Psychopathic personality traits predict competitive wins and cooperative losses in negotiation
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ABSTRACT

Corporate corruption has recently called attention to the relevance of psychopathic personality traits—the absence of conscience, remorse, or scruples—in business settings; yet, little is known about how these personality traits affect business practices. We present two studies testing whether psychopathic personality traits are related to social perspective and cognitive decision-making biases relevant to negotiation, and whether those traits affect outcomes in a negotiation simulation. Psychopathic personality features were associated with a competitive world-view, including selfish social motivations and illusions of conflict with others. In mixed-motive negotiations, psychopathic traits predicted greater personal monetary gains when success favored competitive actions, but predicted monetary loss when success depended on cooperation. Results suggest that psychopathic personality traits can both bolster and hinder success in business.

1. Introduction

In an effort to understand individuals who engage in unethical, antisocial (sometimes illegal) business practices, the fields of forensic psychology and organizational behavior have begun a scientific conversation (Babiak, 1995). The topic of this conversation is the role of the psychopathic personality, which has long needed to be taken out of the prison and into the boardroom (Smith & Lilienfeld, 2013). Individuals possessing psychopathic tendencies fall on a spectrum and are present not only in clinical and criminal populations, but also in society more generally. Those with high levels of psychopathy are characterized by empathic deficits, a manipulative interpersonal style, and impulsive behavior, and there is increasing recognition of the relevance of this construct in the world of business, along with the related personality characteristics of Machiavellianism—master manipulators who seek power over others—and narcissism—entitled egomaniacs convinced of their superiority—together, forming the Dark Triad (Babiak, Neumann, & Hare, 2010; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). It has been proposed that the cutthroat world of business is an environment in which some psychopathic personality traits (e.g., callousness, fearlessness) might breed success (Mullins-Sweatt, Glover, Dereffino, Miller, & Widiger, 2010).

Success in business may be achieved by those with psychopathic personality traits, who experience little remorse at using deception, exploitation, and ambiguously dishonest or immoral behavior to reach their goals—normally discouraged, these tactics are overlooked if not rewarded in contexts such as Wall Street, Madison Avenue, and Silicon Valley (Boddy, 2006). Emerging research finds that individuals with psychopathic personality traits use their charisma and charm to attain management roles despite their poor performance reviews, where evidence suggests they bully subordinates and may perpetrate vast amounts of organizational misbehavior (Boddy, 2006; Mathieu, Neumann, Hare, & Babiak, 2014). Here, we examine how psychopathic personality traits may influence the outcome of business-related negotiations.

1.1. Negotiation: a primer

Negotiating with a competitor, supplier, or partner is a delicate process through which the two parties seek to maximize value (Bazerman, Curhan, Moore, & Valley, 2000; Thompson, 1990). While monetary value is often the focus of novice negotiators, a successful negotiation can also confer social benefits; exercising fairness and concern for one’s partner in a negotiation can foster current and future deals, and a positive business relationship, while selfishness can destroy future value (Ganesan, 1994). Negotiations are complex problem-solving endeavors. Parties are likely to have different, sometimes opposing, interest in multiple issues...
that may be combined, traded off, or taken off the table completely. In all negotiations, the challenge is to communicate one’s interests clearly and realize the optimal solution, which maximizes value for both parties (e.g., Weingart, Bennett, & Brett, 1993).

In negotiation parlance, to-be-resolved issues tend to fall into three classes: “compatible,” “integrative,” or “distributive.” Compatible issues occur when both parties desire the same outcome; in this instance, no compromise is necessary and both parties can achieve their preferred outcome simultaneously. The challenge of resolving compatible issues is in recognizing that interests are aligned. Since most individuals enter negotiations with the expectation that compromise will be necessary, compatibility sometimes remains uncovered and both parties compromise unnecessarily—leaving value “on the table”. Consistent with that expectation, however, are distributive issues on which negotiation partners seek the exact opposite outcomes. Distributive issues are zero sum; in this instance, the optimal solution is to split the difference—reaching a fair compromise that engenders trust in the relationship. Finally, where partners have different priorities on multiple issues, it is possible to find an integrative solution. That is, one party may give up some value on one issue, in return for value on another, greater priority issue, and vice versa. The optimal solution for two or more integrative issues is to give and take according to one’s priorities such that maximum value is extracted and evenly split between the parties (Pruitt, 1981). Overcoming false expectations, sharing information freely and proposing creative multi-issue compromises, are challenges not easily overcome, but may be particularly difficult for those with psychopathic personality features. Indeed, recognizing the importance of preserving social value in negotiations is a concept that may be lost on the more callous and manipulative among us.

1.2. Psychopathy and competition in negotiation

Optimal negotiation outcomes require that both parties value the relationship and seek to cooperate to find a shared-value solution. Psychopathic personality traits, however, are better correlated with the selfish manipulation of others, callousness, and impulsive behavior (Hare, 2006). Indeed, Curry, Chester, and Viding (2011) found that psychopathic personality traits were associated with offering less money in an ultimatum game. Where offering half of the money to the partner is considered fair in this context, those possessing psychopathic personality features offered less than that amount to their anonymous partner. In addition to a disregard for norms of fairness, psychopathic personality traits are associated with a competitive, or even predatory, approach to interpersonal interactions (Porter & Woodworth, 2007; Ross & Rausch, 2001), and an expectation that others will approach social interactions in the same way (Mahaffey & Marcus, 2006). Further, individuals with psychopathic personality features see others as highly vulnerable to manipulation and instrumental victimization—as pawns to be used in pursuit of their own goals (Black, Woodworth, & Porter, 2014). These interpersonal dispositions further suggest that they may be competitive and selfish negotiators (see also Dual Concern Theory; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Competitive negotiators are likely to be distrustful of others and exchange less information regarding their interests, choosing instead to keep their cards close to their chest (Tjosvold, 1997). As a result, both parties are less informed and optimal solutions may not be realized. In particular, this strategy is detrimental to integrative negotiations where an open exchange of information about preferences and priorities is necessary to reveal the optimal outcome (e.g., Weingart et al., 1993).

1.3. The present study

Study 1 examined the hypothesis that individuals with high levels of psychopathic traits will endorse selfish (“proself”, not “prosocial”) social motivations. Further, we expected that psychopathic traits would be positively related to illusions of competition, including beliefs that others are likely to hold goals and perspectives that oppose their own, and that issues up for negotiation are likely to be distributive (i.e., zero sum) in nature. We expected that such robust illusions of competition would influence the outcome of negotiations involving individuals with psychopathic tendencies. Study 2 examined the impact of psychopathic personality traits in an actual negotiation, with the expectation that a competitive world-view, coupled with the disinterest in social relationships and lack of empathy, would enhance personal monetary achievements in competitive, but not cooperative situations. Specifically, we predicted that psychopathic personality features would be associated with personal success in distributive bargaining, allowing them to take home a larger piece of the pie than their partner, without regard for cooperative fairness. While it was unclear how psychopathic personality traits might affect compatible bargaining, we predicted that individuals with psychopathic personality features would be poor integrative bargainers. We hypothesized that psychopathic personality traits would result in less personal gain on integrative issues as a result of behaving selfishly on a task which requires trust, communication, cooperation, and compromise. Indeed, this selfish and competitive approach was expected to have a negative impact on the dyad more generally, decreasing the total value that the dyad would be able to extract from integrative bargaining, and overall.

2. Study 1

2.1. Method

2.1.1. Participants

One hundred and forty-nine (74 male, 75 female) participants with a mean age of 34.73 (SD = 12.02; range: 18–70) years completed an online survey in return for $2 USD. Subjects were required to be at least 18 years of age and located in the United States, and were recruited using Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Although no further demographics were gathered for this sample, research suggests that the median American on Mechanical Turk has a Bachelors degree, earns an income of $40,000–60,000 annually, and participates in online research out of intrinsic interest and as a source of secondary income (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Ipeirotis, 2010). Ethical approval was received from an independent review board for this study.

2.1.2. Materials

Psychopathy was measured using the Dirty Dozen (Jonason & Webster, 2010), a 12-item measure that provides scores for each of the Dark Triad traits: psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism. Psychopathic personality traits were measured on 9-point Likert scale responses (1 – strongly disagree to 9 – strongly agree) to the following questions: I tend to lack remorse, I tend to be unconcerned with the morality of my actions, I tend to be callous or insensitive, and I tend to be cynical. The measure was created by choosing items from longer, well-validated measures of each of the Dark Triad traits. It effectively quantifies levels of psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism, as found in community and student populations, and each subscale has shown good reliability (α = .63 – .79), and convergent and divergent validity in previous research (Jonason & Luévano, 2013; Jonason & Webster, 2010). In particular, subscales have been shown to differentially predict self-reported aggression and mating preferences (Jonason, Valentine, Li, & Harbeson, 2011; Jonason & Webster, 2010). In the present sample,
reliability for the psychopathy subscale was similarly good (\(z = .76\)) and mean ratings ranged from the minimum of 1, to a high of 4.5. Reliabilities for the Machiavellianism and narcissism sub-scales in the current sample were .78 and .82, respectively.

Participants also completed three tasks to assess for cognitive biases and social motivations related to an illusion of competition, including a false consensus task (Ross, Greene, & House, 1977), a zero sum measure (Crocker & Canavello, 2008), and a social value orientation task (SVO; see van Lange, De Bruin, Otten, & Joireman, 1997). To assess for the belief that others are likely to hold goals and perspectives that oppose their own, participants were presented with a vignette-based task with four scenarios that each culminated in a dichotomous behavioral choice (i.e., false consensus task; Ross et al., 1977). For example, participants were asked to imagine that they were given the choice by their professor to complete (a) a group paper or (b) an individual paper as a course assignment. Following this, participants estimated the proportion of their peers that would choose each option. Results on this measure consistently show that participants believe that their peers will, overwhelmingly, agree with their choice (i.e., false consensus effect; Marks & Miller, 1987). We also measured the belief that issues up for negotiation are likely to be distributive (i.e., zero sum) in nature using a brief 6-item questionnaire (see Crocker & Canavello, 2008). Using a 5-point Likert scale (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) participants indicated the degree to which they agree with statements such as “My successes don’t mean much if most other people succeed at the same task” and “I believe that people are basically self-interested.” In the present sample, reliability for the zero sum measure was good (\(z = .78\)).

Finally, participants also completed an SVO task, which measures social motivation and is comprised of 9 items that required the participant to distribute “points” (see van Lange et al., 1997). Participants were asked to imagine an unknown other and to complete three options for the allocation of points, which are desirable for both parties. Choices consistently include options that (a) distribute points evenly (e.g., each receive 500 points), (b) maximize points for the self, with fewer points being allocated to the unknown partner (e.g., 550 points for the self, and 300 for the partner) and (c) maximize relative advantage for the self over the partner (e.g., 500 points for the self, and 100 for the partner). Participants that consistently choose one of the above options in 6 or more of the 9 trials are classified as cooperative, individualistic, or competitive, respectively.

2.1.3. Procedure

Participants were directed to an online survey where they completed the Dirty Dozen, false consensus, zero sum, and SVO questionnaires in random order. Participants also completed demographic questions (age, gender).

2.2. Results and discussion

2.2.1. Do psychopathic personalities hold illusions of competition?

2.2.1.1. Cognitive biases. Cognitive biases related to illusions of competition were examined for their association with psychopathic personality traits. Zero sum beliefs were positively correlated with all subscales of the Dirty Dozen (psychopathy: \(r(148) = .320, p < .001\); narcissism: \(r(148) = .337, p < .001\); Machiavellianism: \(r(148) = .282, p = .001\)). Psychopathic traits continued to predict zero sum beliefs when narcissistic and Machiavellian traits were controlled in a partial correlation, \(r(144) = .201, p = .015\). Controlling for the other two traits, narcissism was still related to zero sum beliefs, \(r(144) = .239, p = .004\), but Machiavellianism was not, \(r(144) = .041, p = .625\).

Individuals who endorsed higher levels of psychopathic traits also estimated that fewer people would agree with their decisions on the false consensus task, \(r(144) = -.244, p = .003\). Agreement estimates were unrelated to Machiavellianism, \(p = .23\), and narcissism, \(p = .89\), and remained unrelated when the remaining two facets were controlled in partial correlations, \(ps = .37\) and .95, respectively. However, psychopathic traits predicted false consensus even when controlling for the other two facets (Machiavellianism, narcissism), \(r(140) = -.230, p = .006\).

2.2.1.2. Social value orientations. The majority of participants \((n = 90)\) held a cooperative orientation, \(n = 43\) held an individualistic orientation, and \(n = 6\) held a competitive orientation. Ten participants could not be classified, due to inconsistent responding. Following common and recommended practice, individualistic and competitive participants were combined into a ‘proself’ group \((n = 49)\) for comparison to the ‘prosocial’ (cooperative; \(n = 90)\) participants (e.g., Garling, Fujii, Garling, & Jakobsson, 2003; van Prooijen, Ståhl, Eek, & van Lange, 2012). A series of ANOVAs were conducted, with SVO type (prosocial vs. proself) serving as the independent variable and Dirty Dozen subscale scores serving as dependent variables. Only scores on the psychopathy subscale differed across SVOs, \(F(1,138) = 4.77, p = .031\). Prosocial individuals \((M = 2.19, SD = .78)\) endorsed more psychopathic personality traits than prosocial individuals \((M = 1.90, SD = .76)\).

In sum, results suggest that participants with psychopathic personality features perceive others to be at odds with their own beliefs and goals, believe that to maximize one’s benefits it must be to the detriment of another, and in turn, they strive to maximize their own benefits without regard for others. Results expand on past research by Ross and Rausch (2001), who characterized psychopathy as associated with an achievement disposition. Taken together, these biases suggest strongly that individuals with psychopathic personality traits will behave in a self-serving manner during negotiations.

3. Study 2

Study 2 utilized an ecologically valid negotiation in the laboratory to examine whether psychopathic personality traits would be related to (a) selfish and unfair division of value in distributive bargaining, and (b) sub-optimal personal and group-level outcomes in integrative bargaining, which requires cooperation.

3.1. Method

3.1.1. Participants

Participants were undergraduate business students in their junior or senior year attending a public university on the west coast of the United States. All participants were enrolled in a core course in the Business Administration curriculum and completed the negotiation task as an in-class exercise; no compensation was provided. A total of 63 dyads (126 students) were included in analyses. Of these, 57 were male (25 sellers, 32 buyers) and 69 were female (38 sellers, 31 buyers). Ethical approval for the use of existing data was received from an independent review board.

1 All relationships between zero sum beliefs and Dirty Dozen subscales remain statistically significant when gender is entered as a covariate, \(r(145) = .317, p < .001\). Further, effects are present in both male and female samples, when examined independently (all \(ps < .05\)).
following the collection of data, the removal of identifying information, and the completion of the course.

3.1.2. Materials and procedure

3.1.2.1. Negotiation task. Participants completed a negotiation exercise face-to-face with a classmate. To create pairs, participants were asked to find a partner in the class who they did not know. To assign roles, a simple decision rule was used; the older individual in the pair assigned the role of buyer, and the younger, the role of seller. A commonly-used negotiation scenario was used (Bontempo & Iyengar, 2008; two published reports exist using this negotiation task for research purposes—Ams & Kammrath, 2004; Park, Ferrero, Colvin, & Carney, 2013); participants were randomly assigned within each dyad to play the role of an entrepreneur selling his/her family business or an executive at a multinational company who is seeking to purchase the business. Dyads were informed that four issues remained to be negotiated, each of which were associated with economic values represented by points. Points were assigned to each participant depending on how each issue was settled. Effective communication between the two parties would reveal that one issue was distributive, one compatible, and two integrative. A total of 1500 points were shared, in a zero-sum fashion, on the distributive issue. On the compatible issue, both the buyer and seller were awarded the same number of points—up to 500 points each if they successfully uncovered that their interests were aligned on this issue. The remaining pair of issues were integrative; one issue was of greater value to the buyer (worth up to 2500 points) than the other (worth up to 1000 points), and vice versa for the seller. Each individual could obtain a maximum of 5500 points, and the dyad could obtain a maximum combined total of 7500 points. The optimal solution across all four issues was to share the maximal solution (7500 points) equally (3750 points each).

3.1.2.2. Dirty Dozen. Participants completed the same self-report measure of Dark Triad personality traits as used in Study 1 (Dirty Dozen; Jonason & Webster, 2010) in an online survey approximately two months after the completion of the negotiation task as part of an assignment on understanding one’s own personality. Again, responses on the psychopathy subscale items were good, $\alpha = .72$, and mean ratings ranged from 1 (minimum) to 4. Reliabilities for the Machiavellianism and narcissism sub-scales in the current sample were .79 and .80, respectively.

3.2. Results and discussion

Six negotiation outcome variables were calculated to reflect achievement in negotiating distributive, compatible, and integrative issues. Individual-level outcomes included the number of points that each participant achieved on (a) the pair of integrative issues, (b) the distributive issue, and (c) their total number of points. Dyad-level outcomes included the number of points that the team achieved on the (d) compatible issue (which was, by definition, the same for both individuals in each dyad), (e) the total achieved value on the integrative pair of issues, and (f) the dyad’s total points. See Tables 1 and 2 for descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations.

3.2.1. Do psychopathic personality traits predict individuals’ negotiation outcomes?\(^4\)

To correct for non-independence of the data, a series of multi-level models were conducted using the xtmixed command in

STATA. Resulting coefficients describe the effects of psychopathic personality traits on individual negotiation outcomes, controlling for dyad-level variance. Role (buyer versus seller) was also included in each model as a dummy variable to control for potential differential effects of role on negotiation outcomes. Results suggest that while individuals with higher levels of psychopathic traits extracted more value than those endorsing relatively fewer psychopathic traits on the distributive issue ($b = 94.82$, $SE(b) = 46.00$, $z = 2.06$, $p = .039$), psychopathic personality traits were negatively associated with achievement when negotiating integrative issues ($b = -127.08$, $SE(b) = 60.11$, $z = -2.11$, $p = .035$) (see Table 3). On the whole, however, there was no effect of psychopathic personality traits on individuals’ total number of points achieved ($b = -48.12$, $SE(b) = 72.33$, $z = -.067$, $p = .506$)—that is, competitive gains and cooperative losses appeared to off-set each other.\(^5\)

3.2.2. Do psychopathic personality traits predict dyadic negotiation outcomes?

Because achieved outcomes on the compatible issue, dyadic total on the integrative issues, and total dyadic points were the same for both the buyer and seller, these variables were examined at the dyadic-level. In order to do so, the sum of the buyer and seller’s psychopathic personality sub-scales was used as a dyad-level predictor of these outcomes. Pearson correlations trended in the negative direction, such that dyads endorsing more psychopathic personality traits achieved less on the integrative pair of issues ($r(63) = -.192$, $p = .132$), and less overall ($r(63) = -.194$, $p = .127$), but effects were not statistically significant. Further, there was no effect of dyadic psychopathy levels and outcomes on the compatible issue, $r(63) = .069$, $p = .592$.\(^6\)

4. General discussion

The current research examined the role of psychopathic personality traits in negotiation. Among a sample of business students, psychopathic personality traits bred selfish and competitive negotiators who both excel and fail at bargaining tasks. Individuals with psychopathic personality traits, even more than those with Machiavellian and narcissistic traits, endorsed a competitive world-view. Together, these social and cognitive biases paint a picture of an individual who consistently strives to maximize personal achievement at the expense of others, perhaps due to the belief that personal goals can only be met by doing so. Psychopathic traits and its associated biases maximized personal gain during competitive bargaining, but become a liability when bargaining required cooperation.

These results are in line with previous research that has linked psychopathic personalities with biases in interpersonal evaluations. For example, Black et al. (2014) found that individuals possessing these traits endorsed a “negative-other” perspective, assuming others are low in agreeableness regardless of their actual personality. Similarly, Mahaffey and Marcus (2006) reported that individuals who rated themselves as higher on psychopathy were more likely to assume that others were more psychopathic as well, suggesting a “dog-eat-dog” perspective where they project their antisocial and selfish ambitions onto others. Such a social

\(^4\) Multi-level models, parallel to that reported for psychopathic traits, were conducted to examine effects of Machiavellian and narcissistic traits on each of the individual and dyadic outcomes described here. No significant effects emerged.

\(^5\) Including gender in the multi-level models predicting individual-level negotiation outcomes did not materially affect results. Psychopathic personality traits continued to negatively affect integrative outcomes ($b = -139.30$, $SE(b) = 61.51$, $z = -2.26$, $p = .024$), (marginally) predict positive distributive outcomes ($b = 82.74$, $SE(b) = 46.97$, $z = 1.76$, $p = .078$), and did not affect total points ($p = .34$).

\(^6\) Relationships between psychopathic personality traits and dyad-level outcomes remained non-significant when the dyad’s gender (same versus different) was controlled in partial correlations.
perspective, we expected, might produce a selfish negotiator with difficulties cooperating for mutual benefit.

Indeed, negotiators with higher levels of psychopathic traits were selfish when negotiating distributive issues, taking more value, and leaving their partner with less. Although this outcome is personally satisfying, it may be detrimental to the buyer/seller relationship—a consequence that is likely to be of little interest to those with psychopathic personality features. Such an act of unfairness is in line with recent research suggesting that selfishness, however, did benefit the partner of a high-psychopathy individual when the issue at hand was distributive issue, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each negotiator reports trusting their partner, the amount of communication, and the use of deception may have led high-psychopathy individuals to fail to integrate issues, this should be tested directly in future work. In particular, the extent to which each nego-
hallmarks, leading to poor overlap with other, longer measures of the same construct. Given our present findings, we suspect that facets measuring interpersonal manipulation and callous affect will more strongly predict wins and losses in negotiation, compared to erratic life-style and criminal tendency facets (as measured by the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale; Paulhus, Neumann, & Hare, in press). Alternatively, the “Boldness” component of psychopathy, as measured by the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI-R; Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005), may also shed light on the way in which individuals with psychopathic personality traits bargain. Boldness, lying at the nexus of social potency and low stress reactivity, is manifested in assertive and persuasive behaviors—behaviors and outcomes important contributions to our understanding of how alternative measures of psychopathic personality features affect bargaining behaviors and outcomes.

Finally, given the social nature of business practice, the competitive social perspective held by individuals with high levels of psychopathic traits is likely to influence the process and outcome of interactions beyond negotiation. For example, group decision-making tasks may be disrupted by group members with psychopathic personality features who enter the exercise with the goal of swaying everyone to their point of view, rather than allowing their perspective to be informed by the unique knowledge and insight of others. Future research should consider the effect of psychopathic personality features in other organizational contexts.

5. Conclusion

As psychopathic personality traits in corporate settings become increasingly relevant, we sought to examine the social and cognitive biases of individuals endorsing these traits and to postulate how they may succeed and fail in applied business practices. In particular, we find that psychopathic traits are associated with a competitive social perspective, expectations that others are in opposition with their perspective, and the belief that achieving one’s goals must come at the expense of another. Further, we find that individuals endorsing psychopathic personality traits maximize personal gain in negotiations where issues are distributive in nature, but are unable to use compromise to optimize integrative bargaining outcomes. These findings contribute to the emerging literature examining psychopathic personalities in the workplace, and call for further research on the manner in which dark personalities function within corporate organizations.
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