (Boddy, 2012). The construct validity of the PM-MRV was assessed using a factor analysis where all 8 items were found to load as one factor. This model had an eigenvalue > 1 (5.32) and it accounted for 66.5% of the variance (C. Boddy, personal communication, April 11, 2016). The 8 items loaded highly with the single factor with correlations ranging from .43 (Glibness and superficial charm) to .68 (Displays a lack of remorse). The PM-MRV has not been tested for concurrent or criterion related validity or test-retest reliability (C. Boddy, personal communication, April 11, 2016).

Emotional State Measure: The Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale (DASS)–21 (Lovibond, & Lovibond, 1995; aka Emotional Reactions Scale; See Appendix B) was used to measure depression, anxiety, and stress. It is comprised of three subscales (Depression, Anxiety and Stress), each consisting of 7 items (Lovibond, & Lovibond, 1995). Each item was scored on a 4-point response format ranging from 0 (*Did not apply to me at all*) to 3 (*Applied to me very much, or most of the time*). Scores on each of the three subscales of the DASS can range from 0 to 21, with higher scores indicating greater symptoms of depression, anxiety, or stress. The following ranges of scores were used to assess the severity level of the depression subscale: 0-4 is considered minimal, 5-6 is mild, 7-10 is moderate, 11-13 is severe, and 14 and above is

extremely severe. The following ranges of scores were used to assess the severity level of the anxiety subscale: 0-3 is considered minimal, 4-5 is mild, 6-7 is moderate, 8-9 is severe, and 10 and above is extremely severe. The following ranges of scores were used to assess the severity level of the stress subscale: 0-7 is considered minimal, 8-9 is mild, 10-12 is moderate, 13-16 is severe, and 17 and above is extremely severe.

The reliability (internal consistency) of the DASS-21 was .88 for the depression scale, .82 for the anxiety scale, and .90 for the stress scale (Henry & Crawford, 2005). Convergent validity for each subscale was examined by correlating each with other corresponding measures of depression, anxiety and stress (Henry & Crawford, 2003). The depression subscale was found to correlate highly with other measures of depression with coefficients ranging from .66 to .78. The anxiety subscale revealed correlation coefficients ranging from .62 to .72 with other tests, while the stress subscale score was found to have an r -value of .67 with its counterpart test (Henry & Crawford, 2003). The discriminant validity of the depression subscale had correlation coefficients ranging from -.48 to .62. The discriminant validity of the anxiety subscale had coefficients ranging from -.29 to .56. The discriminant validity of the stress subscale had correlation coefficients ranging from -.31 to .56 (Henry & Crawford, 2003).

Work and Personal Life Inventory: Work and personal life conflict was measured using the Work-Family Conflict Scale (WFCS) (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; See Appendix C). For this study, the name of the survey was changed (Work and Personal Life Inventory) to not alert participants as to the intent of the study. This scale is an 18-item inventory that is comprised of 6 separate subscales (3 items each). All items were answered using a five-point Likert-type response wherein higher scores indicated an increase in conflict. The first subscale, labeled Time-Based Work Interference With Family (see appendix for examples), examines

work to family conflict with a Cronbach alpha of .87 (Carlson et al., 2000). The second subscale, termed Time-Based Family Interference With Work, is family to work conflict that has a Cronbach alpha of .79 (Carlson et al., 2000). The third subscale is Strained Based Work Interference With Family that has a Cronbach alpha of .85 (Carlson et al., 2000). The fourth subscale is Strain Based Family Interference With Work that has a Cronbach alpha of .87 (Carlson et al., 2000). The fifth subscale is Behavior-Based Work Interference With Family that has a Cronbach alpha of .78 (Carlson et al., 2000). The sixth is Behavior-Based Family Interference With Work that has a Cronbach alpha of .85 (Carlson et al., 2000). The scale was found to have an overall internal consistency of .70 and discriminant validity of the subscales had correlation coefficients ranging from .24 to .83 (Carlson et al., 2000).

Productivity Measure: A productivity measure was assessed by the Health and Productivity Questionnaire Short Form (HPQSF; Kessler, Barber, Beck, Berglund, Cleary, McKenas, Pronk, Simon, Stang, Ustun, & Wang, 2003). The HPQSF is a 13-item shortened version that focuses on health and productivity through absenteeism, presenteeism, work-related injuries, accidents, and work-related achievements and failures (see Appendix D; please review Appendix E for scoring instructions).

Given that HPQSF does not focus specifically on a mental disorder or physical disorder, it was ideal for this study given its broad focus on absenteeism and presenteeism. Some responses were measured on a likert type response format scored 0 *worst performance* to 10 *perfect performance*, and other questions asked how many hours the individual spent performing certain tasks at work and how many hours spent missing work (see Appendix D). The internal consistency was found to be a moderate Cronbach's $\alpha = .73$ (Kessler et al., 2003). When compared to archival employee data it has been shown that those who score as a low performer

on HPQ have an Odds Ratio ranging between 2.2 and 5.0 of being predicted as not having high job performance (presence of high performance; Kessler et al., 2003). Again, when compared to archival employee data, those who are scored as low performers on the HPQ have an Odds Ratio between 2.1 and 3.9 of being predicted to be rated as having low performance (absence of high performance; Kessler et al., 2003).

Technology Usage Survey: Technology usage was assessed using “Off Hours” Work-Related Technology Usage Scale (Gardner & Vogl, 2014; See Appendix H). For this study, this survey was simply called the Technology Usage Survey. This measure is comprised of 16-items total that are broken into three separate sections. The first section (3-items) determines whether their job provides technological device to use for work. The second section (3-items) determines whether participants bring their own technological device to use for work. The third section (6-items) asks on average how much does your work contact you during “Off Hours”. The fourth section (4-items) asks on average do you spend engaging with technology for work during “Off Hours”.

Reasons for a Change of Work or Management: To assess the reason for change of a job or management was addressed by using the Gallup Q12© Survey (Harter, Schmidt, Killham, & Agrawal, 2016). This survey was created for use in a Gallup Poll on employee engagement and satisfaction. The version used in this study was comprised of 12 items because the first question was omitted because it was judged to be far too broad. This survey is copyrighted; thus, it is not possible to include it in the Appendix. Respondents indicate their level of agreement with each item, using a 5-point Likert type scale: 1 (*Strongly agree*), 2 (*Agree*), 3 (*Neither agree or disagree*), 4 (*Disagree*), & 5 (*Strongly Disagree*). A sample question is “*My supervisor, or someone at work, seems to care about me as a person*”.

The version of the survey used has a Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$. When averaged, the scores of the questions were found to have a convergent validity of .91, when comparing averages to longer surveys (i.e., surveys on job satisfaction and engagement) (Harter et al., 2016).

Demographics (Managerial Behavioral Questionnaire): A managerial behavior questionnaire (6-item) that assesses basic attitudes about the workplace life was embedded within the basic demographic information. The name of the questionnaire was titled as it was in *Corporate Psychopaths*, Clive Boddy (2011), because the name did not reveal the intent of the survey. Responses were rated on a 5-point likert type scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Everyday*) (Boddy, 2011; See Appendix I). Scores of the questionnaire could range from 5, meaning the individual's work does not demand much, to 25 meaning that work requires a lot of the person's time. Psychometric statistics are not yet available for this questionnaire. An additional survey (8-items) inquired about how employees "feel" about their jobs (i.e., anxious, depressed, nervous, etc.) (Boddy, 2011; See Appendix J). Scores on this questionnaire could range from 8, meaning the person feels "overall good" about their job to 40, meaning the person's job "makes them feel bad after work". Psychometric statistics are not yet available for this questionnaire either. All of the questions in the demographic realm were designed to help the researcher evaluate the overall work environment of the employee.

Demographics: A demographic questionnaire created for this investigation, intended in part to serve as a prescreening tool, asked participants about their sex; age; ethnicity; whether they have children, how many children they have, and how many are under the age of eighteen; sex, ethnicity, and perceived age of their manager; and their current career, whether they had another job, and interactions with superiors (see Appendix K). This information was presented first to help control for people just clicking "accept" when they do not have another job at

present. This information will be used to keep track where the evaluations of the manager/supervisor is coming from.

Questions About Change: To assess what the employee learned after they changed their job or changed management 3-items was created for this study. The survey asks what they learned from the experience of the dysfunctional manager (See Appendix U).

Procedure

Participants who were eligible for this study were given an option to accept or not accept this HIT. Those who chose to participate were given a link that directed them to the survey in Qualtrics. They were first provided an informed consent form (see Appendix L) and, once read, acknowledged their consent by clicking the next button. The demographics section was then presented. Here the participants were asked whether they had another job and how many interactions per week they had with their supervisor on average. If the participants did not have another job or did not interact with their supervisor at least on 3 different days (in a 7-day work period), the participants were redirected to a page that thanked them for their time and informed them they did not meet the requirements for this study (see Appendix M). Then the Managerial Behavioral Questionnaire, the overall employee job well-being survey (Boddy, 2011), and the HPQ were presented; however, the surveys were randomized to minimize order effects. These surveys served as ways to obtain the “big picture” as to what their job environment was like as well as what type of employee they perceive themselves to be. The management survey, emotional state measure, technology survey, and the work and personal life inventory were presented in a randomized order. Upon completion of these surveys a question was presented that asked if they previously ever worked with a dysfunctional manager. If yes was selected, then all of the surveys were presented in a randomized order, with participants being instructed to

rate them according to their previous dysfunctional manager. They were then presented with questions regarding their change of job.

Upon completion of the surveys the participants were presented a debriefing (see Appendix K) as well as given a random code. The random code helped ensure that people would not enter the code twice, when only completing the study once. That code was inputted in a box under the survey link they clicked on the MTurk page. The participants were allotted 60 min to complete all measures, with a timer presented at the top to allow for proper time management. When finished, they were given the completion code to enter onto MTurk's Amazon Mechanical Turk website to be paid \$2 for their work, provided their work was deemed satisfactory. This was determined by whether (1) they devoted adequate time (i.e., 25 min or greater), (2) refrained from providing extremely high (selecting the highest number all the way through) or extremely low (selecting only the lowest numbers all the way through) scores for 95%³ of the questions, or (3) the survey was completed by a single IP address (to ensure they did not take the survey multiple times). Payment was not provided for participants who failed to pass the demographic pre-screen initially, but did so after a second try (as this is viewed as an attempt to circumvent the eligibility criteria).

³ This was acceptable if the participant spent 20 minutes or more going through the study, as this was an act of person genuinely answering the questions. However, if someone answered all high or low numbers for 95% and only took 10 minutes they were considered as just running through for the money.

Results

Table 5 shows the breakdown of the managers perceived to be Normal Managers, Abusive Managers, and Corporative Psychopaths. Given that The Psychopathy Measure-Management Research Version (PM-MRV; Boddy, 2011) is still relatively new it seemed most appropriate to follow the same procedures as the creator of the scale, Clive Boddy, in terms of breaking the scores down by category.

Table 5: PM-MRV Breakdown of Manager Rated (N = 318)		
Normal Manager	Abusive Supervisor	Corporate Psychopath
225	45	48

Hypothesis 1

To evaluate Hypothesis 1, participants were assigned to one of the three categories, as mentioned before, on the basis of their scores obtained on the PM-MRV (*Normal Manager*, *Dysfunctional Manager*, and *Corporate Psychopath*) (Boddy, 2011). A one-way MANOVA (with manager type as the independent variable) was computed wherein employee scores on the 6 WFCS (subscales) served as the dependent variable. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted. A statistically significant effect was found for manager type, $F(12, 620) = 7.328, p < .001$; Wilks' Lambda .767; partial eta squared = .124.

To determine more precisely the sources of significance each of the 6 dependent variables were analyzed by one-way MANOVAs, with 3 levels. The results for all analyses are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6:						
Hypothesis 1 <i>WFCS (subscales) & PM-MRV Values (N = 318)</i>						
Variable	F-Test	P-Values	Normal Manager M (SD)	Dysfunctional Manager M (SD)	Corporate Psychopath M (SD)	Effect Size
TBWIWF ¹	24.05	.001	7.14 (3.16) ^a	9.73 (3.69) ^b	10.17 (3.61) ^b	.13
TBFIWW ²	4.06	.018	5.76 (2.56) ^a	7.02 (3.36) ^a	6.04 (2.83) ^a	.03
SBWIWF ³	34.04	.001	7.08 (3.19) ^a	10.20 (3.43) ^b	10.60 (3.60) ^b	.18
SBFIWW ⁴	2.18	.114	5.86 (2.75) ^a	6.73 (3.08) ^a	5.67 (2.50) ^a	.01
BBWIWF ⁵	8.94	.001	2.25 (3.89) ^a	9.31 (2.98) ^b	9.10 (3.24) ^b	.05
BBFIWW ⁶	9.51	.001	7.78 (3.27) ^a	9.76 (3.19) ^b	9.27 (3.21) ^b	.06

Notes: ¹Time-Based Work Interference With Family, ²Time-Based Family Interference With Work, ³Strained-Based Work Interference With Family, ⁴Strain-Based Family Interference With Work, ⁵Behavior-Based Work Interference With Family, ⁶Behavior-Based Family Interference With Work

Means that share a superscript are not different from one another; those with different superscripts are significantly different.

As seen in Table 6 with time based work interference with family, strain based work interference with family, and behavior based work interference with family, only the normal managers was significantly different (using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .008) from the corporate psychopaths and dysfunctional managers. However, corporate psychopaths and dysfunctional groups were not significantly different from each other. It is important to note that with behavior based work interference with family that only the normal manager was different

from the dysfunctional manager. Corporate psychopaths were not significantly different from any other groups.

Results Hypothesis 2

To evaluate Hypothesis 2, participants were assigned to one of the three categories, as mentioned before, based on their scores obtained on the PM-MRV (*Normal Manager*, *Dysfunctional Manager*, and *Corporate Psychopath*) (Boddy, 2011). A one-way MANOVA (with manager type as the independent variable) was computed wherein employee scores on the DASS-21 (subscales) served as the dependent variable. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices and multicollinearity, with no serious violations noted. There was a statistically significant difference between Normal Manager, Dysfunctional Manager, and Corporate Psychopath on the combined dependent variables, $F(6, 626) = 10.364, p < .001$; Wilks' Lambda .827; partial eta squared = .090.

To determine more precisely the sources of significance each of the 3 dependent variables were analyzed by one-way MANOVAs, with 3 levels. The results for all analyses are presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7:						
Hypothesis 2 <i>DASS – 21</i> & <i>PM-MRV</i> Values (<i>N</i> = 318)						
Variable	F-Test	P-Values	Normal Manager M (SD)	Dysfunctional Manager M (SD)	Corporate Psychopath M (SD)	Effect Size
Depression	104.55	.001	2.77 (4.18) ^a	5.76 (4.95) ^b	5.88 (5.88) ^b	.09
Anxiety	7.20	.001	2.25 (3.89) ^a	4.53 (4.58) ^b	3.75 (4.77) ^b	.04
Stress	28.21	.001	3.98 (4.27) ^a	8.24 (5.51) ^b	8.56 (6.19) ^b	.16
Note: Means that share a superscript are not different from one another; those with different superscripts are significantly different.						

As seen in Table 7 with respect to Depression and Stress, normal managers were significantly different (using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .017), than corporate psychopaths and dysfunctional managers. However, corporate psychopaths and dysfunctional groups were not significantly different from each other. It is important to note that with anxiety that only normal managers were different from dysfunctional managers. Corporate psychopaths were not significantly different from any other groups.

Secondary Analysis

Multiple secondary analyses were performed based on the significant results for the hypotheses. These analyses were conducted to examine whether the phenomenon of corporate psychopathy was a significant predictor for work to family balance; family to work balance; depression; anxiety; and stress.

Secondary Analysis: Work to Family

A multiple regression was first conducted to predict work to personal life conflict (bringing work related issues home) based on the available independent variables. The predictors included overall work environment (culture), sending texts about company related matters to other employees after hours, sending emails about company related matters to other employees after hours, making phone calls for the company after hours, the difficulty of the job, and overall scores on the PM-MRV (Boddy, 2011). The overall model was significant, $F(6, 171) = 21.992, p < .001, R^2 = .436$, and accounted for 44% of the variance. Overall work environment (culture), job difficulty, and overall scores on the PM-MRV (Boddy, 2011) were significant predictors for work to personal life conflict (bring work related issues home; see Table 8). Sending texts and emails and making phone calls after hours were not found to be significant.

Overall work environment (culture) was associated with an increase in work to personal life scores ($b = -.517, t(171) = -5.344, p < .001$). Overall difficulty of the job was also associated with an increase in work to personal life scores ($b = .410, t(171) = 2.286, p = .024$). In addition, overall PM-MRV scores were also associated with an increase in work to personal life scores ($b = .300, t(171) = 2.551, p = .012$).

Table 8

Multiple Regression to predict work to personal life conflict (bringing work related issues home) based on the available independent variables. (N = 177)

	Unstandardized				
	B	SE	Beta	T	P
<i>Work Environment</i>	-.517	.097	-.411	-5.344	.000
<i>After hour Texting</i>	.091	.052	.116	1.760	.080
<i>After hours E-Mails</i>	.048	.048	.067	.995	.321
<i>After hours Phone Calls</i>	.046	.155	.020	.297	.767
<i>Difficulty of the Job</i>	.410	.179	.150	2.286	.024
<i>PM-MRV</i>	.300	.117	.184	2.551	.012

Note. $F(6, 171) = 21.992, p < .001, R^2 = .436$

Secondary Analysis: Family to Work

A multiple regression was also conducted to predict personal life to work conflict (bringing personal life related issues to work) based on the available independent variables. The predictors included overall work environment (culture), sending texts about company related matters to other employees after hours, sending emails about company related matters to other employees after hours, making phone calls for the company after hours, the difficulty of the job, and overall scores on the PM-MRV (Boddy, 2011). The overall model was significant, $F(6, 171) = 8.361, p < .001, R^2 = .227$, and accounted for 28% of the variance. Overall work environment (culture) and the difficulty of the job were found to be significant predictors for personal life to work conflict (bringing personal life related issues to work; see Table 9). Sending texts and

emails and making phone calls after hours, as well as overall scores on the PM-MRV (Boddy, 2011) were not found to be significant. Overall work environment (culture) was associated with an increase for work in personal life scores ($b = -.44, t(171) = -4.934, p < .001$). The overall difficulty of the job was also associated with an increase for work in personal life scores ($b = -.173, t(171) = 2.286, p = .026$).

Table 9

Multiple Regression to predict personal life to work conflict (bringing personal life related issues to work) based on the available independent variables. (N = 177)

	Unstandardized				
	B	SE	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
<i>Work Environment</i>	-.425	.086	-.444	-4.934	.000
<i>After hours Texting</i>	.064	.046	.107	1.383	.168
<i>After hours E-Mails</i>	.034	.043	.061	.779	.437
<i>After hours Phone Calls</i>	.202	.138	.118	1.460	.146
<i>Difficulty of the Job</i>	-.360	.160	-.173	-2.252	.026
<i>PM-MRV</i>	.026	.105	.021	.247	.805

Note. $F(6, 171) = 8.361, p < .001, R^2 = .227$

Secondary Analysis: Scores Derived from the DASS-21

Multiple regressions were also conducted for each of the 3 scales derived from the DASS-21. In all 3 regression analyses the predictors consisted of the following: overall work environment (culture), sending texts about company related matters to other employees after hours, sending emails about company related matters to other employees after hours, making phone calls for the company after hours, the difficulty of the job, and overall scores on the PM-MRV (Boddy, 2011).

DASS-21: Depression. In this multiple regression the overall model was significant, $F(6, 171) = 29.354, p < .001, R^2 = .507$, and accounted for 51% of the variance. Overall work environment (culture) and making phone calls for the company after hours were significant predictors for depression (see Table 10). Sending texts and emails after hours, job difficulty, and overall scores on the PM-MRV (Boddy, 2011) were not found to be significant. Overall work environment (culture) was associated with an increase for work to personal life scores ($b = -.629, t(171) = -8.754, p < .001$). Making phone calls for the company after hours was also associated with an increase for work to personal life scores ($b = .174, t(171) = 2.701, p = .008$).

Table 10

Multiple Regression to predict depression score (DASS-21 subscale) based on the available independent variables. (N = 177)

	Unstandardized				
	B	SE	Beta	T	P
<i>Work Environment</i>	-.418	.048	-.629	-8.754	.000
<i>After hours Texting</i>	.014	.026	.033	.534	.594
<i>After hours E-Mails</i>	.016	.024	-.042	-.673	.502
<i>After hours Phone Calls</i>	.208	.077	.174	2.701	.008
<i>Difficulty of the Job</i>	.107	.089	.074	1.204	.230
<i>PM-MRV</i>	.014	.058	.017	.249	.804

Note. $F(6, 171) = 29.354, p < .001, R^2 = .507$

DASS-21: Anxiety. The overall model for predicting anxiety was significant, $F(6, 171) = 19.975, p < .001, R^2 = .412$, and accounted for 41% of the variance. Overall work environment (culture) and making phone calls for the company after hours were significant predictors for anxiety (see Table 11). Sending texts about company related matters to other employees after hours, sending emails about company related matters to other employees after hours, the difficulty of the job, and overall scores on the PM-MRV (Boddy, 2011) were not found to be significant.

Overall work environment (culture) was associated with an increase in work to personal life scores ($b = -.434, t(171) = -5.534, p < .001$). Making phone calls for the company after hours

was also associated with an increase for work to personal life scores ($b = .470, t(171) = 6.675, p < .001$). The overall difficulty of the job was also associated with an increase for work to personal life scores ($b = -.144, t(171) = -2.147, p = .033$).

Table 11

Multiple Regression to predict anxiety score (DASS-21 subscale) based on the available independent variables. (N = 177)

	Unstandardized				
	B	SE	Beta	T	P
<i>Work Environment</i>	-.233	.042	-.434	-5.534	.000
<i>After hours Texting</i>	.005	.023	.014	.207	.836
<i>After hours E-Mails</i>	-.014	.021	-.045	-.653	.515
<i>After hours Phone Calls</i>	.451	.068	.470	6.675	.000
<i>Difficulty of the Job</i>	-.167	.078	-.144	-2.147	.033
<i>PM-MRV</i>	.040	.051	.057	.773	.440

Note. $F(6, 171) = 19.975, p < .001, R^2 = .412$

DASS-21: Stress. The overall model was significant, $F(6, 171) = 25.797, p < .001, R^2 = .475$, and accounted for 48% of the variance. Overall work environment (culture) and making phone calls for the company after hours were significant predictors for stress score (see Table 12). Sending texts and emails and making phone calls after hours and difficulty of the job were not found to be significant. Overall work environment (culture) was associated with an increase in/for work to personal life scores ($b = -.498, t(171) = -6.714, p < .001$). Overall scores on the

PM-MRV (Boddy, 2011) were also associated with an increase with work to personal life scores ($b = .144, t(171) = 2.066, p = .040$).

Table 12

Multiple Regression to predict stress score (DASS-21 subscale) based on the available independent variables. (N = 177)

	Unstandardized				
	B	SE	Beta	T	p
<i>Work Environment</i>	-.324	.048	-.498	-6.714	.000
<i>After hours Texting</i>	.047	.026	.116	1.818	.071
<i>After hours E-Mails</i>	-.018	.024	-.049	-.765	.445
<i>After hours Phone Calls</i>	.096	.078	.082	1.233	.219
<i>Difficulty of the Job</i>	.151	.089	.107	1.689	.093
<i>PM-MRV</i>	.121	.059	.144	2.066	.040

Note. $F(6, 171) = 25.797, p < .001, R^2 = .475$

Discussion

As hypothesized, employees who rated their managers as corporate psychopaths reported higher work and personal life conflict with time from work interfering with personal life and the strain of work influencing personal life in one direction (Work to Personal Life Conflict) As pointed out in previous research, corporate psychopaths like to have control over their employees because they want results (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Jonason, Slomski, & Partyka, 2012). However, behaviors for work and behaviors for personal life had employees (who perceived their manager

just as dysfunctional) reporting higher work and personal life conflict in both directions This aligns with research on management that is perceived to be overall abusive (Work to Personal Life Conflict and Personal Life to Work Conflict). When a team leader is perceived as abusive it thus not only affects individual performance but team performance as well (Farh & Chen, 2014). The more abusive the leader is perceived, the lower the level of productivity within the team environment (Boddy, 2012; Farh & Chen, 2014).

As also hypothesized those who reported having a corporate psychopath as a manager reported having higher negative affect, which supports Boddy's research (2014). Specifically, those who reported having corporate psychopaths as a manager reported higher scores on the depression and stress scales (DASS-21 subscales).

In general, dysfunctional managers have employees that report higher work and personal life conflict (both directions), supporting the findings of Carlson, Ferguson, Hunter, and Whitten (2012). However, this thesis was interested in corporate psychopathy in managers and how that relates to employees' work personal life balance. Consistent with this, higher scores on the PM-MRV was a significant predictor for Work-to-personal-life as well as stress levels. Regarding the work environment (culture) this was the strongest predictor for work-to-personal-life conflict, personal-life-to work conflict, depression levels, anxiety levels and stress levels. This is important because McGregor and Doshi (2015) found culture to be a contributor to employee motivation that in turn increased customer satisfaction.

As expected, making calls after hours by employers was a significant predictor for levels of depression and anxiety. This relation is particularly interesting given the findings of a recent study wherein it was reported that employees using social media during and after work-hours (to communicate among co-workers) had higher job commitment and job satisfaction (Hanna, Kee,

& Robertson, 2017). A suggestion as to why this contrary finding emerged may lie in the fact that phone calls may take place at an inopportune time whereas checking social media can take place when convenient.

Implications

Findings from this study may have direct relevance to human resources with regard to identifying early indicators of an abusive supervisor and designing programs on how to address and resolve employee-supervisor conflicts. This in turn can help those in human resource departments better “police” managers.

The finding that after hour phone calls significantly predicted levels of depression and stress merits further discussion. At present, countries such as France and Germany, have passed laws that prohibit companies from contacting their employees after hours (Morris, 2017; Nelson, 2014). Companies, such as Volkswagen and Daimler, have specific policies and programs that will prevent emails from being sent after hours and even delete any emails sent to an employee on vacation (“Volkswagen turns off Blackberry email after work hours”, 2012; “Should holiday email be deleted?”, 2014). Given the United States does not have policies like these in place, it may be time for the private and federal U.S. agencies to begin examining how such activities impact workers’ overall quality of life.

Stress is very costly to organizations in the US, with an estimated total cost of \$300 billion arising from accidents, diminished productivity, legal, insurance, medical, workers’ compensation and absenteeism (“Workplace Stress,” 2016). In 2008, it was estimated that 5% - 8% (or \$190 billion) of the healthcare expenditures per year for employers in the US and employees were due to workplace stress (Goh, Pfeffer, & Zenios, 2016). Goh et al. identified several stressors within the workplace and found work life balance to be the third leading source

of stress in the workplace (high job demand and lack of insurance coverage were numbers one and two, respectively). Work and personal life conflict alone is estimated to account for \$24 billion a year in health care expenditures. Given the high cost of workplace stress it may well be time to give serious consideration to the impact of after work intrusions, such as making calls after hours for employers, and take steps to reduce or cease them completely.

Limitations

As stated at the beginning of this paper, companies are hesitant to allow research on “corporate psychopaths”, with the most salient reason being fear of litigation from employees being labeled or viewed as a corporate psychopath or some variant of this description (Babiak et al., 2010). Accordingly, this study was performed online, which may or may not serve as a suitable analog. Performing this research within several companies is the ideal path for the future studies. This approach would also allow researchers to sample people from every department to better identify in what departments corporate psychopaths have the most negative impact. Then researchers could compare reports of management complaints made to human resources to observed managers as well as working conditions. Collecting comprehensive data in a “live setting” could also identify if corporate psychopaths are preventing people from making complaints in certain areas.

Another potential limitation concerns relying upon employees to rate their managers, a procedure which is open to situational bias. For example, when an employee rates their manager, he/she could be having an especially bad day or good day (i.e., their manager had given them some positive news). Hopefully, studies like these will open more doors to allow researchers into companies in order to examine these phenomena more closely.

Other limitations include asking participants if they specifically worked for a dysfunctional manager, which may have primed them to think more negatively about their previous manager. The reason this may have been the case is because some of the comments provided about previous managers centered along the lines of “Do not work for morons”. As most of the comments started off negatively, asking if they worked for a dysfunctional manager thus may have primed them to respond in a certain way.

Future studies would benefit from having employees maintain diaries over a specified period of time to document issues at work that spillover at home and vice versa as they occur (not just documenting at a single point in time). A few such studies have appeared in the literature in regard to work and personal life balance, over periods ranging from 7 to 14 business days (Butler, Gryzwacz, Bass, & Linney, 2005; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009), as well as having employees sample two days each week during a 5-week period (Claessens, Erde, Rutte, & Roe, 2010). Future diary studies that employ similar recording approaches may help advance understanding; however, the greatest scientific yield may accrue from diary-based studies wherein respondents record events on a daily basis over more extended time periods.

A final limitation centers on the lack of diversity among the managers on whom the ratings were based; e.g., 84% were white/Caucasian, as well as among respondents (75% white/Caucasian). This raises issues about representativeness of the sample and the extent to which the findings may generalize to companies as a whole.

References

- Babiak, P., & Hare, R. D. (2006). *Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Babiak, P., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (2010). Corporate psychopath: Talking the walk. *Behavioral Science and the Law*, 28, 174-193
- Beauregard, T. A., (2014). Fairness perceptions of work–life balance initiatives: Effects on counterproductive work behavior. *British Journal of Management*, 25, 772–789
- Boddy, C. R. (2010). Corporate psychopaths and productivity. *Management Services*, 54(1), 26-30.
- Boddy, C. R. (2011). *Corporate psychopaths: Organizational destroyers*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boddy, C. R. (2014). Corporate psychopaths, conflict, employee affective well-being and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121, 107-121.
- Boddy, C. R., Ladyshevsky, R. K., & Galvin, P. (2010). The influence of corporate psychopaths on corporate social responsibility and organizational commitment to employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(1), 1-19.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In *International Encyclopedia of Education*, Vol. 3, 2nd. Ed. Oxford: Elsevier. Reprinted in: Gauvain, M & Cole, M. (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children*, 2nd Ed. (1993, pp. 37-43). NY: Freeman.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk a new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3-5.

- Butler, A., Grzywacz, J., Bass, B., & Linney, K. (2005). Extending the demands- control model: A daily diary study of job characteristics, work-family conflict and work-family facilitation. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 78(2), 155-169.
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268-295.
- Carlson, D., Ferguson, M., Hunter, E., & Whitten, D. (2012). Abusive supervision and work-family: The path through emotional labor and burnout. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 849-859.
- Carlson, D. S., Ferguson, M., Perrewe, P. P., & Whitten, D. (2011). The fallout of abusive supervision: An examination of subordinates and their partners. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 937-961.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249-276.
- Claessens, B. J., Van Eerde, W., Rutte, C. G., & Roe, R. A. (2010). Things to do today...: A daily diary study on task completion at work. *Applied Psychology*, 59(2), 273-295.
- Cleckley, H. (1988). *The Mask of Sanity*. Augusta, Georgia 5th ed, private printing for educational use by Emily Cleckley.
- Crawford, J. R., & Henry, J. D. (2003). The Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS): Normative data and latent structure in a large non-clinical sample. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 42(2), 111-131.
- Dén-Nagy, I. (2014). A double-edged sword? A critical evaluation of the mobile phone in creating work-life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 29(2), 193-211.

- Farh, C. I. C., & Chen, Z. (2014). Beyond the individual victim: Multilevel consequences of abusive supervision in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 6*, 1074-1095.
- Full-Time Employee. (2016). Healthcare.gov. Retrieved from <https://www.healthcare.gov/glossary/full-time-employee/>
- Gardner, K. J., & Vogl, R. J., (2014, May). The relationship between psychosocial impairment and information communication technology use. Paper presented at the 85th Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Goh, J., Pfeffer, J., & Zenios, S. A. (2016). The relationship between workplace stressors and mortality and health costs in the United States. *Management Science, 62*(2), 608-628
- Hanna, B., Kee, K. F., & Robertson, B. W. (2017). Positive impacts of social media at work: Job satisfaction, job calling, and Facebook use among co-workers. *In SHS Web of Conferences, 33*. EDP Sciences.
- Henry, J. D., & Crawford, J. R. (2005). The 21-item version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS–21): Normative data and psychometric evaluation in a large non-clinical sample. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44*, 227–239.
- Horton, J. J., & Chilton, L. B. (2010, June). The labor economics of paid crowdsourcing. *Paper presented at the 11th Association for Computing Machinery Conference on Electronic Commerce*. Cambridge, MA.
- Ipeirotis, P. (2012) Demographics of Mechanical Turk. Department of Information, Operation, and Management Sciences. New York University. New York, NY.
- Jonason, P. K., Slomski, S., & Partyka, J. (2012). The dark triad at work: How toxic employees get their way. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 449-453.

- Jones, D. N., & Hare, R. D. (2015). The mismeasure of psychopathy: A commentary on Boddy's PM-MRV. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-10.
- Kessler, R., Barber, C., Beck, A., Berglund, P., Cleary, P., McKenas, D., Pronk, N., Simon, G., Stang, S., Ustun, B. T., & Wang, P. (2003). The world health organization health and work performance questionnaire (HPQ). *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 45(2), 156-174.
- Kessler, R. C., Ames, M., Hymel, P. A., Loeppke, R., McKenas, D. K., Richling, D. E., Stang, P. E., & Ustun, T. B. (2004). Using the World Health Organization Health and Work Performance Questionnaire (HPQ) to evaluate the indirect workplace costs of illness. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 46(6), S23-S37.
- Lovibond, P. F. (1995). *Manual for the depression anxiety stress scales*. Sydney: Sydney Psychology edition.
- Lowman, R. (1989). *Pre-employment screen for psychopathy: A guide to professional practice*. Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Exchange.
- 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
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.11.010><http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.11.010>
- McGregor, L., & Doshi, N. (2015). How company culture shapes employee motivation. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Michel, J. S., & Clark, M. A. (2011). Personality and work-life integration. In *Creating Balance?* (pp. 81-99). Springer. New York City, New York

Minton-Eversole, T. (2012, July 19). Virtual teams used by most organizations, survey says.

Retrieved from

<http://www.shrm.org/hrdisciplines/orgempdev/articles/pages/virtualteamsusedmostbyglobalorganizations,surveysays.aspx>

Morris, D. Z. (2017, January 1). New French law bars work emails after hours. Retrieved from

<http://fortune.com/2017/01/01/french-right-to-disconnect-law/>

Nelson, S. S. (2014, December 1). German government may say 'Nein' to after work emails.

Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2014/12/01/366806938/german-government-may-say-nein-to-work-emails-after-six>

Off-hours. 2017. In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hacker>

Pitichat, T. (2013). Smartphones in the workplace: Changing organizational behavior,

transforming the future. *LUX: A Journal of Transdisciplinary Writing and Research of Claremont Graduate University*, 3(1), 13. Retrieved from

<http://scholarship.claremont.edu/lux/vol3/iss1/13>

Pelino, M. (2012). The Expanding Role of Mobility in the Workplace-IT Pro White Paper

Library. Retrieved from

http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en_us/solutions/trends/unified_workspace/docs/Expanding_Role_of_Mobility_in_the_Workplace.pdf

Should holiday email be deleted? (2014). Retrieved from. [http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-](http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-28786117)

28786117

Sturges, J., & Guest, D. (2004). Working to live or living to work? Work/life balance early in the

career. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 14(4), 5-20.

- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2, 178-190.
- Volkswagen turns off Blackberry email after work hours. (2012). Retrieved from. <http://www.bbc.com/news/technology-16314901>
- Workplace Stress (2011, August 11). In *American Institute of Stress*. Retrieved April 1, 2016, from <http://www.stress.org/workplace-stress/>
- Wright, K. B., Abendschein, B., Wombacher, K., O'Connor, M., Hoffman, M., Dempsey, M., Krull, C., Dewes, A., & Shelton, A. (2014). Work-related communication technology use outside of regular work hours and work life conflict the influence of communication technologies on perceived work life conflict, burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28(4), 507-530.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 82(1), 183-200.

Appendix A (*Supervisor Measure*)

Q. On the following scale: 0 = Not Displayed At All, 1 = Somewhat Displayed, and 2 = Displayed, which of the following characteristics do you think are displayed by your current manager? Please circle the code number that corresponds with their displaying each characteristic.

Characteristics displayed		Not Displayed	Somewhat Displayed	Displayed
<p>A. Glibness and Superficial Charm:</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Current Manager	0	1	2
<p>B. Are Accomplished Liars</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Current Manager	0	1	2
<p>C. Are Manipulative and Conning</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours as being good at conning and using people, having well developed political/networking skills and being good at seducing other people).</i></p>	Current Manager	0	1	2
<p>D. Have A Grandiose Sense of Self-Worth</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Current Manager	0	1	2
<p>E. Display a lack of remorse about how their actions harm other employees</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Current Manager	0	1	2
<p>F. Are Emotionally shallow, calculating and cold</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Current Manager	0	1	2

<p>G. Display a lack of empathy – they don't show any capacity to experience the feelings of others</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours as openly making fun of others, being able to fire people without worrying about it, being selfish, being emotionally or verbally abusive).</i></p>	<p>Current Manager</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>H. Refuse to take responsibility for their own actions</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	<p>Current Manager</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>2</p>

Appendix B (*Emotional State Measure*)

Please read each statement and circle a number 0, 1, 2 or 3, which indicates how much the statement applied to you *over the past week* (7-days). In this test, there are no right or wrong answers. I ask that you do not overthink the responses (take a lot of time), but please do not rush through this survey. Again, all responses are confidential and I ask that you answer truthfully.

The rating scale is as follows:

0 = Did not apply to me at all

1 = Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time

2 = Applied to me to a considerable degree, or a good part of time

3 = Applied to me very much, or most of the time

- 0 1 2 3 1. I found it hard to wind down.
- 0 1 2 3 2. I was aware of dryness of my mouth.
- 0 1 2 3 3. I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all.
- 0 1 2 3 4. I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g., excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion).
- 0 1 2 3 5. I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things.
- 0 1 2 3 6. I tended to over-react to situations.
- 0 1 2 3 7. I experienced trembling (e.g., in the hands).
- 0 1 2 3 8. I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy.
- 0 1 2 3 9. I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself.
- 0 1 2 3 10. I felt that I had nothing to look forward to.
- 0 1 2 3 11. I found myself getting agitated.
- 0 1 2 3 12. I found it difficult to relax.
- 0 1 2 3 13. I felt down-hearted and blue.
- 0 1 2 3 14. I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing.
- 0 1 2 3 15. I felt I was close to panic.
- 0 1 2 3 16. I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything.
- 0 1 2 3 17. I felt I wasn't worth much as a person.

- 0 1 2 3 18. I felt that I was rather touchy.
- 0 1 2 3 19. I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g., sense of heart rate increase, heart missing a beat).
- 0 1 2 3 20. I felt scared without any good reason.
- 0 1 2 3 21. I felt that life was meaningless.

Appendix C (*Work and Personal Life Inventory*)

Please read each statement carefully and respond based on your current job. Please read each statement and circle a number 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, which indicates how much you agree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. I ask that you do not overthink the responses (take a lot of time), but please do not rush through this survey. Again, all responses are confidential and I ask that you answer truthfully.

The rating scale is as follows: (Radio Buttons)

1 = Disagree Strongly

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral

4 = Agree

5 = Agree Strongly

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. The time I spend on family responsibilities often interfere with my work responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. The time I spend with my family often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent and spouse.

- 1 2 3 4 5 16. The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be effective at work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. The problem-solving behavior that works for me at home does not seem to be as useful at work.

Appendix D (*Productivity Measure*)

The next set of questions is designed to help us better understand the work behavior about your current job. Please answer honestly and know that these answers are confidential. **Remember to answer based on your current job and please respond based on the last 28 days at your current job.**

The absenteeism and presenteeism questions

B3. About how many hours altogether did you work in the past 7 days? (If more than 97, enter 97.)

Number of hours (00-97)

B4. How many hours does your employer expect you to work in a typical 7-day week? (If it varies, estimate the average. If more than 97, enter 97.)

Number of hours (00-97)

B5. Now please think of your work experiences over the past 4 weeks (28 days). In the spaces provided below, write the number of days you spent in each of the following work situations.

In the past 4 weeks (28 days), how many days did you...

Number of days (00-28)

B5a. ...miss an entire work day because of problems with your physical or mental health? (Please include only days missed for your own health, not someone else's health.)

B5b. ...miss an entire work day for any other reason (including vacation)?

B5c. ...miss part of a work day because of problems with your physical or mental health? (Please include only days missed for your own health, not someone else's health.)

B5d. ...miss part of a work day for any other reason (including vacation)?

B5e. ...come in early, go home late, or work on your day off?

B6. About how many hours altogether did you work in the past 4 weeks (28 days)? (See examples below.)

Number of hours in the past 4 weeks (28 days)

Examples for Calculating Hours Worked in the Past 4 Weeks

40 hours per week for 4 weeks = 160 hours

35 hours per week for 4 weeks = 140 hours

40 hours per week for 4 weeks with 2 8-hour days missed = 144 hours

40 hours per week for 4 weeks with 3 4-hour partial days missed = 148 hours

35 hours per week for 4 weeks with 2 8-hour days missed and 3 4-hour partial days missed = 112 hours

B9. On a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 is the worst job performance anyone could have at your job and 10 is the performance of a top worker, how would you rate the usual performance of most workers in a job similar to yours?

Worst Performance

Perfect Performance

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

B10. Using the same 0-to-10 scale, how would you rate your usual job performance over the past year or two?

Worst Performance

Perfect Performance

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

B11. Using the same 0-to-10 scale, how would you rate your overall job performance on the days you worked during the past 4 weeks (28 days)?

Worst Performance

Perfect Performance

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Appendix E (HPQ Scoring Directions)

III. Scoring absenteeism

We have two ways of measuring and scoring absenteeism. One relies on the respondent estimating how many hours he/she worked over a four-week period. The other asks the respondent to estimate how many hours he/she worked in the past 7 days. We recommend using the four week estimates when available, as they will tend to smooth out any up or down spikes that might have occurred in a particular week (e.g. a respondent missing several hours of work because of a doctor's appointment). Both are included, however, because some employees find it hard to estimate the number of hours they worked for a four week period. Here we describe the scoring for both the 7-day and the 4-week estimates. Finally, when both the 7-day and 4-week estimates are available for most workers, some employers compare the results to get a sense of the reliability of the data.

Absenteeism is scored in terms of hours lost per month, which is to say that a high score indicates a higher amount of absenteeism. The measure of absolute absenteeism is expressed in raw hours, with a negative lower bound (if the person works more than expected) and an upper bound equal to the number of hours the respondent is expected to work. The measure of relative absenteeism is expressed as a percentage of expected hours and ranges between a negative number (works more than expected) and 1.0 (always absent).

a) Using 4-Week Estimates

Absolute absenteeism: $4xB4 - B6$ Relative absenteeism: $(4xB4 - B6)/(4xB4)$ Relative hours of work: $B6/(4xB4)$

b) Using 7-day Estimates

Absolute absenteeism: $4xB4 - 4xB3$ Relative absenteeism: $(4xB4 - 4xB3)/4xB4$ Relative hours of work: $B3/B4$

IV. Missing values, extreme values, unused questions in scoring absenteeism

The researcher has to make decisions about imputation of missing values based on other data available either in the larger survey or from administrative records. When ancillary data are not available to make imputations, cases should be deleted from analysis, ideally with a weight imposed on the remaining cases to restore representativeness of the sample.

In some cases, respondents tell us in response to B4 that their employer expects them to work "24 hours a day 7 days a week" or "more than is humanly possible" or etc. In cases of this sort, we make a rational imputation to the 90th percentile of the distribution of the acceptable responses to this question in the subsample of respondents in the organization under study of the same age, sex, and broad occupational type as the respondent who gave this extreme value.

In other cases, respondents tell us in response to B4 that their employer doesn't care how many hours they work so long as they complete their work. In cases of this sort, we make a rational

imputation that the actual hours the respondent reports working equals the number of hours the employer expects them to work.

B6 is consciously designed to be a difficult question to answer. The goal is to force respondents into thinking carefully, as it is difficult to answer this question without pausing and giving it some thought. Note that B5 is not used in calculating absenteeism. Instead, B5 is designed to help the respondent review the past four weeks before coming to the question that requires effort (B6). B6 is, in this regard, what survey methodologists call a “prequest” – a question designed to prime the respondent to give more accurate information that otherwise to the following question.

Comparison of responses to B5 and B6 can be used to detect respondents who give superficial responses to B6. The best way to do this is to compare $(4 \times B4 - 8 \times B5a - 8 \times B5b - 4 \times B5c - 4 \times B5d + 4 \times B5e)$ to B6. Large discrepancies are indicative of superficial responding and more detailed examination of case-by-case responses can be used to make rational decisions about case deletion.

V. Scoring presenteeism

Presenteeism is conceptualized as a measure of actual performance in relation to possible performance. Unlike absenteeism, a higher score indicates a lower amount of lost performance. Simple scoring, which is the only approach available in the absence of objective benchmark data, assumes that responses on the 0-10 response scales in questions B9-B11 indicate percent of performance. With this assumption made, absolute presenteeism has a lower bound of 0 (total lack of performance during time on the job) and an upper bound of 100 (no lack of performance during time on the job).

Relative presenteeism is a ratio of actual performance (B11) to the performance of most workers at the same job (B9, possible performance). We recommend restricting the distribution of relative presenteeism to the range of 0.25 to 2.0, where 0.25 is the worst relative performance (25% or less of other workers' performance) and 2.0 is the best performance (200% or more of other workers' performance). For example, if the respondent rates his own performance as 1, and the average worker's performance at 8, he is assigned a presenteeism score of 0.25 (1 divided by 8 is 0.125, restricted to the lower bound of 0.25). If another respondent rates his performance at 9, but rates the average worker's performance at 3, he gets the score of 2 (9 divided by 3 is 3, restricted to upper bound of 2).

In the rare cases where the performance of the average worker is rated zero, any non-zero rating of the respondent's own performance would be assigned a relative presenteeism score of 2.0 (e.g. 7 for own performance divided by 0 for other workers, theoretically an infinitely large number, would be recoded to the upper bound of 2). If the respondent rates both the average worker and his own performance as zero, a relative presenteeism score of 1.0 would be assigned. Note that the 0.25-2.0 recommended range is asymmetric by design due to the fact that objective ratings show that even the best workers seldom have more than twice the productivity of the average worker, while the worst workers often have productivity less than half the average and sometimes have productivity as low as one-fourth the average. The scoring rules are:

Absolute presenteeism scoring rule: $10 \times B11$

Relative presenteeism scoring rule: $B11/B9$ (restricted to the range of 0.25 to 2.0)

VI. Missing values, extreme values, unused questions in assessing presenteeism

The researcher has to make decisions about imputation of missing values based on other data available either in the larger survey or from administrative records. When ancillary data are not available to make imputations, cases should be deleted from analysis, ideally with a weight imposed on the remaining cases to restore representativeness of the sample.

In some cases, respondents tell us in response to B4 that their employer does not care how many hours they work so long as they complete their work. In cases of this sort, we make a rational imputation that the actual hours the respondent reports working equals the number of hours the employer expects them to work.

Note that B10 is not used in calculating presenteeism. Instead, B10 is designed to help the respondent focus response to B11 on the past four weeks by asking separately about earlier times. This approach is known in the methodological literature as a synthetic bounded recall question -- a question designed to prime the respondent to give more accurate information than otherwise to the following question.

VII. Combining absenteeism and presenteeism

Relative absenteeism and *relative* presenteeism can be combined into one score. To do so, the measure of relative hours of work should be created first. It is equal to one minus relative absenteeism. For example, if the respondent reports expected hours of work per week to be 40 (i.e. 160 hours in 4 weeks) and actually worked 120 hours in the past 4 weeks, his relative absenteeism is $(40 \times 4 - 120) / 40 \times 4 = 0.25$. Then his relative hours of work are $1 - 0.25 = 0.75$ (or $120 / 40 \times 4$). If this respondent's measure of relative presenteeism is 1.6, the combined score is $0.75 \times 1.6 = 1.2$. Notice that this hypothetical respondent compensates lost hours with higher productivity as the total score is greater than 1.

Absolute presenteeism could be combined with relative hours worked to obtain a total score that discounts relative hours worked by the amount of lost performance. For example, if absolute presenteeism is 80%, the total score will be $0.8 \times 0.75 = 0.6$. This measure will always be below the total score obtained from the combination of relative presenteeism and relative absenteeism because absolute presenteeism cannot be higher than 100%.

Combining *absolute* absenteeism with absolute or relative presenteeism leads to difficulties. Let us assume that this combined score measures lost hours of work just like absolute absenteeism. One could argue that hours of work lost during 4 weeks should be discounted (or inflated) by the measure of performance (absolute or relative presenteeism). The rationale here is that if the person was especially productive during that period, the lost hours should count for more, and if the respondent was not productive, the lost hours should be discounted. In this case, the total score increases with productivity. On the other hand, as we have seen in the example above, respondents may compensate lost hours with higher performance. From this point of view, the

total score combining absolute absenteeism and presenteeism should decrease with productivity. However, actual and expected working hours are necessary to compute the total score under these assumptions, which brings us back to relative absenteeism. In any case, given that the same two questions (about actual and expected working hours) are used to obtain both absolute and relative absenteeism, it is always advisable to use relative absenteeism when creating the combined score.

VIII. When to use absolute versus relative absenteeism and presenteeism measures

The decision to use absolute versus relative absenteeism and presenteeism measures should be made based on substantive considerations that vary from one research question to another. For example, we use relative absenteeism as the dependent variable in the regression equations to estimate the effects of health problems on work absence because we believe that the structural effects of health problems across workers who vary in FTE are best conceptualized as proportional rather than as absolute. For example, we believe that workers with half-time jobs are likely to miss only half as many hours because of the flu as workers with full-time jobs. However, we convert to absolute absenteeism when we carry out simulations that estimate the overall number of lost workdays due to particular health problems because users of the HPQ reports find it more useful to know the absolute number of lost workdays due to health problems than the ratio of such days. The situation can be different for presenteeism, where absolute scores might make more substantive sense both as outcomes in regression analyses and in simulations.

IX. Limitations of not using the entire HPQ

Three limitations of not using the full HPQ have to be mentioned. First, the full HPQ includes additional questions that allow imputations and consistency checks to be made for questions that are most often left missing in the short absenteeism and presenteeism question series (e.g., B3, B12). Second, the full HPQ includes additional memory priming questions that improve the accuracy of report in the absenteeism and presenteeism questions (e.g., B8a-g). Third, use of the full HPQ makes it possible to have the data included in the HPQ master dataset, in which case more complex scoring rules can be used to code presenteeism than the simple scaling methods described here. These more complex rules use regression-based methods to calibrate scores on the presenteeism scales to objective measures obtained in several archival calibration studies. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, the short HPQ absenteeism and presenteeism question can be quite useful in providing a quick assessment of lost work performance in a workplace sample.

Appendix F (*Demographics*)

The following questions ask for basic information about you as well as your working environment. In addition, you will be asked what type of job you are currently employed with as well as the interaction of your current manager. Please remember that all responses are confidential. Please respond honestly.

1. Do you have another job other than completing HITs on Amazon Mechanical Turk
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. Please indicate age _____
3. Please indicate sex:
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Other
4. Please select current Martial status
 - a. Married
 - b. Single (Never Married)
 - c. Divorced
 - d. Widow
 - e. Separated
5. What is your ethnicity?
 - a. White
 - b. Hispanic or Latino
 - c. Black or African American
 - d. Native American or American Indian
 - e. Asian / Pacific Islander
 - f. Other
6. Please indicate whether you have kids
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
7. Please indicate how many kids you have
 - a. 1
 - b. 2
 - c. 3
 - d. 4
 - e. 5 or more
8. Please indicate how many kids you have that are under the age of 18

- a. 1
- b. 2
- c. 3
- d. 4
- e. 5 or more

9. Please mark your current job category (i.e., The place your currently employed)

- a. Accounting
- b. Admin & Clerical
- c. Banking
- d. Contract & Freelance
- e. Engineering
- f. Government
- g. Health Care
- h. Human Resources
- i. Information Technology
- j. Education
- k. Manufacturing
- l. Retail
- m. Sales & Marketing
- n. Transportation
- o. Other
 - i. Please Specify _____

10. Please indicate number of months at current job _____

11. In the past 7 days, how many days did you interact with your current manager/supervisor. This means how often in the past 7 days has your manager/supervisor has talked with you in person (or via email or via phone) about your job/task. This must be more than just a quick hello passing in the hallway, at the water cooler. I am looking for the interactions where you have a long conversation and your manager gives detail instructions on how you are doing or how to do your job. _____

12. Please provide the sex of your Manager/Supervisor

- a. Male
- b. Female
- c. Other

13. Please provide the Ethnicity of your Manager/Supervisor

- a. White
- b. Hispanic or Latino
- c. Black or African American
- d. Native American or American Indian

- e. Asian / Pacific Islander
- f. Other

14. Please estimate the age of your Manager/Supervisor _____

Appendix H (“Off Hours” Work-Related Technology Usage Scale)

The company I **work for has provided** me with the following pieces of technology:

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-----|----|--------|
| 1. | A cell phone | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 2. | Tablet | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 3. | Laptop Computer | Yes | No | Unsure |

The company I **work for lets me bring my own** of the following pieces of technology to use for work:

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-----|----|--------|
| 1. | A cell phone | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 2. | Tablet | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 3. | Laptop Computer | Yes | No | Unsure |

Sometimes employers contact their employees or expect them to do work in their “off hours”. (**Off-Hours a period of time other than regular business hours** (Merriam-Webster's online dictionary, n.d.)) when they are not “on the clock”. Please consider your past 7 days at your job and read each question **carefully** then circle the most appropriate response related to your last 7 days of WORK-RELATED technology usage.

1. On average, how many **work-related text messages** do you **send** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

2. On average, how many **work-related text messages** do you **receive** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

3. On average, how many **work-related text e-mails** do you **send** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

4. On average, how many **work-related text e-mails** do you **receive** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

5. On average, how many **work-related text phone calls** do you **make** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

6. On average, how many **work-related text phone calls** do you **receive** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

7. The average **daily hours** you spend emailing in **employment related activities during “off hours”**.

Text Box

8. The average **daily hours** you spend texting (sending and receiving) in **employment related activities during “off hours”**.

Text Box

9. The average **daily hours** you spend tweeting in **employment related activities during “off hours”**.

Text Box

10. The average **daily hours** you spend talking on your cell phone in **employment related activities during “off hours”**.

Text Box

Appendix I (*Demographics of Work Environment*)

The next set of questions is designed to help us better understand the current work environment of your current job. Please answer honestly and know that these answers are confidential.

Remember to answer based on your current job and please respond based on the last 30 days at your current job.

Q. How often do each of the following things apply in your current job?		Never	Once to eleven times per year	Once to three times per month	Once to four times per week	Every day
1. How often does your job require you to work very fast?	Current Job	1	2	3	4	5
2. How often does your job require you to work very hard?	Current Job	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often does your job leave you with little time to get things done?	Current Job	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often is there a great deal to be done?	Current Job	1	2	3	4	5
5. How often do you have to do more work than you can do well?	Current Job	1	2	3	4	5
6. How many hours per week do you work in this job? (Please write in average number of hours worked per week).	Current Job	x	x	Hours	x	x

Appendix J (*Demographics of Work Environment*)

The next set of questions is designed to help us better understand the overall attitudes about your current job. Please answer honestly and know that these answers are confidential. **Remember to answer based on your current job and please respond based on the last 30 days at your current job.**

Q.	For your current job please circle the response number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about each statement.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Quite Often	Extremely Often
1	In the last 30 day my job made me feel angry	1	2	3	4	5
2	In the last 30 day my job made me feel anxious	1	2	3	4	5
3	In the last 30 day my job made me feel at ease	1	2	3	4	5
4	In the last 30 day my job made me feel bored	1	2	3	4	5
5	In the last 30 day my job made me feel calm	1	2	3	4	5

6	In the last 30 day my job made me feel content	1	2	3	4	5
7	In the last 30 day my job made me feel depressed	1	2	3	4	5
8	In the last 30 day my job made me feel discouraged	1	2	3	4	5

Workplace Attitudes Study

Participant Consent Form

Purpose of the research

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between managerial types and employee's workplace attitudes.

Procedures to be followed

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete several surveys about yourself and your manager/supervisor.

- You will first be asked to answer questions about yourself and your workplace environment.
- Next you will be asked to respond to a survey about your manager/supervisor.
- You will be presented two surveys asking about your life and feelings.

Expected time the subject will need to dedicate to the study

This task should take you no more than 25 minutes to complete.

Procedures that are experimental, and the standard treatment foreseeable risks or discomforts

There is minimal risk to participating in this study. Every response is confidential and will remain confidential. Please answer as honestly and openly as possible. However, if you feel uncomfortable answering the questions you are free to withdraw at any time.

Benefits

We hope you enjoy this study, and we want to thank you for helping to further expand research knowledge on the manager/supervisor and employee dynamics, as this information may help lead to improvements in the work settings in the future.

Confidentiality AMT Workers

Because you are completing this study using Amazon's Mechanical Turk (AMT), your AMT worker ID will be retained only in the AMT database. The only item linking your responses to your worker ID will be the randomly generated code for payment. This information will be retained during the duration of the study to ensure that no one takes the study twice. Neither your AMT worker ID nor any data generated by you in the study will be shared with anyone outside the research team. Information provided and identifying records will remain confidential and destroyed after data collections is completed. The results of this research study may be made public and quoted in professional journals, but information from this study will only be reported as a group not individually.

Voluntary nature of the study

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate and you can refuse to answer questions or discontinue your participation at any time. If you withdraw, we will delete all data you have provided; Amazon may retain data collected when you accepted this HIT, which is consistent with their policies.

Compensation AMT Workers

If you participate in this study and complete the HIT we will compensate you \$2.00 through your AMT account. No payment will be provided for partial completion. If you do not qualify for this study based on your responses, you will not be paid for the task.

Contact Information

If you have any questions about this research you may contact Stephen Schenck sschenck@memphis.edu or Dr. Frank Andrasik fandrasik@memphis.edu, faculty supervisor.

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject for this study you may contact the Administrator for the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at irb@memphis.edu. The University of Memphis does not have any funds budgeted for compensation for injury, damages, or other expenses. as a result of participating in this investigation.

I certify that I am 18 years of age or older.
I affirm that I have read, understand the contents of this form, and consent to participate
in the research described in this consent form.
*If you consent to participate, please click the **CONTINUE** button below.*

Appendix L (*Do Not Qualify Statement*)

Thank you for your time in attempting this survey, however you do not meet the following criteria stated on Mechanical Turk:

If you do not satisfy these criteria you are not qualified to accept this HIT.

Workers whose performance does not reflect these qualifications will not have their assignment approved and will not be paid through MTurk.

If you wish to discuss any issues related to this study, please contact sschenck@memphis.edu.

Thank you for attempting this survey.

Appendix M (*Debriefing*)

(The following will appear upon survey completion. The payment code will be generated by the following website <http://sapir.psych.wisc.edu/~lupyan/randString.php>)

I want to thank you for taking time out of your day to participate in this study. This project is being conducted in order to examine how perceptions of managerial types relate to overall employee attitudes regarding work and home. The information you and others have provided will help us to better understand these important aspects, which in turn will be of value in planning future projects to gain even further knowledge about how managerial styles influence employees at work and at home. Please feel free to contact sschenck@memphis.edu about any concerns that may have arisen during the study. Collecting and analyzing data of this type requires much time and effort upon the research team. If you would like us to provide more detailed information once the study is completed, please send a separate email to sschenck@memphis.edu, entering Results on the subject line. This way we will not be able to match your name to your responses and thus continue to maintain your anonymity. We cannot state for certain when the study will be completed, but we will retain your email address for mailing once we have sufficient information to share. Again, any information shared will be pooled together, not presented individually.

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject for this study you may contact the Administrator for the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at irb@memphis.edu. The University of Memphis does not have any funds budgeted for compensation for injury damages, or other expenses as a result of participating in this investigation.

We thank you for completing this survey and are affirming that your responses have been recorded.

Your MTurk completion code is:

`{e://Field/MTurkCode}`

Appendix N (Work with Dysfunctional Manager)

1. Have you previously worked with a Dysfunctional Manager?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

Appendix O (*Supervisor Measure*)

Q. On the following scale: 0 = Not Displayed At All, 1 = Somewhat Displayed, and 2 = Displayed, which of the following characteristics do you think are displayed by your current manager? Please circle the code number that corresponds with their displaying each characteristic.

Characteristics displayed		Not Displayed	Somewhat Displayed	Displayed
<p>A. Glibness and Superficial Charm:</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Previous Manager	0	1	2
<p>B. Are Accomplished Liars</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Previous Manager	0	1	2
<p>C. Are Manipulative and Conning</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours as being good at conning and using people, having well developed political/networking skills and being good at seducing other people).</i></p>	Previous Manager	0	1	2
<p>D. Have A Grandiose Sense of Self-Worth</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Previous Manager	0	1	2
<p>E. Display a lack of remorse about how their actions harm other employees</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Previous Manager	0	1	2
<p>F. Are Emotionally shallow, calculating and cold</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	Previous Manager	0	1	2

<p>G. Display a lack of empathy – they don't show any capacity to experience the feelings of others</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours as openly making fun of others, being able to fire people without worrying about it, being selfish, being emotionally or verbally abusive).</i></p>	<p>Previous Manager</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>H. Refuse to take responsibility for their own actions</p> <p><i>(Such behaviours 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></p>	<p>Previous Manager</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>2</p>

Appendix P (*Emotional State Measure*)

Please read each statement and circle a number 0, 1, 2 or 3, which indicates how much the statement applied to you *over a week* (7-days) with your previous manager/supervisor. In this test, there are no right or wrong answers. I ask that you do not overthink the responses (take a lot of time), but please do not rush through this survey. Again, all responses are confidential and I ask that you answer truthfully.

The rating scale is as follows:

0 = Did not apply to me at all

1 = Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time

2 = Applied to me to a considerable degree, or a good part of time

3 = Applied to me very much, or most of the time

0 1 2 3 1. I found it hard to wind down.

0 1 2 3 2. I was aware of dryness of my mouth.

0 1 2 3 3. I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all.

0 1 2 3 4. I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g., excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion).

0 1 2 3 5. I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things.

0 1 2 3 6. I tended to over-react to situations.

0 1 2 3 7. I experienced trembling (e.g., in the hands).

0 1 2 3 8. I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy.

0 1 2 3 9. I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself.

0 1 2 3 10. I felt that I had nothing to look forward to.

0 1 2 3 11. I found myself getting agitated.

0 1 2 3 12. I found it difficult to relax.

0 1 2 3 13. I felt down-hearted and blue.

0 1 2 3 14. I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing.

0 1 2 3 15. I felt I was close to panic.

0 1 2 3 16. I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything.

0 1 2 3 17. I felt I wasn't worth much as a person.

- 0 1 2 3 18. I felt that I was rather touchy.
- 0 1 2 3 19. I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g., sense of heart rate increase, heart missing a beat).
- 0 1 2 3 20. I felt scared without any good reason.
- 0 1 2 3 21. I felt that life was meaningless.

Appendix Q (*Work and Personal Life Inventory*)

Please read each statement carefully and respond based on your previous manager\supervisor. Please read each statement and circle a number 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, which indicates how much you agree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. I ask that you do not overthink the responses (take a lot of time), but please do not rush through this survey. Again, all responses are confidential and I ask that you answer truthfully.

The rating scale is as follows: (Radio Buttons)

- 1 = Disagree Strongly
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Agree Strongly

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. The time I spend on family responsibilities often interfere with my work responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. The time I spend with my family often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent and spouse.

- 1 2 3 4 5 16. The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be effective at work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. The problem-solving behavior that works for me at home does not seem to be as useful at work.

Appendix R (“Off Hours” Work-Related Technology Usage Scale)

The company I (previous) **work for has provided** me with the following pieces of technology:

4.	A cell phone	Yes	No	Unsure
5.	Tablet	Yes	No	Unsure
6.	Laptop Computer	Yes	No	Unsure

The company I (previous) **work for lets me bring my own** of the following pieces of technology to use for work:

4.	A cell phone	Yes	No	Unsure
5.	Tablet	Yes	No	Unsure
6.	Laptop Computer	Yes	No	Unsure

Sometimes employers contact their employees or expect them to do work in their “off hours”. (**Off-Hours a period of time other than regular business hours** (Merriam-Webster's online dictionary, n.d.)) when they are not “on the clock”. Please consider your past 7 days at your job and read each question **carefully** then circle the most appropriate response related to your last 7 days of WORK-RELATED technology usage.

1. On average, how many **work-related text messages** do you **send** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

2. On average, how many **work-related text messages** do you **receive** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

3. On average, how many **work-related text e-mails** do you **send** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

4. On average, how many **work-related text e-mails** do you **receive** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

5. On average, how many **work-related text phone calls** do you **make** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

6. On average, how many **work-related text phone calls** do you **receive** a day **during “off hours”**?

Text Box

7. The average **daily hours** you spend emailing in **employment related activities during “off hours”**.

Text Box

8. The average **daily hours** you spend texting (sending and receiving) in **employment related activities during “off hours”**.

Text Box

9. The average **daily hours** you spend tweeting in **employment related activities during “off hours”**.

Text Box

10. The average **daily hours** you spend talking on your cell phone in **employment related activities during “off hours”**.

Text Box

Appendix S (*Demographics of Work Environment*)

The next set of questions is designed to help us better understand the previous work environment of your previous job. Please answer honestly and know that these answers are confidential.

Remember to answer based on your current job and please respond based on the last 30 days at your previous job.

Q. How often do each of the following things apply in your current job?		Never	Once to eleven times per year	Once to three times per month	Once to four times per week	Every day
7. How often does your job require you to work very fast?	Previous Job	1	2	3	4	5
8. How often does your job require you to work very hard?	Previous Job	1	2	3	4	5
9. How often does your job leave you with little time to get things done?	Previous Job	1	2	3	4	5
10. How often is there a great deal to be done?	Previous Job	1	2	3	4	5
11. How often do you have to do more work than you can do well?	Previous Job	1	2	3	4	5
12. How many hours per week do you work in this job? (Please write in average number of hours worked per week).	Previous Job	X	X	Hours	X	X

Appendix T (*Demographics of Work Environment*)

The next set of questions is designed to help us better understand the overall attitudes about your current job. Please answer honestly and know that these answers are confidential. **Remember to answer based on your current job and please respond based on 30 days at your previous job.**

Q.	For your current job please circle the response number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about each statement.	Never	Rarely	Someti mes	Quite Often	Extremel y Often
1	In the last 30 day my job made me feel angry	1	2	3	4	5
2	In the last 30 day my job made me feel anxious	1	2	3	4	5
3	In the last 30 day my job made me feel at ease	1	2	3	4	5
4	In the last 30 day my job made me feel bored	1	2	3	4	5
5	In the last 30 day my job made me feel calm	1	2	3	4	5

6	In the last 30 day my job made me feel content	1	2	3	4	5
7	In the last 30 day my job made me feel depressed	1	2	3	4	5
8	In the last 30 day my job made me feel discouraged	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix U (Questions About Change)

1. Did your previous dysfunctional manager cause you to change job or management?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. Did you learn something from this change?
 - a. Yes (present question 3)
 - b. No
3. Based on your previous experience with a dysfunctional manager, what did you learn from the experience that you will take with you going forward? What will better you as an employee or as an employer?
 - a. **[Text Box]**