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Abstract

In this research study, we have explored the effect of psychopathic leadership on employee behavioral silence and how the employee behavioral silence leads to work-family conflict thus, effecting the organizational citizenship behavior. Considering the insights offered by behavioral plasticity theory, we have investigated whether the organization based self-esteem moderates the effect of psychopathic leadership on employee behavioral silence. Data is collected using a structured questionnaire at three different time lags with a gap of one month. The sample consists of 400 employees of government department in Pakistan, mainly Police department. At Time1 387 data received were useable and at Time2 only 350 responses were useable. The final sample obtained at Time3 was 228 to pursue this research study. The results obtained after data analysis using SPSS indicates that the links hypothesized are significant except the moderation hypothesis. The findings of this research suggests that due to psychopathic leadership, employees are inclined towards behavioral silence, thus, leading to work-family conflict and inversely effecting organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, the moderation hypothesis is not proved. We have concluded our research study by sharing several practical and managerial implications and by offering some future interventions and avenues for potential researchers.
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1. Introduction

The main purpose of this study is to conduct an empirical assessment of the psychopathic leadership and to investigate the relationship between the psychopathic leadership and other variables, including employee behavioral silence, organizational citizenship behavior, work-family conflict and organization based self-esteem under behavioral plasticity theory. Psychopathic leadership is known as the dark side of leadership and the hidden cost associated with the consequences of this type of leadership or supervisory behavior remained the area of attention to the researchers in the last decade. However, the impact of psychopathic leadership on the employee silence along by the moderating role of organization based self-esteem has not been studied. In Pakistan, the major problem faced by the employees in government sector organizations (specifically, police department) is that due to psychopathic leadership, employee behavioral silence is high that is ultimately decreasing their frequency of organizational citizenship behavior and also resulting in work-family. This study discusses the role of psychopathic leadership with regard to organizational citizenship behavior and work-family conflict, paying particular attention to employee behavioral silence as a mediator and organization based self-esteem as moderator.

Employees often have ideas, information and opinions for constructive ways to improve work in the organization. Employee’s attitude, behavior and feedback towards the work and organization is crucial in getting the true knowledge about it. Sometimes employees practice voice and convey their ideas, information, and opinion, whereas, other times they remain silent. In Pakistan, the major problem faced by the employees in government sector organizations
(specifically, police department) is that due to psychopathic leadership, employee behavioral silence is high that is inversely effecting employee’s organizational citizenship behavior and contributing to the employee’s work-family conflict. Past research studies have found that psychopathy was associated with an increased use of hard tactics like threats and manipulation (Partyka, 2012). Also, psychopathic leaders are low in empathy and patience (Skeem, 2011). They try to invade other privacy and lack a feeling of remorse. According to Organ, 1988, organizational citizenship behavior means doing a better job and to make an effort above and beyond formal requirements. Employees are the most reliable source of data and information in the organization (Clapham & Cooper, 2005), but when employees tend not to express their ideas, views or feedback consciously, they are not able to recognize themselves with the organization, hence, they experience internal detachment with their work as well as the organization. Whereas, it is seen that where employees are participating in organizational activities voluntarily on the basis of organizational citizenship behavior, there, they avoid revealing their views and ideas with a conscious decision. In contrast, employees who are facing behavioral silence have lower tendency for organizational citizenship behavior. Previous research studies suggest that employee performance is based on the level of satisfaction with their job, whereas, when an employee remains silent because of the fear of his leader or supervisor, it leads to anxiety (Cleveland, 1995), thus, badly effecting on-job and off-job hours resulting in to work- family conflict.

In this research study, we demonstrate the behavioral plasticity theory as overarching theory. Behavioral plasticity theory (Brockner, 1983, 1988) suggests that individuals differ in the extent to which they respond to the social influences, such as their team leader’s behavior. Behavioral plasticity theory explains the inter-individual differences on the basis of differences in self-esteem, that is, “the degree of positive self-worth that an individual ascribes to himself/ herself” (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). More specifically, behavioral plasticity theory predicts that individuals with low self-esteem are more susceptible to situational influences (social cues) than individuals with high self-esteem (Brockner, 1988). This is, for example, because employees low on self-esteem are less certain of their own beliefs and, thus, turn more towards others for guidance.

Now by applying this concept to our model, we can say that psychopathic leadership will lead to employee behavioral silence (defensive and acquiescent) and employee behavioral silence will ultimately negatively impact organizational citizenship behavior and will positively impact work-family conflict. Also, in presence of low organization based self-esteem, the relationship between organizational psychopathic leadership and employee behavioral silence will be stronger.

The study is significant in many aspects. Firstly, there is a detailed study on why under certain circumstances witness remain silent or even participate in workplace mistreatment and how mistreatment occurs and under what condition do mistreatment flourish and which contextual and relational factors attenuate its occurrence or its impact considering the role of psychopathic leadership in workplace mistreatment (bad worms). Secondly, employee behavioral silence has seen as the mediating mechanism between psychopathic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior and work-family conflict, which enriches the literature with a new antecedent of organizational citizenship behavior and work-family conflict. Thirdly, this study has used behavioral plasticity theory as an overarching theory that has been rarely used by past researchers while studying employee behavioral silence.

2. Literature Review
Apparently, expressing and withholding behaviors might appear to be polar opposites because silence implies not speaking while voice implies speaking up on important issues and problems in the organization (Zehir and Erdöan, 2011). Employee silence is depicted as withholding any form of genuine expression about the individual's behavioral, cognitive and/affective evaluations of his organizational circumstances to persons who are perceived to be capable of effecting change or redress (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). While Morrison & Milliken (2000) take organizational silence as a negative behavior, Pinder & Harlos (2001) also see silent employees who deliberately withhold their evaluations about the organizational issues as harmful to themselves, to others or to the organization. Based on Morrison & Milliken (2000) and Pinder & Harlos’s (2001) “Quiescent Silence” and “Acquiescence Silence” are the two prohibited types of silence. Psychopathic leadership is known as the dark side of leadership. Psychopathic leadership actions often cause a ripple effect throughout an organization, setting the tone for an entire corporate culture. Examples of detrimental effects are increased bullying, conflict, stress, staff turnover and absenteeism, reduction in productivity and in social responsibility. Organization citizenship behavior is very important for the organizations because they need employees who can do more than their usual job duties and provide performance that is beyond expectations. Organizational citizenship behavior describes actions in which employees are willing to go above and beyond their prescribed role requirements. As Organ (1988) suggested, high levels of organizational citizenship behavior would lead to a more efficient organization and helps in bringing new resources to the organization. Podsakoff, et al. (2000) mentioned that in several ways the organizational citizenship behavior contributes to the organizational superior performance as follows: Increasing co-worker or managerial productivity, releasing resources so they can be used for more productive purposes, coordinating activities within and across work groups, reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions, strengthening the organizations’ ability to attract and retain the best employee.

Work-family conflict refers to a form of inter-role conflict, in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some way. It occurs when a struggle is made to meet the obligations of both roles in a limited time (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This limitation of time and resources can cause increased stress, tiredness, weariness, loss of performance, low work satisfaction and decrease in organizational commitment because of contradictory needs of an individual (Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). Many scholars underline that work-family conflict has considerable effects on especially the attitude of employees towards their work place and their behaviors during work time (Frone, et al., 1992). For this reason, work-family conflict is gaining more attention of other researchers.

Self-esteem is defined by Coopersmith (1967) as “the approval of oneself and the degree to which one sees oneself as capable, significant, and worthy”. Individuals with low self-esteem are prone to experiencing elevated work stress. It involves individual’s overall self-evaluation of his/her competencies (Rosenberg, 1965), as well as an affective (liking/disliking) component (Pelham & Swann, 1989). Building on the concept of self-esteem, Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham developed the concept of organization based self esteem which they defined as ‘the degree to which organizational members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of the organization’ (1989). It also entails the belief that one is a capable, significant, and worthy organization member (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Gardner, Van Dyne & Pierce (2004) suggests that organizational members can assess their value through the signals communicated by the organization and managers. Specifically, the characteristics of different management systems and practices will let employees construct
different organizational experiences and form various levels of organization based self esteem (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). The field of knowledge and research studies are scarce that covers and explore those supervisors that are more inclined to abuse their power? (bad worms). Also, it would be valuable to study how organizational or personal factors influence perpetrators’ behaviors? Several researchers have emphasized to determine why under certain circumstances witness remains silent or even participate in workplace mistreatment and whether work is required to determine the spillover effect of silence on family (2018). There was a need to study how different facets of silence associate with leadership? (Shuhua Sun, 2016). Hannes Guenter & Bert Schreurs, et;al (2016) suggested to examine why employee remains silent and whether behavioral plasticity theory helps predict the effects of certain kinds of leadership on silence? There is a lack of research study that has studied the considered antecedents and outcomes associated with employee silence at different levels of analysis? (Jinyun Duan, Chanzi Bao, Caiyun Huang, & Chad Thomas Brinsfield, 2017). To fulfil the research gap, it would be useful to integrate other work related or organizational factors that may influence employee silence. (Kultigin Akcin, Serhat Erat, Umit Alniaicik, & Aydem B.Ciftcioglu, 2018).

3. Theoretical Framework

This study makes theoretical as well as empirical contribution to the literature, as it investigates the situational and contextual factors which directly impact the employee behavioral silence and which further impact the organizational citizenship behaviors and work family conflict. Mediating role of silence is adding in literature as it is answering why employees remain silent. Antecedents and consequences of silence are also explained. The role of organization based self-esteem is crucial in determining the outcomes. However, the dark side of leadership conducted by managers also has an impact in increasing or decreasing the frequency of behavioral silence. Within this framework it is possible to say that both organizational silence and organizational citizenship behavior are very important subjects for organizations to reach desired objectives.

3.1. Psychopathic Leadership:

Psychopathy has been described as impulsivity and thrill seeking combined with low empathy and anxiety (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Hare, 1985; Skeem, Polaschek, Patrick, & Lilienfeld, 2011). They are characterized as antagonistic and have a belief in their own superiority and a tendency towards self-promotion (LeBreton, Binning, & Adorno, 2006; Lynam & Widiger, 2007). Psychopathic leaders possess characteristics like public humiliation of others, remorseless, or devoid of guilt, encourages co-workers to torment, alienate, harass and or humiliate other peers, takes credit for other people's accomplishments, steals and or sabotages other persons' work, threatens any perceived enemy with discipline and job loss, invades personal privacy of others, often borrow money and other material objects without any intentions of giving it back and will do whatever it takes to close the deal (having no regard for ethics or legality).

Organizational citizenship behavior describe actions in which employees are willing to go above and beyond their prescribed role requirements. As Organ (1988) suggested, high levels of organizational citizenship behavior should lead to a more efficient organization and helps in bringing up new resources to the organization.
Work-family conflict refers to a form of inter-role conflict, in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some way. There are three major forms of work-family conflict based on this definition: (i) time-based conflict; (ii) strain-based conflict; and (iii) behavior-based conflict. Time-based conflict may occur when time devoted to one role makes it difficult to participate in another role. This form of conflict is consistent with excessive work time and schedule conflict as well as role overload. Strain-based conflict suggests that strain experienced in one role limits the ability to meet the demands of another role, or interferes with participation in another role. Behavior-based conflict occurs when the behaviors required in one role are counterproductive in another role. The reasons behind work-family conflict is stated as long and unsteady working hours, overtime working, autonomy status, the size of the organization, low wages, negative attitudes of management, work relations, promotion, expectations of the family, health status, age, income, and employee performance (Frone & Cooper, 1992). Behavioral plasticity theory posits that people differ in the extent to which they respond towards the external stimuli such as their leader’s behavior. Consistent with this view, we propose that under psychopathic leadership, individuals will be less likely to exhibit organizational citizenship behavior and will be more into work family conflicts. As basically any behavior is situation specific (Mumford & Fried, 2014), we expect the same to be true for psychopathic leadership. Therefore, based on behavioral plasticity theory, we propose that:

Hypothesis 1(a): Psychopathic leadership is negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior.
Hypothesis 1(b): Psychopathic leadership is positively related to work-family conflict.

3.2. Employee Behavioral Silence:

Consistent with a number of research studies (Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Kish-Gephart, Detert, Trevino, & Edmondson, 2009; Morrison, 2011), employee silence can be defined as the intentional withholding of input (e.g., suggestions, ideas, concerns and issues) about potentially important work related issues from persons with the perceived authority to act. Such that, silence describes an intentional form of non-communication that employees engage in, despite the fact that they have something to say. Employees may choose to remain silent about several issues, challenges and problems at work such as safety and security concerns, organizational performance, problematic issues, disagreement with the organization’s policies, and fairness issues (e.g. Brinsfield, 2013; Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003).

Employees are the essential part of the organization and play a role of a catalyst for the organizational change, innovation, and improvement and they influence organizational performance (Çakıcı, 2007). Rodgers (1998) stated that employees will have a strong organizational culture if they actively take part in decision making and undertake responsibilities of their job.

According to Jonason, Slomski, & Partyka (2012), psychopathy was associated with an increased use of hard tactics (e.g., threats and attempts at manipulation). Organizational psychopaths generally appear to be intelligent, sincere, powerful, charming, witty, and entertaining communicators. They quickly assess what people want to hear from them and then create stories that best fit others expectations. They will con people into doing their work for them, take credit for other people's work and even assign their work to junior staff members. They have low patience when dealing with others, display shallow emotions, and are
unpredictable, undependable and fail to take responsibility if something goes wrong that is their own fault.

Based on the past research studies, one might expect that silence could be exacerbated by psychopathic leadership. Psychopathic leaders expect unquestioning obedience, and hence, may signal to employees that challenging them would be met with reprisal. The decision to remain silent in such situations exhibit that people are motivated to engage in behaviors that lead to desired outcomes or prevent undesired outcomes (James, 1950; Vroom, 1964). Hence, when people expect that speaking up will be met with an undesirable outcome (e.g., reprisal) they choose silence as the behavioral option (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). This reasoning is further reinforced by a wide range of research studies on the effects of supervisor and leader behavior on employee voice and other related constructs (e.g., issue selling, whistle-blowing, spirals of silence). (Ashford, Rothbard, Piderit, & Dutton, 1998; Detert & Burris, 2007; Miceli, Near, & Dworkin, 2008). According to the behavioral plasticity theory, individuals are influenced by the external factors (social and contextual). Moreover, drawing from it we suggest that psychopathic leadership will lead to employee behavioral silence. Behavioral plasticity theory states that, individual reacts to the social influences differently (Brockner, 1988). Hence, we argued that:

Hypothesis 2: Psychopathic leadership positively related to employee behavioral silence.

3.3. Organizational Citizenship Behavior:

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior was first introduced by Organ (1988). Organ defined organizational citizenship behavior as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". It means doing a better job, making an effort above and beyond formal requirements, and filling the gap between procedures and regulations on one hand, and dynamic reality on the other. Organizational citizenship behavior is usually understood as exerting exceptionally good behaviors for the sake of the organization and informally supporting its members.

Barnard (1938) stated that the willingness of individuals to contribute in cooperative efforts to the organization is necessary to effective attainment of organizational goals. Katz & Kahn (1978) pointed out that organizational citizenship is important for the organization because it can be highly valuable to the organization and can contribute to the performance and competitive advantage.

Organizational citizenship behavior is very important for the organization because they need employees who would do more than their usual job duties and can show performance that is beyond their expectations. Organizational citizenship behavior includes helping an individual coworker on a task, voluntary actions that help a fellow employee in work related problems, participating in the governance of the organization, voluntary participation in, and support of organizational functions of both a professional and social nature, carrying one’s duties beyond the minimum requirements, a pattern of going well beyond minimally required role and task requirements, alerting others in the organization about changes that may affect their work, the discretionary enactment of thoughtful and considerate behaviors that prevent work related problems for others, refraining from complaining about trivial matters, a willingness to tolerate
the inevitable inconveniences and impositions within the organization without complaining and carrying task with a positive attitude.

Pinder & Harlos (2001) defined employee silence as "withholding of any form of genuine expression about the individual’s behavioral, cognitive and affective evaluations of his organizational circumstances from persons who are perceived to be capable of effecting change or redress." Many researchers argued that silence is a relatively simple, and unitary concept. While Morrison & Milliken (2000) assumed organizational silence as a negative behavior, Pinder and Harlos (2001) also assume silent employees as those, who deliberately withhold their evaluations about the organizational issues as harmful to themselves, to others or to the organization. Based on the conceptualizations by Morrison & Milliken (2000), Pinder & Harlos’s (2001) and conceptualizations by Van Dyne, acquiescent silence can be defined as withholding relevant ideas, information, or opinions, based on resignation. Employees do not share their ideas and suggestions when they understand that they cannot make a difference (Van Dyne et.al, 2003). Similarly, defensive silence is defined as withholding relevant ideas, information, or opinions as a form of self-protection, based on fear (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). It is an intentional and proactive behavior that is intended to protect self from external threats. Van Dyne et.al (2003) defined defensive silence as ‘preserving work-related information, ideas and opinions based on fear with the goal of protecting the self’. Defensive Silence is ‘intentional and proactive behavior that is intended to protect the self from external threats’ (Schlenker & Weigold, 1989). It is more proactive, involving awareness and consideration of alternatives compared to acquiescent silence and it is followed by a conscious decision to withhold ideas, information, and opinions as the best personal strategy at the moment (Van Dyne et.al, 2003). Organizational silence often leads to increased negative emotions within the organization and decreases employee performance and effectiveness (Perlow & Williams, 2003). Since employee performance is linked to their satisfaction, silent employees remain incapable of satisfying these needs (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

Past research studies have focused on the fear and risk associated with speaking up (Detert & Burris, 2007; Morrison, 2011). As per the behavioral plasticity theory, individual responds to the certain situation based on their degree of self-esteem and people with low self-esteem are not certain about their belief and so they will less likely to indulge in extra-role organizational citizenship behavior. Hence, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3(a): Employee behavioral silence is negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior.

Employee behavioral silence is widely considered as inherently subjective, deeply personal and influenced by some situational, political, cultural and economic factors. This multidimensional conception is often sketched as withholding of expressed evaluations of work circumstances to persons able to effect change, this behavior is followed by some unjust events (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). This has been expressed in literature as “mum effect”. Researches on this mum effect reveals that individuals have a general reluctance within their personality to convey negative information because of the discomfort associated with being the conveyer of bad news (Conlee & Tesser, 1973). Previous research studies suggested that employees may choose to remain silent about issues if they conclude that the context is unfavorable. An unfavorable context is expressed as where employees believe that raising an issue may lead to negative consequences. It can be understood from the following examples which the previous literature has highlighted, how raising a sensitive issue such as gender inequity can damage a person’s public image.
Research on whistleblowing likewise highlights the risks (real and perceived) associated with calling attention to problems. Whistleblowers are sometimes viewed as traitors and can suffer negative career outcomes as a result of their calling attention to organizational wrongdoing, even if they were their bosses. Past research studies suggest that employees weigh these costs when considering whether to speak up or not about the issues and concerns they usually face. (Dutton et al., 1997; Near & Miceli, 1992).

Psychopaths have a unique affective experience, such that it has been suggested that the definitive marker of psychopathy is a lack of the self-conscious, emotion, guilt and an absence of conscience (Hare, 1999). In addition to it, psychopaths do not experience anxiety and fear to the extent that normal people do and are also less prone to experience embarrassment (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1999). As a result, they often fail to learn from punishment for misdeeds. Psychopaths are also impulsive and seek immediate gratification of their needs (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1999). The more the employees are affected by the psychopathic leadership, the more they exhibit behavioral silence and as a result their respective commitment level with the organization will decrease. In consistence with behavioral plasticity theory, employees with silent behaviors will less likely tend to identify themselves with the organization and as a result their internal association will let them not to involve in extra-role behaviors like organizational citizenship behavior.

Organizational citizenship behaviors are discretionary behaviors on the part of an employee that directly promote the effective functioning of an organization. Though, these behaviors are extra role still their significance is nevertheless minimal from in role functions. According to Bolino & Turnley (2005) the ideal worker is an employee who does not only demonstrates high levels of task performance (in role function), but also engages in high levels of contextual performance, that is termed as organizational citizenship behavior (Paillé, 2011). According to researchers (Podsakoff, et al., 2000), organizational citizenship behavior increases organizational efficiency by influencing certain areas such as increasing production, raising client satisfaction or decreasing customer complaints and improving the quality of service provided. The practical importance of organizational citizenship behavior is that they improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness by contributing to the resource transformation, innovativeness and adaptability (Organ, 1988).

Employees are the most reliable source of data and information in the organization (Clapham & Cooper, 2005), but when employees tend not to express their ideas, views or feedback consciously, they do not feel to recognize or associate themselves with the organization, hence, they experience internal detachment with their work as well as the organization. Whereas, it is found that employees who participates in organizational activities voluntarily on the basis of organizational citizenship behavior, they avoid revealing their views and ideas with a conscious decision. In contrast, employees who are in the behavior of organizational silence have lower tendency for organizational citizenship behavior. Several past research studies also reported the remarks of employees like “I raised a concern about some policies and I was told to shut up and that I was becoming a troublemaker. I would have pursued [the issue] further but presently I can’t afford to risk my job. This has made me go into a detached mode, making me a ‘yes man’” (Elizabeth w. Morrison, 2013). Based on behavioral plasticity theory, individuals react to the social cues (Brockner, 1988) that influences their behaviors. Thus, under psychopathic leadership employees will tend to exhibit their opinions less, which thereof, decrease their recognition with the organization and they will less likely to engage in extra role behaviors. So we hypothesize that;
Hypothesis 4(a): Employee behavioral silence mediates the relationship between psychopathic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

3.4. Work-Family Conflict:

In the field of literature, work–family conflict is usually specified as ‘a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures of the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some aspect’ (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

According to Morrison organizational silence is a negative behavior. It means withholding of any useful information, views, ideas or opinion about an individual or the organization because of the harm associated with it (Harlos, 2001). It is viewed as a negative phenomenon, as an employee by remaining silent, withholds his opinion and thoughts related to technical or behavioral issues about his work or workplace in order to protect himself from indulging into any critical situation which can threat his job. Previous research studies have explained that employees usually choose to remain silent about the issues which bother them, because of their assumption that the context is unfavorable, which means raising an issue may lead to negative consequences. It is an intentional and proactive behavior that is intended to protect self from external threats. It often leads to increased negative emotions within the organization and decreases employee performance and effectiveness (Perlow & Williams, 2003).

Since employee performance is linked to their satisfaction, silent employees remain incapable of satisfying these needs (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995) which results in frustration, anxiety and overthinking. Jia Juannong (2009) pointed out that long-time silence puts an employee to a mental strike which badly effect not only the behavior of the employee in on job hours but also in off job hours. They are more likely to engage in useless and baseless argumentation with their family members to protrude their anxiety and frustration. Hence, based on the behavioral plasticity theory, employees who ascribe less positive self-worth to themselves usually undergo mental strike. We hypothesize that;

Hypothesis 3(b): Employee behavioral silence is positively related to work-family conflict.

Employee silence occurs while face-to-face interaction between employees, such as meetings and discussions in which they fail to speak up about the negative issues regarding the organization, workplace, policy or employees due to fear or threat. Psychopathic leaders have inbuilt characteristics like public humiliation of others, remorseless, or devoid of guilt, encourages co-workers to torment, alienate, harass and or humiliate other peers, takes credit for other people's accomplishments, sabotages other persons' work, threatens any perceived enemy with job loss, invades personal privacy of others, often borrow money and other material objects without any intentions of giving it back and they do whatever it takes to close the deal. Work-family conflict is a form of inter-role conflict, in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible and where the stress or imbalance in one role spills over to the other role. The basic reasons behind work-family conflict is usually long and unsteady working hours, overtime working, autonomy status, the size of the organization, work pressure, burn out, work place conflicts, injustice, low wages, negative attitudes of management or co-workers, work relations, promotion, expectations of the family, health status, income, and employee performance (Frone & Cooper, 1992). Thus, as per the behavioural plasticity theory individuals get influenced by the social cues such as psychopathic
leaders, and tend to exhibit silence behaviours more often, thus resulting into work-family conflict. Therefore, it is hypothesized that;

Hypothesis 4(b): Employee behavioral silence mediates the relationship between psychopathic leadership and work-family conflict.

3.5. Organization Based Self-Esteem:

Self-esteem refers to an individual’s overall self-evaluation of his/her competencies (Rosenberg, 1965), as well as an affective component (Pelham & Swann, 1989). Building on the concept of self-esteem, (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham) developed the concept of organization based self-esteem which they defined as ‘the degree to which organizational members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of the organization’ (1989). It also leads to the belief that one is a capable, significant, and worthy organization member (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Gardner, Van Dyne & Pierce (2004) suggest that organizational members can assess their value through the signals communicated by the organization, supervisors and managers. Specifically, the characteristics of different management systems and practices will let employees construct different organizational experiences and form various levels of organization based self-esteem (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Because employees under psychopathic leadership are less likely to have any (real) authority or autonomy towards voice, they are less likely see themselves as vital and effective members of an organization. This may undermine their feeling of self-competence resulting in low organization based self-esteem (Yin, Wang, & Huang, 2012). Similarly, employees’ perception of self-value is negatively affected when there is less recognition and appreciation (Lee & Peccei, 2007) and when their suggestion, feedback or voice is unheard and are given less importance. Previous research studies have found self-esteem to be associated with employee voice and silence behavior. For example, high self-esteem has been found to have a positive influence on people’s expressive behaviors (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998) and voice. Similarly, Pinder & Harlos (2001) argued that lower self-esteem would lead to employee silence. Organization based self-esteem is built upon individual based self-esteem and is shaped by employees’ experience of working in specific organization. Therefore, organization based self-esteem will have more distinctive influence on work attitudes and behaviors than global self-esteem (Pierce et al., 1989).

The research of Jonason, Slomski, & Partyka (2012) has stated that psychopathy is associated with an increased use of bad tactics (bullying, retaliation, manipulation etc.). Organizational psychopaths quickly assess what people want to hear from them and then create stories that best fit others expectations and exploit their subordinates by taking extra work from them, taking credit for other people's work and even assign their work to junior staff members. They have low patience when dealing with others, display shallow emotions. In addition, they are unpredictable, undependable and fail to take responsibility when it is actually their own fault.

Employee silence is the level where employee of an organization has lesser commitment level because of withholding information regarding certain trouble causing issues, so as a result they less recognize themselves with the organization. Morison & Miliken (2000) explained that silence is a result of boss’s attitude. As a result, employees do not voice up in the organization.
Past research studies found a positive correlation between organization-based self-esteem and employee voice behavior (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Liang, Farh, & Farh, 2012). People with high organization based self-esteem are also more likely to believe that their perspectives are correct and that their speaking up will have a positive impact (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Consequently, high organization based self-esteem will result in a lower level of employee silence. Thus, under behavioral plasticity theory, that posit that individuals with low self-esteem are more susceptible to situational influences (social cues) than individuals with high self-esteem, we argue that:

Hypothesis 5: Organization based self-esteem will moderate the relationship between psychopathic leadership and employee behavioral silence in such a way that the relationship will be stronger in presence of low organization-based self-esteem.

Conceptual Framework:

![Conceptual Framework](image)

Fig.1 Research model depicts employee behavioral silence as mediator between psychopathic leadership and its outcomes (organizational citizenship behavior and work-family conflict). It also depicts organization based self-esteem as a moderator between psychopathic leadership and employee behavioral silence.

### 4. Research Methodology

#### 4.1. Research Design

This empirical study was casual in nature. All the variables are analyzed under natural settings. The data was collected in different time lags. It means that this research study was temporally segregated and data was collected at three time waves with a gap of one month. Kevin Dutton has categorized careers that have highest proportion of psychopaths. Considering his classification, Police officers falls under that category. Therefore, the unit of analysis of this research study were employees of government sector organization mainly Police department across Islamabad and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The data was collected from employees working in police department. Convenient and non-probability sampling technique was used to gather data. The total sample surveys distributed were 400, but at the end, the sample size used for analysis was 228.
Data was collected from individuals of government sector by using questionnaires. Questionnaires were used widely to collect data and this technique is proved to be a good tool for data collection in many studies in past. Questionnaires were distributed using convenient sampling technique. Data was coded and the identity of the respondents were kept confidential. Additionally, a time-lagged design was followed with questionnaires been divided into three parts according to the three time lags. Psychopathic leadership and organization based self-esteem were tapped at Time1, employee behavioral silence at Time2, whereas, organizational citizenship behavior and work-family conflict were tapped at Time3. Except psychopathic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior which were peer-reported, all other variables of interest were self-reported.

We distributed 400 questionnaires among employees working at various hierarchical levels at Time1, out of which 387 responses were useable. Further, at Time2, 350 useable responses were received and at Time3, only 228 questionnaires were usable. Data was collected from both males and females, which consist of 96.1% males, and 3.9% females. The marital status of participants was recorded as; 17.1% individuals were unmarried, 80.3% were married and 2.2% were divorced. The age of participants ranged from 20 to 54. About 7.5% participants had masters and remaining 92.5% had bachelors or below degree. About 18.9% of respondents were working at the middle level, 79.8% at entry-level, and 1.3% were working at top-level.

The analysis of this research followed the quantitative approach and the data was analyzed by using SPSS 21. The scales used to tap the study variables are well-established, validated and easy to understand. In Pakistan, the official language of most of the working sectors is English. Past research studies have also suggested English language as adequate for conducting survey based research in Pakistan (Butt, Choi, & Jeager, 2005; Khan, Abbas, Gul & Raja, 2015; Raja et al., 2004) and has scored good reliabilities. All the respondents of this study knew English as they had graduate or above level of qualification. Hence, the questionnaire was not translated into Urdu language which is a national and native language of Pakistan.

Controls were identified through one-way ANOVA. The demographics found to be significant on the research study's dependent variables were controlled for subsequent analysis. Correlation analysis was done to find out the association between the independent and dependent variables using SPSS. Mediation regression analysis using PROCESS technique in SPSS was used to test direct as well as mediation hypothesis. Moderated regression analysis was carried out through SPSS to test the interaction effects. The Cronbach alpha reliability analysis and confirmatory factor analysis were performed in order to establish the reliability and validity of the scales used for constructs in this research study. All the items were tapped with 7 point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The reliability of all scales used in this study were ranged between 0.82 to 0.90. Table-1 shows the mean, standard deviation, reliabilities and correlation among the studied variables.

4.2 Measures

4.1 Psychopathic Leadership was measured by 10-items from the Levenson peer-reported psychopathy scale (Levenson et al. 1995). Cronbach’s alpha in this research study is 0.85.

4.2 Employee Behavioral Silence was measured by Van and Dyne et al. (2003) 5-items scale for Aquiescent silence and 5-item for Defensive silence. Cronbach’s alpha in this research study is 0.86.
4.3. Organizational Citizenship Behavior was measured with a 14-items scale by William & Endorson. Cronbach’s alpha in this research study is 0.82.

4.4. Work-Family Conflict was measured using the 5-item subscale of the Work-Family Conflict Scale (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Cronbach’s alpha in this research study is 0.85.

4.5. Organization Based Self-Esteem was measured by Liang, & Farh (2012) with 10 items. Cronbach’s alpha in this research study is 0.90.

5. Results and Analysis

In present study, organization type, gender, marital status, education, designation, were analyzed through one-way ANOVA to check their impact on dependent variables. Results indicated that only type of organization was directly significant with the outcome variables organizational citizenship behavior and work-family conflict.

The results in table-1 denote the arithmetic mean and standard deviation for psychopathic leadership (M=5.05, SD=0.86), organization based esteem (M=4.93, SD=1.07), employee behavioral silence (M=4.84, SD=1.02), organizational citizenship behavior (M=4.24, SD=0.77), and work-family conflict (M=4.74, SD=1.15). Pearson Correlation analysis was performed to find the inter-correlation among major study variables. All of the correlations were found to be significant at p<0.00, p<0.01, p<0.03 and p<0.04. According to the correlation results for independent variable, i.e. psychopathic leadership and moderator i.e. organization based self-esteem has significant and positive correlation (r=.245, p<0.000). Moreover, psychopathic leadership had a positive and significant correlation with employee behavioral silence (r=.144, p<0.030). Furthermore, psychopathic leadership has a positive and significant correlation with one of the studied outcomes, i.e. work family conflict (r=.237, p<0.000), whereas, it has a negative and significant correlation with organizational citizenship behavior (r=-.135, p<0.04). However, mediator has positive and significant correlation with work family conflict (r=.301, p<0.000), whereas, it has a negative and significant correlation with organizational citizenship behavior (r=-.192, p<0.004).

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation

|   | Mean | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |
|---|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1 | OBSE | 4.93| 1.07| (.90)|    |    |    |
| 2 | PSYL | 5.05| 0.86|.245**| (.85)|    |    |
| 3 | EMPSI| 4.84| 1.02|.144*|.481**| (.86)|    |
| 4 | WFC  | 4.74| 1.15|.164*|.237**|.301**| (.85)|    |
| 5 | OCB  | 4.24| 0.77|.513**|-1.135*|-1.92**| .231**| (.82)|

Note: This table demonstrate mean, standard deviation and correlation values. Values in brackets describe reliabilities of variables separately

Abbreviations: OBSE=Organization Based Self-Esteem, PSYLEAD=Psychopathic Leadership, EMPSI=Employee Behavioral Silence, WFC=Work Family Conflict, OCB=Organizational Citizenship Behavior

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level
N=228.

The positive association among psychopathic leadership and employee behavioral silence (β=0.56, t=8.25, p<0.000), the association among employee behavioral silence and organizational citizenship behavior (β=-0.12, t=2.21, p<0.02), and the association between psychopathic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (β=-0.12, t=2.05, p<0.04) is proved by the results. Thus, the hypothesis 1a is proved. Also, the hypothesis 4a proposed that
employee behavioral silence mediates the relationship between psychopathic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior is proved by the results shown in the Table-2 ($\beta=-0.07$, $z=-2.12$, $p<0.03$).

**Table 2: Mediation Analysis (Employee Behavioral Silence mediated between Psychopathic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior)**

| Mediator: Employee Behavioral Silence and DV: Organizational Citizenship Behavior | B     | S.E  | t    | p    | LLCI | ULCI |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|
| PSYL→OCB                                                                         | -0.12 | 0.05 | 2.05 | 0.04 | -0.00| -0.23 |
| PSYL→EMPSI                                                                       | 0.56  | 0.06 | 8.25 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.42 |
| EMPSI→OCB                                                                        | -0.12 | 0.05 | 2.21 | 0.02 | -0.01| -0.23 |

**Indirect Effect**

| PSYL→EMPSI→OCB | B   | S.E  | Z    | p    |
|-----------------|-----|------|------|------|
| -0.07           | 0.03| -0.00| -2.12| 0.03 |

**Normal Theory Test for Indirect Effect**

| Effect | S.E  | Z    | p    |
|--------|------|------|------|
| -0.07  | 0.03 | -2.12| 0.03 |

Note: This table demonstrate the values for mediation analysis of first link which is PSYL→EMPSI→OCB. Abbreviations: DV=Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), IV=Psychopathic Leadership (PSYL) and Mediator=Employee Behavioral Silence (EMPSI) $p<.000$. The positive association among psychopathic leadership and employee behavioral silence ($\beta=0.56$, $t=8.25$, $p<0.000$), the association among employee behavioral silence and work-family conflict ($\beta=0.27$, $t=3.37$, $p<0.00$), and the association between psychopathic leadership and work-family conflict ($\beta=0.31$, $t=3.67$, $p<0.00$) is proved by the results. Thus, the hypothesis 1b is proved. Also, the hypothesis 4b proposed that employee behavioral silence mediates the relationship between psychopathic leadership and work-family conflict is proved by the results obtained and shown in the Table-3 ($\beta=0.15$, $z=3.10$, $p<0.00$).

**Table 3: Mediation Analysis (Employee Behavioral Silence mediated between Psychopathic Leadership and Work-Family Conflict)**

| Mediator: Employee Behavioral Silence and DV: Work-Family Conflict | B     | S.E  | t    | p    | LLCI | ULCI |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|
| PSYL→WFC                                                          | 0.31  | 0.08 | 3.67 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.48 |
| PSYL→EMPSI                                                       | 0.56  | 0.06 | 8.25 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.70 |
| EMPSI→WFC                                                         | 0.27  | 0.08 | 3.37 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.43 |

**Indirect Effect**

| PSYL→EMPSI→WFC | B   | S.E  | Z    | p    |
|-----------------|-----|------|------|------|
| 0.15            | 0.05| 0.05 | 0.28 |

**Normal Theory Test for Indirect Effect**

| Effect | S.E  | Z    | p    |
|--------|------|------|------|
| 0.15   | 0.05 | 3.10 | 0.00 |

Note: This table demonstrate the values for mediation analysis of second link which is PSYL→EMPSI→WFC. Abbreviations: DV=Work-Family Conflict (WFC), IV=Psychopathic Leadership (PSYL) and Mediator=Employee Behavioral Silence (EMPSI) $p<.000$. 
Overall, all of the hypothesis were supported with empirical evidence to the hypothesized model except the moderation hypothesis that states that organization based self-esteem will moderate the relationship between psychopathic leadership and employee behavioral silence in such a way that the relationship will be stronger in presence of low organization based self-esteem. Future researchers can consider other moderators between psychopathic leadership and employee behavioral silence. Also, researchers can study a different mediator while considering psychopathic leadership and organization based self-esteem as a moderator.

6. Conclusion

Employee silence is a concept of growing importance because it affects the personal well-being of employees, increases stress and causes them to feel guilty where they often experience psychological problems and have trouble seeing the possibility of change, and hence they consider themselves as less important to the organization (Bagheri, et al. 2012). People silent themselves to avoid embarrassment, confrontation and other perceived dangers (Perlow et al., 2003). Psychopathic leadership is famous in public humiliation of others, and remorselessness. They are devoid of guilt, and usually encourage co-workers to torment, alienate, harass and or humiliate other peers, take credit for other people's accomplishments and threaten any perceived enemy, thus, leading to employee behavioral silence (defensive and acquiescent) and employee behavioral silence ultimately negatively affect organizational citizenship behavior and positively affect work-family conflict.

6.1. Practical and Theoretical Implications

The study has several contributions to the existing literature. This study seeks to identify under what condition does an employee remain silent. This study supplements the literature on employee silence (defensive silence, acquiescent silence) and its outcomes like organizational citizenship behavior and work-family conflict. Moreover, it has studied psychopathic leadership and its role towards employee organizational citizenship behavior and work family conflict. Employee behavioral silence is studied as a contributor towards work family conflict. Our research offers useful insights for practitioners as well. For police employees, there should be counseling and training programs to make them emotionally stable, to teach them stability in decision making so that they might not turn into psychopaths when they get chance of leadership. For organizations, our findings imply that psychopathic leadership has a significant role in employee’s behavioral silence, so in order to let the employees speak up about the issues, psychopathic leaders should be replaced with authentic leaders who will have a positive impact on employees and will contribute to the organization in an effective way. It adds in the literature of silence as this study has taken the new antecedent of employee behavioral silence with rarely taken outcomes, so it has peculiar distinction as compare to other studies. By taking self-esteem as a moderator between psychopathic leadership and employee behavioral silence this study contributes theoretically. It highlights the problematic areas which, if considered, can help in improvement of organizational performance and employee’s efficiency such as resulting in decreasing the ratio of behavioral silence and encouraging employees to raise their voices about addressing the organizational issues. Additionally, improving the self-esteem of employees and motivating them to take part in extra role behaviors by satisfying their needs and providing them anxiety free workplace environment.

6.2. Limitations and Future Research Suggestions

There are certain limitations that can serve as avenues for future studies. Firstly, work is needed
to determine the role of psychopathic leadership in career advancement. Secondly, there is a need to understand the motives, perceptions, and ability complexes that underlie psychopathic leadership could help clarify the relationships between psychopathic leadership style and overt workplace behavior. Thirdly, future research can focus on task performance, and creative performance of psychopathic leaders and task performance and creativity of individuals working under psychopathic leadership. Fourth, antecedents of psychopathic leadership and employee silence, other outcomes and other contextual factors can serve as better option for future research. This study has collected data from only police sector, other government or private sectors and other professional group could be investigated including lawyers, surgeons, media and journalists in future where psychopathic leadership can be seen frequently. Other dimensions of silence such as prosocial silence can be studied which is generally used as a positive term in literature and prosocial silence behavior might be very beneficial to the organization and employees. Moreover, organization identification can also be used as a moderator. Further, future researchers can examine employee silence along with employee commitment through qualitative or quantitative research to draw more rich and varied information and opinion. Future research can compare the psychopathic leadership in different provinces of Pakistan as well as the psychopathic rates and detriments in different countries.
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Annexure-1: Questionnaire

| 1= Strongly Disagree | 2= Somewhat Disagree | 3= Slightly Disagree | 4= Neutral | 5= Slightly Agree | 6= Somewhat Agree | 7= Strongly Agree |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|

How much do you perceive your importance in the organization?

1. I count around here.
2. I am taken seriously.
3. I am important.
4. I am trusted.
5. There is faith in me.
6. I can make a difference.
7. I am valuable.
8. I am helpful.
9. I am efficient.
10. I am cooperative.

No. How do you perceive your boss-supervisor(s)?

1. For my leader, what is right is whatever he/she can get away with.
2. My leader enjoys manipulating other people’s feelings.
3. My leader often admires a really clever scam.
4. My leader thinks that people who are stupid enough to get ripped off usually deserve it.
5. My leader tells other people what they want to hear so that they will do what he/she wants them to do.
6. In today’s world, my leader feels justified in doing anything he/she can get away with to succeed.
7. When my leader gets frustrated, he/she often “let off steam” by blowing his/her top. (gets angry)
8. Looking out for his/her self is my leader’s top priority.
My leader’s main purpose in life is getting as many goodies as he/she can.
My leader has been in a lot of shouting matches with other people.

This questionnaire has to be filled after 1 week by the respondent

| No. | How often do I think during my work that | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|-----|----------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1   | I am unwilling to speak up with suggestions for change because I am disengaged |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2   | I am unwilling to speak up with suggestions for change because I believe that my colleagues will make the right decision. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3   | I keep my ideas about solutions to problems to myself. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4   | I keep any ideas for improvement to myself because I have low self-efficacy (confidence) to make a difference. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5   | I am unwilling to express my ideas for change in disengaged areas because I don’t want to increase the work load. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6   | I withhold new information due to fear about my future in the organization. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7   | I withhold relevant information due to fear. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8   | I omit (leave) pertinent (relevant) facts in order to protect him/her self. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9   | I avoid expressing ideas for improvements, due to self-protection. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10  | I do not speak up and suggest ideas for change, based on fear. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

| No. | Indicate the degree to which you have been experiencing conflict between your work and family life | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1   | The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2   | The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3   | Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4   | My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5   | Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

| No. | How often do you believe this person (your peer/colleague) has exhibited the following pro-social/helping behavior for the past six months at your current workplace? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1   | Helps others who have been absent. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2   | Helps others who have heavy workloads. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3   | Assists supervisor with his/her work (without being asked to). |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4   | Takes time to listen to co-workers’ problems and worries. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5   | Goes out of the way to help new employees. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6   | Takes a personal interest in other employees. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7   | Has work attendance above the norm. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8   | Gives advance notice when unable to come to work. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9   | Takes undue work breaks (R). |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10  | Spends a great deal of time on personal phone conversations (R). |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11  | Conserves and protects organizational property. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12  | Complains about insignificant things at work. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13  | Passes along information to co-workers. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14  | Adheres to informal rules devised to maintain order. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |