11-1-2013

# Dark Side Leadership: A History and Organizing Template

Daryl R. Smith
*Cedarville University*, darylsmith@cedarville.edu

K. A. Hasselfeld

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/business_administration_presentations

**Dark Side Leadership: A History and Organizing Template**

**ABSTRACT**

We revisit the history of dark side leadership research over the past twenty years. The literature has developed from the view that this type of leadership is simply the dark side of charisma to a well defined construct. We emphasize the work of Hogan and colleagues who have developed an effective tool for the measurement of dark side leadership along eleven dimensions. The tool is called the Hogan Development Survey or HDS. The HDS has proven to be robust, valid, and reliable. We also suggest that the HDS is a helpful tool for organizing the academic literature regarding dark side leadership and related terms such as destructive and narcissistic leadership. We suggest that many of these related terms are more specific or narrow manifestations of dark side leadership.

# Dark Side Leadership: A History and Organizing Template

The term dark side leadership first surfaced in the academic literature nearly 20 years ago (Conger, 1990). In the last ten years there has been a plethora of articles on the subject. Thus, it seems a good time to re-visit the history of the construct. A number of related constructs will be reviewed as well. In fact, we shall argue that many of these constructs are indeed more specific manifestations of the general construct of dark side leadership. Finally, a template will be presented to organize the related constructs.

## History

The term dark side leadership first appeared when it was used by Conger (1990) and Hogan, Rashkin, and Fazzini (1990) to describe the pitfalls of charisma in leadership. Though they do not state so specifically, we assume the term was adopted from George Lucas's popular film *Star Wars* which took the United States by storm in the summer of 1977. The film's hero, Luke Skywalker, is encouraged by his mentor to avoid the "dark side" where evil traits and actions abide.

*Foundational Work*

The roots of these initial works (Conger, 1990; Hogan, et al., 1990) can be found in work done by Bentz (1985) on management incompetence. Bentz's work had been done on failed executives at Sears and Roebuck to determine the causes of the failure. McCall and Lombardo (1983) and later researchers from the Center for Creative Leadership (Leslie & Van Velsor, 1996 as cited in Hogan & Hogan 2001) validated Bentz's (1985) work. Most of this work was done at the request of their clients who wanted to predict which of the managers had the potential to become a costly derailment once they achieved the executive level. This early work on

derailment can be summarized by four areas: 1) problems with interpersonal relationships 2) inability to meet business objectives 3) failure to build an effective team and 4) a lack of ability to adapt to transition (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Each of the four areas can be linked in part to flawed personality traits.

This work then led to research on how leaders fail. Kovach (1986) examined the derailment of what he termed "fast-track" managers, while Kets de Vries (1989) examined leaders who self destruct. The business landscape of the 1980s was highlighted by the rise of several charismatic leaders, among them Lee Iacocca and John DeLorean, both of whom came from the automotive industry. These, and other, charismatic leaders often produced dramatic results (e.g. Iacocca turnaround of Chrysler) and spectacular failures (e.g. DeLorean bankrupting his self named automotive company after only one year of producing cars). Such high profile cases led scholars to begin to study the construct of charisma and its limitations and dangers. This led to work of both Conger (1990) and Hogan, et al. (1990) in the area of charisma. These researchers labeled the abuse of charisma as dark side leadership.

*First Work with the Dark Side*

Conger (1990) examined a number of well known leaders (e.g. DeLorean, Edwin Land of Polaroid, Al Campeau of Federated Department Stores, and Thomas Edison) and concluded that that while these charismatic leaders possessed several behaviors that separated them from managers, these same behaviors had the potential to produce disastrous outcomes for their organizations. He specifically cited problems of charismatic leaders in the areas of: strategic vision, communication and impression-management skills, and general management practices.

His focus was on the types of things that these charismatic leaders do wrong, not on the origin of these behaviors.

Hogan et al. (1990) took a similar view of dark side leadership as an abuse of charismatic leadership skills. They identified three types of flawed managers. The first is the High Likeability Floater –this individual is well liked by everyone, but not very effective as a manager. As a result, their performance is rarely questioned. The second type is the "Hommes de Ressentiment". Often these individuals appear to be charming, leader-like, and bright but underneath lays a stream of resentment and bitterness accompanied by a desire for revenge. The final category is what Hogan et al. (1990) describe as the Narcissists. As the name suggest, these individuals feel entitled and special and do not hesitate to seek out special attention, favors and benefits. All of the individuals listed can initially appear very likeable, but beyond the first impression they harbor a dark side. In this piece, Hogan and colleagues begin to speculate on the personality flaws that may drive these dark side leaders. It is a theme they will later more fully develop.

Another important development in dark side research occurred in 1994 when Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan began to speculate that traits, not simply behaviors, separated dark side leaders from other leaders. The basis of their arguments is that the Big Five Personality traits (Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism) as outlined by Digman (1990) and Costa and McCrae (1992) had begun to dominate the personality research. Indeed a consensus has developed that these five dimensions capture the breadth and depth of what we refer to as personality (Bono & Judge, 2004). Further research would be used to demonstrate links from the Big Five to successful leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt,

2002). For example, high levels of extraversion are linked to high ratings of leadership effectiveness.

Hogan et al. (1994) referred to the Big Five as "bright side" traits. They speculated that perhaps a different set of traits, what they referred to as "dark side" characteristics led to poor leadership. These characteristics are "irritating tendencies that alienate subordinates and interfere with a person's ability to form a team" (Hogan et al., 1994, p. 499). In other words, poor leadership can be caused not only by a lack of "bright side" traits, but rather by a presence of high levels of "dark side" traits. However, they did not attempt to list such traits in their 1994 piece.

*The Hogan Development Survey*

In our opinion, Hogan and his associates have done more to promote research on the dark side of leadership than any other set of scholars. A key piece in the advancement of the field occurred in 1997 with the publishing of the first tool to measure dark side leadership (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). Four years later, Hogan and Hogan (2001) had yet to lend a formal definition to dark side leadership. However, they described it as a set of traits that possessed the ability to derail one's career if not dealt with effectively and elaborated on their 1997 work on their measurement tool.

Equally important, Hogan and Hogan (2001) made the point that leadership incompetence had historically been viewed as lacking the characteristics needed for success (cf. Bray and Howard, 1983). Hogan and Hogan (2001) countered that leadership incompetence is caused by possessing undesirable qualities rather than in lacking desirable ones. This is an important marker in the dark side leadership literature and helped to change the direction of how we think about and research the topic.

Hogan and Hogan (2001) view personality as inextricably linked to leadership.  As previously stated, they view dark side leadership not so much as an absence of necessary bright side traits, but rather the possession of an entirely different set of traits which they labeled, dark side traits. With this focus on the leader's personality, they set out to identify and then measure these traits.  Hogan and Hogan (2001) based their original taxonomy of dark side leadership traits on the DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 1994).  They state that there is a "substantial consensus regarding the range of personality disorders that are prevalent in social life" (p. 42) and that these disorders are captured by the DSM-IV.  These disorders are listed in Table 1.

---------------------------------------
Insert Table 1 about here
---------------------------------------

Hogan and Hogan (2001) are quick to point out that their goal is not to evaluate mental health.   Rather they were searching for personality characteristics that can lead to career derailment.  They used the DSM-IV as a starting point to help discover and define these characteristics and went on to develop scales to assess these characteristics and to validate a scale for their measurement.  Benson (2006, p. 31) describes the five step process used by Hogan and Hogan (1997) to develop their instrument.

1. "…the scales are based on the 11 recurring derailments characteristics identified in the research literature."

2. "…the derailment characteristics were conceptualized as dimensions allowing scores to occur along a continuum rather than relying on type classification."

3. "…the items written for each dimensions were aimed at tapping the "heart" or key portions of the construct."

4. "…in order to add to the discriminant capability of the variable scales, the content overlap between scales was minimized to the extent possible—increasing the between scale independence."

5. "…the items were based on every day events and activities. This final guideline ensured the instrument would not be viewed as offensive and invasive as well as removing any concern associated with medical/psychiatric content (in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990)."

The resulting dark side characteristics are listed in the second column of Table 1 along with a few descriptive words in column 3. The characteristics are measured using 11 scales, each containing 14 items for a total of 154 items. Each scale was developed from themes found in their literature search. Later a 14 item Social Desirability Scale was added for 168 total items (Benson, 2006). Their scale was entitled, the Hogan Development Survey or HDS. Initial coefficient alphas for the scales averaged a .64 (with a range from .5 to .7) and test-retest reliabilities averaged .68 (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). The original scale was normed with over 2,000 respondents and by 2006 the norms were based on more than 10,000 respondents (Benson, 2006). After a decade of use the scales has been found to be robust, reliable, and valid (Furnham & Trickey, 2011).

Hogan and Hogan acknowledge the foundational work of Horney (1950, as cited in Hogan & Hogan, 2001) in the conceptualization of their scales. Horney described how we learn to deal with stress throughout our childhood by one of three ways: "moving away from people"

(MA), "moving against people"(MAG), and "moving toward people"(MT). These three ways of dealing with stress can be used to categorize the eleven dark side characteristics or traits into three groups as can be seen in column two of Table 1 (Hogan & Hogan, 2001).

The topic of stress is important in relation to dark side traits. Hogan and Hogan (2001) consistently describe these eleven traits as emerging or surfacing in the leader during levels of high stress. In fact they point out that traits such as Dutiful are helpful in moderation, but under stress become so pronounced that the individual can, for example, become a bottleneck in the organization as everything must pass through them to be checked and they are afraid to delegate as the product may not be perfect. Furnham, Trickey and Hyde (2012) had similar findings. These socially undesirable traits can in some work situations have positive implications. For example, they found that narcissism was sometimes associated with leadership success. Khoo and Burch (2008) found that Colorful dimension of the HDS to be positively related to transformational leadership, while Cautious and Bold were negatively related to transformational leadership.

*Definition of Dark Side Leadership*

Though we believe that Hogan and Hogan (2001) did an exceptional job in defining the construct of dark side leadership and developing an instrument to measure it, there is a curious lack of a definition for the construct in their writings. In fact, we found this to be an interesting absence in much of the dark side leadership literature. Ironically, we found the best definition for the construct in a textbook (Hughes, Ginnett, Curphy, 2012). After the definition, the authors provide an endnote to numerous works on dark side leadership, but we could not find the authors' definition in any single work referenced. Hence, we include their definition here.

"Dark-side personality traits are irritating, counterproductive behavioral tendencies that interfere with a leader's ability to build cohesive teams and cause followers to exert less effort toward goal accomplishment. (p. 643). Hughes et al. (2012) go on to make a couple of important points regarding these traits. First of all, everyone has at least one dark side trait and secondly these traits seem to appear most often during times of crisis or high stress, a point made earlier in this paper.

*Dark Side leadership since 2001*

Following the publication of Hogan and Hogan's HDS in 2001 there have been a number of areas of research on the dark side traits. Rolland and De Fruyt (2003) used the HDS in conjunction with the Five Factor Model of Personality (FFM), or Big Five, to assess the ability of the dark side traits to incrementally predict, above and beyond the FFM, negative affects (e.g. anger, fear) experienced by military personnel over a six month period. Though they found some direct effects between the dark side (they termed them maladaptive) traits and negative affects, they did not find that the maladaptive traits adding explanatory power beyond that of the FFM.

In contrast to Rolland and De Fruyt (2003), Benson (2006) did find that dark side traits added incremental variance beyond the FFM; however Benson's target criterion was different. In a multi-organizational sample (N = 1306) as well as two different single organizational samples (N = 290, N = 220) dark side traits were shown to be separate and distinct from the FFM traits. More importantly for this discussion, he found that the dark side traits accounted for incremental variance beyond that of the FFM in predicting leadership effectiveness. It is important to note that Rolland and De Fruyt (2003) were examining negative emotional affects at

work, while Benson was using the inventory in harmony with its original intent – to predict

leadership effectiveness or ineffectiveness.

## Related Terms

Since Hogan and Hogan's (2001) work on the Hogan Developmental Survey was

published, there have been a number of related terms to appear in the literature.  In our review of

the literature since 2002 we have found a number of terms that seem to be related to dark side

leadership.  The two most common conceptual models cited in the literature were "dark side

leader" and "destructive leader."  This correlates with Higgs (2009) who included these two

terms along with the following as the terms used in the literature up to that point in time to

describe "bad" leadership: leadership derailment, toxic leadership, negative leader, evil

leadership, and abusive leadership.   Table 2 lists the more frequently used related terms for a

dark side leader, and the behaviors, characteristics and traits noted by the authors.  We will

examine each of these in turn.

-------------------------------------
Insert Table 2 about here
---------------------------------------

*Narcissistic Leader*

The most common characteristic or trait cited for these leaders was a form of the word

narcissism, being cited in over half of the articles we saw on the subject during this time period.

This correlates with the observation by Blair, Hoffman and Helland (2008) that the one construct

that researchers have found continually linked to a leader's tendency to behave ineffectively and

unethically is narcissism.  Gudmundsson and Southey, 2011 cite the following characteristics of

destructive narcissists: (1) grandiosity (inflated sense of self-importance, arrogance,

preoccupation with power and wealth, excessive seeking of admiration), (2) a sense that they are entitled to have whatever they want, including a willingness to exploit others to get it, and (3) lack of concern for and devaluation of others. In sum, these leaders have deep seeded feelings of insecurity that are manifested through behaviors and attitudes that give the impression of superiority. They are generally ruthless, belittle subordinates, seek power and prestige for themselves alone, and feel that they are "the center of the universe" – all revolves around them (Oimet, 2010; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006; Lubit, 2002).

*Destructive Leadership*

Along with dark side leadership, this was the most common term we found in the literature. In many ways, authors used terms that are similar to narcissistic leadership when speaking of destructive leadership. For example, Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Birkeland, and Einarsen (2010) describe a destructive leader as one who is narcissistic as well as autocratic, authoritarian and Machiavellian in their approach to leadership. In a similar vein to Conger (1990) they point out that these types of leaders use their charisma for personal gain. Shaw, Erickson, and Harvey (2011) add to this the destructive leader's tendency towards bullying behavior in order to get compliance as well as a micro managing style.

*Toxic Leadership*

This leader is also described by the term narcissism (Pelletier, 2010; Goldman, 2006) but researchers go on to add the idea of the leader appearing disengaged and anti-social. When they do speak, it is often with marginalizing or demeaning comments. They are often rigid and blame others for mistakes. Emotional volatility often appears in conjunction with the aforementioned behaviors.

*Psychopaths/Sociopath Leadership*

Cangemi and Pfohl (2009) describe the Sociopathic Leader.  Pech and Slade (2007) discuss the Organizational Sociopath.  The Corporate Psychopath is also a common term (Boddy, 2011, Gudmundsson and Southey (2011) for this type of leader.  The spirit of these terms is captured by what Stevens, Dueling and Armenakis (2012) describe as the Successful Psychopath.  This leader is known for exhibiting risky and impulsive decision making and behavior, one who can change course in a moment, leaving the followers to figure out what happened.  Their irresponsibility is often accompanied by unethical decision making.  Hare (2009) is considered one of the leading authorities on the area of psychopath behavior.  He has a twenty item checklist used to help identify the psychopath.  Many of his items show overlap with the HDS, particularly with the dimensions of Bold and Mischievous.  Items such as grandiose sense of self worth and lack of remorse or guilt are but two examples.

*Dysfunctional Leader*

In contrast to the other related terms listed, this is not one of the common terms used for dark side leadership.  The reason for its inclusion will become evident shortly.  Dysfunctional leaders avoid change and making decisions whenever possible.  They often under manage and therefore under deliver.  They are known to exclude others and hence betray trust (Carson et al. in press).

## Using the HDS as an Organizing Template

A careful analysis of these terms and their associated traits reveal that almost all could be categorized under eleven HDS dimensions (Hogan & Hogan, 2001).  We would like to conclude

this paper presenting evidence for the HDS to be the organizing taxonomy of all dark side and related terms literature.

Note that the third column of Table 2 lists the traits, characteristics and behaviors that the researchers include in their descriptions of various forms of dark side leadership.  An analysis of Table 2 quickly reveals that an overwhelming majority of the dimensions listed fall under the "moving away" (MA) or "moving against" (MAG) categories of traits in the HDS.  A few of the exceptions are the traits listed alongside the Dysfunctional leadership term.

As mentioned previously, Dysfunctional Leadership was not a common related term found in the literature in regards to dark side leadership.  We believe that this illustrates the reality that when followers are asked to identify dark side leaders, their first thoughts gravitate to the "moving against" category of dark side traits, followed by the "moving away" category. While it is natural to think first of these types of salient behaviors as Lord (1985) and Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich (1985) suggest, we must remember that the "moving toward" category of dark side traits also inflict damage to the organization and the followers.  The damage is just not as noticeable, at least at first.

As stated so clearly by Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad (2007, p. 209), "Consequently, destructive leadership behaviors are not necessarily active and manifest, but may also constitute passive and indirect behaviors. An example of passive physical-indirect behavior may be a leader who fails to protect a subordinate's welfare, for example in a working environment with potential safety risks (Neuman & Baron, 2005). An example of passive-verbal-indirect behavior may be a leader failing to provide a subordinate with important information or feedback (Neuman &

Baron, 2005)." Such a scenario would occur under the dimension of Dutiful, one of the "moving toward" categories.

For further evidence of the organizing efficacy of the HDS we return to the original work on dark side leadership, that of Conger (1990). As mentioned previously Conger views dark side leadership as the charismatic leader's failure in three skill areas. "The very behaviors that distinguish leaders from managers also have the potential to produce problematic or even disastrous outcomes for their organizations. For example, when a leader's behaviors become exaggerated, lose touch with reality, or become vehicles for purely personal gain, they may harm the leader and the organization" (Conger, 1990, p. 44). He goes on to give specific examples of behaviors in these three skill areas. These behaviors are listed in Table 3. We believe that the behaviors demonstrated by these leaders reflect underlying dark side traits as delineated by Hogan and Hogan (2001). Note how many of the items can be linked to dimensions of the HDS, particularly to the dimension of Bold, followed by Mischievous. Notice as well, how many of these structures fall under the "moving against" categories.

--------------------------------------
Insert Table 3 about here
--------------------------------------

**Conclusion**

In reviewing the history of dark side leadership since its inception in 1990, we see how it has developed from simply the abuse of charismatic leadership to a well defined construct which can be measured using the Hogan Development Survey (HDS) along eleven dimensions (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). The HDS not only provides a valid and reliable measure of dark side

leadership, but also provides a helpful template in organizing the dark side and related terms

leadership body of knowledge.

# References

Aasland, M. S., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The Prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 438–452.

American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (4th ed., Text Revision). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association.

Benson, M.J. (2006). *New explorations in the field of leadership research: a walk on the dark side of personality and implications for leadership (in) effectiveness*. (Doctoral dissertation). UMI Dissertation Services.

Benson, M.J., & Hogan, R.S. (2008). How dark side leadership personality destroys trust and degrades organisational effectiveness. *Organisations and People*, 15,10-18.

Bentz, V.J. (1985). *A view from the top: A thirty year perspective of research devoted to the discovery, description, and prediction of executive behavior.* Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August.

Blair, C.A., Hoffman, B.J., & Helland, K.R. (2008). Narcissism in organizations: a multisource appraisal reflects different perspectives. *Human Performance*, 21,254-76.

Boddy, C.R. (2011). Corporate psychopaths, bullying and unfair supervision in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100,367-379.

Bono, J.E & Judge, T.A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 901-910.

Cangemi, J.P., & Pfohl, W. (2009). Sociopaths in high places. *Organizational Development Journal*, 27(2),85-96.

Carson, M., Shanock, L., Heggestad, E., Andrew, A., Pugh, S., & Walter, M. (in press). The relationship between dysfunctional interpersonal tendencies, derailment potential behavior, and turnover. *Journal of Business and Psychology*.

Conger, J.A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*, 44-55.

Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor (NEO-FFI) Inventory Professional manual*. Odessa, FL. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*, 417-440.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: a definition and conceptual model. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207–216.

Furnham, A., Trickey, G., & Hyde, G. (2012). Bright aspects to dark side traits: dark side traits associated with work success. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52,908–913.

Goldman, A. (2006). Personality disorders in leaders: Implications of the DSM IV-TR in assessing dysfunctional organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 392–414.

Gudmundsson, A., & Southey, G. (2011). Leadership and the rise of the corporate psychopath: what can business schools do about the 'snakes inside'?  *e-Journal of Social & Behavioural Research in Business*, 2(2), 18–27.  http://www.ejsbrb.org.

Hare, R.D. (2009). *Without conscience: The disturbing world of psychopaths among us.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Higgs, M. (2009). The good, the bad and the ugly: leadership and narcissism. *Journal of Change Management*, 9,165-78.

Hogan, R. & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan* Development Survey Manual. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: a view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1/2), 40-51.

Hogan, R, Rashkin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. (2012).  *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience.* 7th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765-780.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1989). Leaders who self-destruct: The causes and cures. *Organizational Dynamics, 17*, 5-17.

Khoo, H. S., & Burch, G. St. J. (2008). The 'dark side' of leadership personality and transformational leadership: An exploratory study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 86-97.

Kovach, B.E. (1986). The derailment of fast-track managers. *Organizational Dynamics, 15*, 41-48.

Leslie, J. B., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). *A Look at Derailment Today: North America and Europe.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Lord, R.G. (1985). An information processing approach to social perceptions, leadership and behavioral measurement in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 7*, 87-128.

Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of destructively narcissistic managers. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16, 127–138.

McCall, M. & Lombardo, M. (1983). Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed (Tech. Rep. No. 21). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S.B., & Dukerich, J.M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*, 78-102.

Neuman, J.H., & Baron, R.M. (2005). Aggression in the workplace: A social-psychological perspectives. In S. Fox and P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive, Investigation of actors and targets*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ouimet, G. (2010). Dynamics of narcissistic leadership in organisations. Towards an integrated research model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(7), 713–726.

Pech, R.J., & Slade, B.W. (2007). Organizational sociopaths: rarely challenged, often promoted. Why? *Society and Business Review*, 2(3), 254-269.

Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: an empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership*, 6(4), 373–389.

Rolland, J.P., & De Fruyt, F. (2003). The validity of FFM personality dimensions and maladaptive traits to predict negative affect at work. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, 101-121.

Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 617–633.

Shaw, J.B., Erickson, A., & Harvey, M. (2011). A method for measuring destructive leadership and identifying types of destructive leaders in organisations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 575-590.

Stevens, G.W., Dueling, J.K., & Armenakis, A. (2012). Successful psychopaths: are they unethical decision-makers and why? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105, 139-149.

**Table 1  The HDS Dimensions and Descriptions**

| DSM-IV Personality Disorder | HDS Themes | Descriptions |
|---|---|---|
| Borderline | Excitable (MA) | Moody and hard to please; intense but short-lived enthusiasm for people, projects, or things |
| Paranoid | Skeptical (MA) | Cynical, distrustful, and doubting others' true intentions |
| Avoidant | Cautious (MA) | Reluctant to take risks for fear of being rejected or negatively evaluated |
| Schizoid | Reserved (MA) | Aloof, detached, and uncommunicative; lacking interest in or awareness of the feelings of others |
| Passive-Aggressive | Leisurely (MA) | Independent; ignoring people's requests and becoming irritated or argumentative if they persist |
| Narcissistic | Bold (MAG) | Unusually self-confident; feelings of grandiosity and entitlement; over-evaluation of one's capabilities |
| Antisocial | Mischievous (MAG) | Enjoying risk taking and testing the limits; needing excitement; manipulative, deceitful, cunning, and exploitative |
|  |  | Expressive, animated, and dramatic; wanting to be |

| Histrionic | Colorful (MAG) | noticed and needing to be the center of attention |
|---|---|---|
| Schizotypal | Imaginative (MAG) | Acting and thinking in creative and sometimes odd or unusual ways. |
| Obsessive-Compulsive | Diligent (MT) | Meticulous, precise, and perfectionistic; inflexible about rules and procedures; critical of others' performance |
| Dependent | Dutiful (MT) | Eager to please and reliant on others for support and guidance; reluctant to take independent action or go against popular opinion |

MA = Moving Away          MAG = Moving Against          MT = Moving Toward

Adapted from Hogan and Hogan (2001) as printed in Benson (2006)

**Table 2.  Common related terms for dark side leadership.**

| Author(s)<br><br>Group | Term | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• *Characteristics/Traits* | HDS Dimension |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Lubit, 2002** | Destructively Narcissistic Manager | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• being highly defensive when criticized (MAG)<br>• currying favor with superiors while failing to support and develop those below them (MT)<br>• devaluing and exploiting others (MAG)<br>• excessive self-promotion and attention-seeking behavior (MAG)<br>• excessively criticizing others (MA)<br>• harboring unfounded beliefs that others want to hurt them (MA)<br>• lack of concern for the needs of subordinates unless convenient (MA)<br>• scapegoating (MAG)<br>• seeing all events in terms of significance to their own careers (MAG)<br>• singular focus on what is best for them (MAG)<br>• trying to take all credit for success (MAG)<br>• undermining competitors for promotion (MAG)<br>• working with others is difficult<br>• *Characteristics/Traits*<br>• drive for power (MAG)<br>• outward self-confidence (MAG)<br>• ruthlessness (MAG) | • Bold<br><br>• Dutiful<br><br><br><br>• Mischievous<br><br>• Colorful<br><br><br>• Skeptical<br><br>• Skeptical<br><br><br>• Reserved<br><br><br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br><br><br>• Bold<br><br>• Colorful and Bold<br><br>• Bold & Mischievous<br><br>• Multiple dimensions<br><br><br>• Bold<br>• Bold or Colorful<br><br>• Bold |
| **Ouimet, 2010** | Narcissistic | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• exploit employees (MAG) | <br>• Mischievous |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Leader | • inhibit intellect of subordinates (MT)<br>• manipulate employees (MAG)<br>• motivate with deception (MAG)<br>• *Characteristics/Traits Listed*<br>• Charisma (MAG)<br>• self-interest (MAG) | • Diligent<br><br>• Mischievous<br><br>• Mischievous<br><br><br>• Colorful<br>•  Mischievous & Bold |
| **Rosenthal and Pittinsky, 2006** | Narcissistic Leader | • *Characteristics/Traits*<br>• Amorality (MAG)<br>• Arrogance (MAG)<br>• feelings of inferiority (MAG)<br>• hypersensitivity and anger (MA)<br>• insatiable need for recognition and superiority (MAG)<br>• irrationality and Inflexibility<br>• lack of empathy (MAG) | <br>• Mischievous<br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br>• Skeptical<br><br>• Bold<br><br><br>• Multiple dimensions<br>• Bold & Mischievous |
| *Destructive Leadership* | | | |
| **Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, and Einarsen, 2010** | Destructive Leader | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• Authoritarian (MAG)<br>• Autocratic (MAG)<br>• Machiavellian (MAG)<br>• Narcissistic (MAG)<br>• personalized charismatic (MAG) | <br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br>• Mischievous |
| **Shaw, Erickson and Harvey, 2011** | Destructive Leader | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• acting in a brutal bullying manner (MAG)<br>• inability to deal with interpersonal conflict or similar situations (MA)<br>• lying and other unethical behavior (MAG)<br>• micro-managing and over-controlling (MT)<br>• not having the skills to match the job<br>• unwillingness to change mind and listen to others | <br>• Bold<br><br>• Excitable & Reserved<br><br><br>• Mischievous<br><br>• Diligent<br><br>• Not applicable<br><br>• Imaginative |

| | | (MAG) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad, 2007** | Destructive Leader | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• Derailed (MA or MAG)<br><br>• supportive-disloyal<br>• tyrannical (MAG) | • Reserved or Colorful & Mischievous<br>• Multiple dimensions<br>• Bold |
| *Toxic Leadership* | | | |
| **Goldman, 2006** | Toxic Leader | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• Narcissistic (MAG)<br>• Antisocial (MA or MAG) | • Bold<br>• Reserved or Mischievous |
| **Pelletier, 2010** | Toxic Leader | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• Acting disengaged (MA)<br>• Being deceptive/lying (MAG)<br>• Being rigid (MT)<br>• Blaming others for the leader's mistakes (MAG)<br>• Coercion (MAG)<br>• Demeaning/marginalizing, or degrading (MAG)<br>• Emotional volatility (MA)<br>• Exhibiting favoritism (MAG)<br>• Forcing people to endure hardships (MAG)<br>• Harassment (including sexual) (MAG)<br>• Ignoring comments/ideas (MA or MAG)<br>• Inciting employee to chastise another (MAG)<br>• Ostracizing/disenfranchising employee (MAG & MA)<br>• Pitting in-group members against out-group members (MAG)<br>• Presenting toxic agendas as noble visions (MAG)<br>• Ridiculing/mocking (MAG)<br>• Social exclusion (MA)<br>• Stifling dissent (MAG & MA)<br>• Taking credit for others' | • Reserved or Leisurely<br>• Mischievous<br><br>• Diligent<br>• Bold<br><br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br><br>• Excitable<br>• Mischievous<br>• Bold<br><br>• Mischievous<br><br>• Reserved, Bold<br><br>• Bold & Mischievous<br><br>• Bold & Skeptical<br><br>• Bold & Mischievous<br><br><br>• Bold<br><br>• Bold & Mischievous<br>• Reserved<br>• Bold & Skeptical<br><br>• Bold & Colorful |

| | | work (MAG) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | • Threatening employees' job security (MAG) | • Bold |
| | | • Using physical acts of aggression (MAG) | • Mischievous & Bold |
| **Psychopaths /Sociopath Leadership** | | | |
| **Boddy, 2011** | Corporate Psychopath | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• Bullying (MAG)<br>• unfair supervision (MAG)<br>• *Characteristics/Traits*<br>• Psychopathic (MAG) | <br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br><br>• Mischievous + others |
| **Gudmundss on and Southey, 2011** | Corporate Psychopath<br><br>(Snakes Inside) | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• abusive supervision<br>• bullying (MAG)<br>• Machiavellianism (MAG)<br>• Narcissistic (MAG)<br>• Psychopathic (MAG)<br>• *Characteristics/Traits*<br>• ego-centric (MAG)<br>• opportunistic (MAG)<br>• ruthless (MAG)<br>• self-serving (MAG)<br>• toxic (MAG)<br>• shameless (MAG) | • Multiple Dimensions<br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br>• Mischievous + others<br><br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br>• Bold<br>• Bold & Colorful<br>• Bold<br>• Mischievous |
| **Stevens, Dueling and Armenakis, 2012** | Successful Psychopath | • *Behavioral Tendencies*<br>• Impulsivity (MA)<br>• Risky behavior (MAG)<br>• Unethical decision making (MAG)<br>• *Characteristics/Traits*<br>• General lack of empathy (MAG)<br>• General Irresponsibility (MAG) | <br>• Excitable<br>• Mischievous<br>• Mischievous<br><br>• Bold<br><br>• Mischievous |
| **Dysfunction al Leader\*** | | | |

| **Carson et al., in press** | Dysfunctional Leader | <ul><li>avoiding change (MA)</li><li>avoiding decision making (MA & MT)</li><li>betraying trust (MAG)</li><li>excluding others (MAG & MA)</li><li>under-delivering (MAG & MA)</li><li>undermanaging (MAG, MT, MA)</li></ul> | <ul><li>Cautious</li><li>Cautious & Dutiful</li><li>Mischievous</li><li>Bold, Colorful, Reserved</li><li>Colorful, Excitable</li><li>Colorful, Dutiful, Reserved</li></ul> |

**Table 3: Conger's three areas of failure for the dark side leader**

| The Source of Failed Vision |
|---|
| The vision reflects the internal needs of leaders rather than those of the market or constituents. **Bold (MAG)** |
| The resources needed to achieve vision have been seriously miscalculated. **Bold (MAG)** |
| An unrealistic assessment or distorted perception of market and constituent needs holds sway. **Bold (MAG)** |
| A failure to recognize environmental changes prevents redirection of the vision. **Bold (MAG)** |
|  |

| Leader's Communication and Impression Management Skills |
|---|
| Exaggerated self-descriptions. **(Bold, MAG)** |
| Exaggerated claims for the vision. **(Bold, MAG)** |
| A technique of fulfilling stereotypes and images of uniqueness to manipulate audiences. **(Bold, MAG)** |
| A habit of gaining commitment by restricting negative information and maximizing positive information. **(Bold, MAG)** |
| Use of anecdotes to distract attention away from negative statistical information. **(Bold, MAG)** |
| Creation of an illusion of control through affirming information and attributing negative outcomes to external causes. **(Bold, MAG)** |
|  |

| Management Practices |
|---|
| Poor management of people networks, especially superiors and peers. **Colorful (MAG), Dutiful (MT), Reserved (MA)** |
| Unconventional behavior that alienates. **Imaginative (MAG)** |
| Creation of disruptive "in group/out group" rivalries. **Bold & Mischievous (MAG)** |
| An autocratic, controlling management style. **Bold (MAG) Diligent (MT)** |
| An informal/impulsive style that is disruptive and dysfunctional. **Mischievous &** |

| |
|---|
| **Imaginative (MAG)** |
| Alternation between idealizing and devaluing others, particularly direct reports. **Reserved & Skeptical (MA) Bold, Colorful & Mischievous (MAG)** |
| Creation of excessive dependence in others. **Bold (MAG)** |
| Failure to manage details and effectively act as an administrator. **Reserved (MA) Colorful (MAG)** |
| Attention to the superficial  **Colorful (MAG)** |
| Absence from operations. Reserved (MA) **Colorful & Mischievous (MAG)** |
| Failure to develop successors of equal ability. **Bold (MAG)** |