

Dark Side Leaders: Are their Intentions Benign or Toxic?

Robert Cote
Lindenwood University

The research will assess and evaluate dark side leadership, including an overview on leadership spectrum, potential causes, derailment, and options for minimizing unethical leadership in organizations. Based on current research, dark side leaders can possess destructive traits that result in toxic and negative consequences with employee morale, productivity, and organizational cultures. These traits can range from low risk to high risk and are manageable. Another aspect of this research is to explore inherent genes that may trigger personality disorders based on internal and external pressures within organizations. Personality disorder traits are extreme risk and result in dysfunctional maladaptive behaviors that may not be resolved. Based on the range of dark traits, proposed approaches will provide options for dark side leaders with unethical behaviors, including best practices, recommendations, therapy, and medications. The benefit of this research is to identify, assess, and provide solutions for minimizing destructive behaviors in dark side leaders.

LEADERSHIP INTRODUCTION

Ethical Leadership has gained popularity and has captivated the attention of the public, corporations, and academic institutions due to unethical behaviors resulting in corporate scandals. As a result, ethical leadership articles have increased in the journals, bookstores are providing books on leaders, and colleges/universities are developing and implementing leadership programs. Over the last 60 years, leadership has evolved from an authoritarian perspective to a focus on followers using behavioral and ethical approaches.

Stogdill & Bass (1974), explain the definition of leadership has many different meanings based on many classification systems, including focus on group processes, personality perspectives, behaviors, power influence, skills approach, and many more reasons. Although researchers have not been able to provide a common definition for leadership, we can agree leadership is complex and will continue to have a variation of meanings by a diverse group of researchers. In the last 20 years, emerging leadership approaches have focused on ethical leadership, including authentic leadership, spiritual leadership, and servant leadership.

Due to the increase in dark side leaders, unethical behaviors have resulted in a number of corporate scandals in society, including Tyco, Enron, WorldComm, Bernie Madoff Ponzi scam, Wells Fargo, Health South, Volkswagen emissions, Samsung (Johnson, 2018; Mathews & Heimer, 2016; Mathews & Gandel, 2015). The first corporate scandal was the Medici Bank dating back to 1492 (Parks, 2006).

Because of these toxic behaviors, a number of leadership approaches focused on ethical leadership have emerged. The framework of ethical leadership is based on the ethical theories developed by Aristotle

(384 – 322 B.C.), Plato (427 – 347 B.C.), and Socrates (470 – 399 B.C.). Ethical theory provide the rules and principles that help guide individuals in making decisions in ethical dilemmas, i.e., good or bad and right or wrong. Ethics based on morals and values those individuals and societies consider appropriate (Johnson, 1965; Velesquez, 1992).

One of the approaches is authentic leadership with a focus on the authenticity (genuine) of leaders. Employees are in search of leaders that can be trusted, honest, and will be around for a while. Another approach introduced by Greenleaf is servant leadership based on the seminal work in the 70's. However, it has gained momentum due to recent research on the topic. Similar to other leadership approaches based on skills and behaviors, servant leader's share power, relate to the needs of followers, and develop them through empowerment and development to their fullest capacities (Hale & Fields, 2007). Compared to servant leadership, spiritual leadership interests have become a focus in the workplace due to the linkage between spiritual values and increase in organizational performance (Oswick, 2009). Spiritual leaders view leadership as a calling tend to demonstrate a higher degree in honesty and integrity. Both servant and spiritual leadership focus on the followers unlike dark side leaders focus on their self-interest (Judge, 1999).

DARK SIDE OF LEADERSHIP

In the last 20 years, dark side leadership research has increased due to the highly publicized corporate scandals. Research efforts focused on understanding the dark traits, causes, and solutions for minimizing unethical toxic behaviors in leaders (Trevino & Brown, 2005). What does it take to be a successful leader? Based on the abundance of research on leadership, evidence supports both good and bad leaders. Good leaders place ethics at the core of leadership, while bad leaders tend to follow unethical behaviors and cause destructive outcomes in organizations (Burns, 1978). Compared to good leadership that has positive outcomes, dark side leadership has a perceived destructive and toxic effect on employees, organizations, and performance. According to Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad (2007), explain dark side leaders use unethical behaviors that create a toxic work environment resulting in negative consequences that affect organizational goals and tasks, performance, company resources, motivation, employee morale, and job satisfaction.

According to Lipman and Blumen (2005), toxic leader's destructive behaviors leave followers worse-off than when they found them. Many destructive leaders possess dysfunctional characteristics, including insatiable ambition, lack of integrity, arrogance, and reckless disregard to their actions. Dark side leaders put their personal interests before followers and the organization. Hogan (2015) explains dark side leadership has a life of its own, which means there is a "vital link between personality, leadership, and team performance" (p. 1).

Researchers have identified distinctive characteristics that attribute to the effectiveness of leaders, including positive task oriented traits (openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and emotional intelligence) that attribute to effective leaders and positive/negative traits. Psychologists believe unethical leaders are the result of negative (destructive) personality traits, including narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). What is derailment and causes for leaders to jeopardize their career?

Leadership Derailment

What is derailment? Derailment is a phenomenon in organizations when leaders fail at being effective and tend to fall of course. Studies conducted in other countries and organizations conclude managers and leaders fail in their career due to the lack of soft (human) skills rather than technical skills. Derailed leaders are successful and effective until they reached a plateau resulting in fired, left the organization, or retired (Zhang & Hannum, 2013).

Jon Bentz, responsible for Psychological Research and Services at Sears, Roebuck & Jon Bentz, responsible for Psychological Research and Services at Sears, Roebuck & Company for over 30 years

until he retired in 1985. Bentz (1967) was the forerunner of management derailment and conducted research on Sears's executives using a battery of psychological tests, including:

- Mental ability (ACE): Problem solving and linguistic,
- Personality traits (Guilford-Martin): social ability, reflectiveness, optimism, emotional control, serious versus carefree, general activity, social leadership, dominance, self-confidence, composure, objectiveness, agreeableness, and tolerance,
- Motivations (Allport-Vernon): analytical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious, and
- Vocational interests (Kuder): mechanical, computational, scientific, persuasive, artistic, literacy, musical, social service, and clerical (Bentz, 1967).

Based on the findings, Bentz's (1967, 1985, 1990) research identifies a couple of concerns that could lead to leadership derailment. Leader's behaviors focuses on individual personality traits versus sociological or organizational. The leader's self-interests are more important than working in developing teams, relationships, and culture to achieve organizational goals. Leader's focus on long-term career expectations is consistent with other studies conducted on Sears's executives. Compared to other populations, Sear's executives focus on personal long-term goals to ensure job security, job promotions, and economic rewards. As a result, leaders follow the theory of Laissez-Faire leadership style follows a "hands-off" approach resulting in a lack of decision-making, relinquishes responsibility, lack of feedback to employees. Leader's also neglect making decisions for the organizations immediate needs, but would focus on developing personal relations for upward job mobility. One variable that can contribute to leadership derailment at Sears is the lack of social leadership. Social leaders are able to facilitate change during times of uncertainty, align people, develop and implement a vision, and communicate a common purpose for achieving organizational goals. This characteristic is associated with Sears's long-term executive success or failure (Bentz 1967; Bentz 1985; Bentz 1990).

Today, leadership studies have focused on approaches for developing new skills to become an effective leader. However, the increase in corporate scandals have shifted research focus to what causes leaders to derail and promote unethical practices. Research conducted for the last twenty years by the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) conclude five leader flaws that lead to management derailment.

Five Key Leader Weaknesses

Based on the statistics related to job stress, it is apparent that employees and leaders job pressures create a working environment that is not productive. As the pressure increases, the leader's behaviors will change the relationship between employees and leaders. For unsuccessful leaders, they tend to promote themselves and personal needs rather than doing their job, they fail to meet business objectives and goals, and may not be trustworthy, have lack of empathy, and insensitive to others feedback and criticism. They have a difficult time developing a vision, see the big picture, and unable to develop teams. Based on CCL research, the five key weaknesses of leaders are: (1) performance problems – failure to meet business objectives, due to excess self-promotion, lack of focus and attention to priorities, and playing office politics. (2) Problems with relationships – inability to use soft skills with colleagues, co-workers, customers, direct reports, and others. Types of behaviors can include insensitivity, critical, manipulative, and dominance resulting in lack of trust, poor role model, and de-motivate employees. (3) Difficulty changing: unable to handle pressure and learn from or reject feedback and criticisms from other employees. Also, not willing to change or adapt leadership abilities to meet the needs of employees and new organizational demands. (4) Difficulty building and leading a team: unable to build successful and product teams, not hiring the right people for the jobs, and ineffective leadership of employees. (5) Too narrow management experience: unable to see the big picture, develop and implement a vision, lack of communication, and the inability to function outside current position to lead the organization (Zhang et al., 2013).

Leaders coping with job pressure may lead to unethical negative traits and behaviors, which can create a work environment that affects employee morale, productivity, performance goals, and career derailment for the leader. Leadership derailment may also result from unhealthy motivations, job

pressures, and “dark triad” traits that contribute to a leader’s behavior from inspirational to toxic (McCall & Lombardo 1983).

Individual Forces - Unhealthy Motivations

Motivation refers to the internal forces and external forces that arouses individual’s enthusiasm and persistence to act or accomplish a certain course of action, including the accomplishment of organizational goals (Porter, Bigley, & Steers, 2003; West & Patterson, 1996). Based on dark side leader’s behaviors, it is important to pay attention to the motivations that can cause more harm than good with followers (Palmer, 1996). Palmer (1996) describes unethical motivations as “monsters” or “internal enemies within leaders as unethical behaviors that create bad outcomes. The following five unethical motivations include: (1) Insecurity – leaders tend to act through extroversion when in doubt. Some leaders who are low on extraversion may be perceived as quiet, socially unassertive, and withdrawn (Jones, 2006). They also project these insecurities on followers when they try to meet their own selfish needs. (2) Battleground mentality – leaders tend to use images to describe wins/losses, allies/enemies while doing battle with the competition (Palmer, 1996). Amazon’s Jeff Bezos has declared war on the competition to increase the competitive advantage (Stone, 2013). Is it productive to undercut prices, offer free shipping, and forego profits to beat the competition? Most companies have developed cross-functional teams to increase productivity through cooperation versus competition. (3) Functional atheism – leaders believe the organization cannot function without their involvement and complete responsibility in all actions with followers, groups, and organization. “I am the one who needs to make it happen” (Palmer, 1996, p.205). Of course, this has detrimental consequences and destroys both the leader and follower. Some of the common symptoms include workaholic, unhealthy family relationships, burnout, stressed, and mindless activity (Palmer, 1996). (4) Fear – leaders need to be aware of the range of emotions, including signs of apprehension, anxiety, nervousness, consternation, concern, dread, panic, and terror (Goleman, 1998). A leader that fears chaos will tend to avoid interaction with followers, implement rules and procedures, and stifle innovation and creativity (Palmer, 1996). (5) Denying death – leaders that fail do not get the opportunity to learn through their mistakes. Instead, leaders deny the fact that projects and programs that are not useful should end instead of prolonging the inevitable. What are job pressures for both employees, managers, and leaders?

Job Pressures

According to data from organizational climate surveys, Hogan (2014) states 80% of workers jobs are stressful, and 75% of workers bosses make it a stressful work environment. This creates additional stress load for workers. Another statistic states 73% of workers stated they “would not want their boss’s job!” (NIOSH, 2014; Hogan, 2014). Based on the statistics of bad leaders, it seems inevitable that the stress is costing companies \$300 billion annually (Hogan, 2014).

The National Institute for Occupational Safety, Health (NIOSH) is part of the U.S. Department of Health, and Human Services (DHHS) and directed by Congress to conduct research on health, occupational safety, and work stress. In 1999, NIOSH published a report on stress at work. NIOSH (1999) indicate the following statistics, “40% of workers reported their job was very or extremely stressful”, three fourths believe job stress is greater than previous generations, 25% of workers believe their job is the number one stressor, and job stress is associated with family problems, financial problems, and health (NIOSH, 2014).

Attitudes in the American Workplace VII, conducted a survey called The Seventh Annual Labor Day Survey using the Stress Place Workplace Scale developed by Marlin Company and American Institute for Stress. The results indicate “80% of workers feel stress on the job”, nearly half say they need help in dealing with stress at work, and 35% associate physical and emotional disabilities due to job stress (Marlin & AIS, 2009). In the next section, leaders key weaknesses will be explored that can cause derailment and unethical decisions, include performance and relationship problems, lack of management experience, adapting to change, including developing and leading a team (Zhang et al., 2013).

Leaders coping with job pressure may lead to unethical negative traits and behaviors, which can create a work environment that affects employee morale, productivity, performance goals, and career derailment for the leader. In the next section, “dark triad” traits and HDS 11 dimensions will provide rationale for dark leaders.

“DARK TRIAD” TRAITS

How do dark traits and behaviors affect leaders and organizations? Research conducted by Hogan and Hogan (2001) focused on dark traits based on DSM-IV Axis II personality disorders. Paulhus and Williams (2002) approach focused on motivators elevated by dark leaders inflates self and harm to others while Hogan and Hogan (2001) approach focused on leaders that lost focus resulting in dark side characteristics emerging. Negative traits known as the “dark triad” and Hogan’s (2001) HDS 11 dark traits will provide context on dark leader’s behaviors in the next section (Paulus & Williams, 2002)

Negative traits can range from low risk, high risk, and extreme risk. Organizations can use assessment tools to evaluate managers and leaders traits. Based on the assessment results, the data can help develop recommendations for implementing effective and ethical leadership. The three dark traits discussed in this section, may be manageable in leaders willing to change. However, the same dark traits diagnosed in personality disorders are extreme and may not be resolved in leaders, including therapy and medication treatment. Later in the paper, current and proposed research will examine options for minimizing or eliminating dark traits in leaders.

Narcissism

Narcissists are self-absorbed and self-confident with feelings of superiority and drive for power and glory. According to research, low levels of narcissism can be normal and healthy for leaders, such as assurance in our abilities and opportunity to recover from setbacks. In the short term, moderate narcissists can emerge in a positive light. Some of the traits include confidence, outgoing, bold, visionary, and inspirational to followers. (Brunell, Gentry, Campbell, Hoffman, Kuhnert, & DeMarree, 2008). However, high levels of narcissism can be counterproductive in effective leadership. For example, narcissist leaders will emerge that express grandiose self-importance, fantasize about being important, believe they are special, and have unrealistic views. These leaders demand admiration, abuse power, claim special privileges, have anger outbursts, are dishonest, fail to acknowledge subordinates, and have autocratic leadership style. More importantly, narcissist leaders put the employees and organization at risk because their visions are unrealistic and difficult to implement (Johnson & Orange, 2003). Based on current trends, there is an increase of narcissism based on research scores among college students between 1982 and 2009. Based on the results, college students display similar traits of dark side leaders, including narcissism and less empathetic. If these trends continue, we can expect more narcissistic leaders in the future (Brown, Sautter, Littvay, Sautter, & Bearnese, 2010; Twenge & Foster, 2010; Twenge & Campbell, 2009).

Machiavellianism

Niccolo Machiavelli was a philosopher, political strategist, historian, and writer (*The Prince*) during the Renaissance. The term Machiavellianism is a manipulative approach for gaining opportunities through unethical behaviors while increasing one’s power for personal gain (Brooks, 2013). In the *The Prince*, Machiavelli argues that leaders must put results over principles in the role of protecting the social and economic well-being of the state. In society, leaders can use power for the protection, stability, and safety of employee’s in organizations (Brooks, 2013). Pfeffer (2010) explains leaders need to use *bare-knuckle strategies* to gain influence and results with individuals. In order for leaders to make an impact, leaders need to be comfortable acquiring and using power and politics. Power is often associated with leadership and people view leaders (good and bad) in leadership positions to have power. In organizations, leaders have two types of power: position power and personal power. Machiavellian (unethical) leaders tend to have a position of power based on a rank or particular office in an organization. Ethical leaders influence

others based on personal power or a position derived by followers as knowledgeable or likeable (Kotter, 1990).

Although we operate in a world that leader's emphasis, agreeableness and collaboration to influence people, Machiavelli believes, it is possible to accomplish great things while operating under unethical principles. In fact, Machiavellian leaders are willing to use any mean to sustain and protect the organization (Pfeffer, 2011). Machiavellian leaders have the following characteristics, including (1) guarding for risks and threat to their power. Machiavellian leaders will use manipulation to pit people against each other, shift loyalties when necessary, and assume people are deceitful, greedy, and unpredictable. (2) Machiavellian leaders have the premise well-liked leaders are not the most effective and organizations will be destroyed if too generous or merciful. (3) Machiavellian leaders are deceitful in maintaining power with the intent of protecting the organization, and (4) Machiavellian leaders use contingent rewards and punishment to get results and people to follow the rules, even if it requires exploiting the fears and desires of people (Evans, 2013; Ormeci, 2011; Hill, 2009; Gillis, 1995)

Essentially, Machiavellian leaders are motivated to gain and use personal power to accomplish their needs compared to other approaches that use power to influence others to accomplish tasks or goals. Machiavellian leaders are skilled at manipulating others, able to engage in deception to get their way, enjoy personal success in the organization, and put their groups in danger. Machiavellian leaders tend to be less skilled in leadership, engage in unethical practices that put organizations at risk, and will succeed at any cost (Kessler, Bandelli, Spector, Borman, Nelson, & Penney, 2010; Becker & O'Hair, 2007). How do Machiavellian leaders disguise their intentions without followers suspecting manipulation?

Psychopathy

Psychopaths have a lack of concern for others, lack of conscience, and impulsive behavior. Compared to narcissists and Machiavellian, they are less callous and may have feelings of remorse or guilt. Psychopaths use their extroversion, charming, and energetic personality to enter into organizations. Once they are hired, they lie and manipulate others to gain power and prestige. In their quest to rise to the top of the company, they will use any tactic to win at their game regardless of others. Psychopath leaders undermine ethical boundaries and can be a toxic influence in the organization (Boddy, 2015; Boddy, 2014, Boddy, Ladyshevsky, & Galvin, 2010). Some of the negative behaviors that have destructive impact on followers and organizations, include bullying and humiliating workers, engage in fraud, use the position for self-interest, create conflicts (chaos) among groups, increase absenteeism, lower morale, decrease productivity, lack of corporate social responsibility, lack of empathy for employees, increase turnover, lower job satisfaction, and damage the environment (Boddy, 2006).

Eleven Dimensions of Dark Side Leaders

Based on three "dark triad" traits (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), psychologists Robert Hogan and Joyce Hogan have developed an inventory of 11 dimensions (personality traits) that correlate with the "dark side" traits and divided into three factors based on severity. Based on each factor, dimensions are assessed on a range from low-risk (no concern) and high-risk (concern) used to predict leaders dark side behaviors. In factor 1, personality traits used by leaders to achieve security by intimidating people and pushing them away, include excitable, cautious, skeptical, reserved, and leisurely use personality traits. In factor 2, personality traits used by leaders for self-promotion by enticing and engaging people to gain recognition, include bold, mischievous, colorful, and imaginative. In factor 3, personality traits used by leaders to manipulate and control while gaining approval by upper management through loyalty and essential for the organization, include diligent and dutiful. The definitions for each dimension is in Table 1: *HDS: Taxonomy of the Dark Side of Leadership Personality*, are available in the dark side assessment tools section (Hogan & Kaiser, 2006; Hogan & Kaiser, 2015).

Leaders coping with unhealthy motivations and pressures may lead to the emergence of a wide range of unethical behaviors that create a work environment that affects employee morale, productivity, performance goals, and career derailment for the leader. Based on the risk factor, low risk behaviors may

go unnoticed compared to high-risk behaviors that trigger a destructive and maladaptive behavior with unhealthy consequences for the leader, organization, and employees.

In the next section, a brief overview of the following leadership questionnaires will examine leadership questionnaires for assessing leader's behaviors, traits, and leadership styles, including Leadership Trait Questionnaire (LTQ), Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBDQ), and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Many assessment tools used by organizations provide results to evaluate effective leadership potential.

LEADERSHIPS ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Many types of questionnaires have been developed for organizations to assess leaders abilities, including traits, skills, behaviors, and styles. The purpose of the assessments is to identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for development. The results provide valuable information for the organization about each individual's unique attributes and skills to ascertain how they can best serve the organization. The following leadership questionnaires (instruments) used for effective leader assessments:

- **Leaderships Trait Questionnaire (LTQ):** Organizations have used the standard trait questionnaires for assessing individuals, including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) personality inventor or Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). The LTQ (see Appendix A) measures personal characteristics of leadership with five raters and self-rating. The results will assess strengths and weaknesses and compare results with followers (Northouse, 2016).
- **Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBDQ):** The LBDQ questionnaire (see Appendix B) developed by Hemphill and Coons in 1957 with 150 questions to assess leadership behaviors. In 1963, Stogdill introduced an abbreviated version called the LBDQ-XII. The questionnaire developed used to measure two types of leadership behaviors, including task (transactional leader) behavior and relationship (transformational leader) behaviors. The results will provide a better understanding of your leadership behavior.
- **Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ):** Bass (1985) developed an earlier version of the MLQ (see Appendix C) to measure follower's perceptions of leaders behaviors based on the factors in the questionnaire. The MLQ constructed based on his initial research involved interviewing 70 executives from South Africa. The MLQ (Form 5X) is an abbreviated version of MLQ used to measure transformational leader, transactional leader, and passive/avoidant leadership styles. Based on the analysis, the transformational leadership (individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation) relates to positive effects, transactional leadership (contingent rewards and punishment) relates to outcomes, and passive/avoidant (laissez-faire) leadership have negatively effects on effectiveness in the organization (p. 189).

The LTQ, LBDQ, and MLQ are excellent screen tools for assessing leaders with effective leadership potential. If organizations develop and implement processes for using leadership assessment tools, the results can provide a pro-active approach for screening leaders with positive ethical traits compared to dark traits assessed in reactive approach.

What is the industry standard assessment tool used for identifying leaders with dark side traits? Hogan Development Survey (HDS) assessment tool is the industry standard assessment tool for assessing low to high-risk behaviors in leaders by many organizations. The 11 dimensions used in the HDS compare with the DSM-IV, Axis II taxonomy personality disorders (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). In the next section, Hogan assessment tool, personality disorder background, personality disorder constructs, and comparison between HDS and DSM-IV personality disorder constructs.

DARK SIDE LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Hogan Development Survey (HDS)

For the assessment of dark side leaders, psychologists Robert and Joyce Hogan (1997) developed the Hogan Development Survey ([Hogan Assessments - Hogan Development Survey](#)) including a taxonomy of dark side leader personality (see table 1) divided into 11 scales. The HDS is an industry standard for predicting leader's blind spots and divided into 11 dimensions (personality traits) with 33 subscales. HDS helps organizations recognize leaders blind spots, develop leaders to be effective in using strengths to develop successful teams (Hogan & Kaiser, 2006; Hogan & Kaiser, 2015).

HDS is the only assessment tool used to assess leader's dark side personality that can lead to leadership derailment. Organizations use HDS to help identify potential blind spots that may disrupt employee morale, performance, and productivity (Hogan, 2017).

TABLE 1
HDS: TAXONOMY OF THE DARK SIDE OF LEADERSHIP PERSONALITY

Scales	Definition	Low Scores	High Scores
Excitable	Temperamental, easily irritated, hard to please, precarious and intense relationships, emotionally unpredictable.	Appear to be calm and lack energy, enthusiasm, and passion	Develop emotional highs and lows with people and projects
Cautious	Averse to criticism and rejection, self-effacing, resistant to change, slow or lack of making decisions.	May be willing to take risks, be indecisive without risk assessment	May be risk averse, reluctant in taking risks, resulting in few mistakes
Skeptical	Motives are vindictive, mistrustful, contemptuous, and sensitive to criticism, negative attitude.	Trusting to the point of being vulnerable.	May be mistrustful, vindictive and cynical in anticipation of betrayed.
Reserved	Detached, uncommunicative, unresponsive to the feeling of others, cold, tough, withdrawn	Resolute under pressure and tough in caring for others	Insensitive to moral issues, uncommunicative, and indifferent towards others
Leisurely	Procrastinating, stubborn, and demonstrates opposition to improved procedure or process, openly cooperative, do not disclose feelings, obstinate, uncooperative.	Appear cooperative and charming while lacking direction or plan of action	Passive aggressive behavior (mean)
Bold	Overly self-assured, grandiose, egotistical, inflated feelings of self-esteem/confidence	Lack of self-confidence, courage, and charisma	Overly confident and self-promoting resulting in the unable to learn from mistakes and admit wrongdoing.

Scales	Definition	Low Scores	High Scores
Mischievous	Disguise true motives, manipulative, impulsive, delightful/appealing, risk-taking, limit testing through deviant behaviors.	Compliant, conservative, and cautious in learning new things	Are deceptive, ignore rules, exploitive, and lies to others
Colorful	Self-dramatizer, theatrical, elicit attention, interruptive, and lack of effective listening skills.	Are modest, quiet, self-effacing in seeking attention.	Overly dramatic, attention seeker, and distracting
Imaginative	Interesting, creative, imaginative, grandiose flights of ideas, act in unusual, unconventional, or eccentric ways.	Practical, follow routine, and lack out of box thinking and new ideas	May be unpredictable, bad judgment, that leads to unusual ideas and loss of credibility
Diligent	Difficult to please, perfectionist meticulous, thorough, detailed, task oriented, tends to micromanage	High standards, hard worker; self-sacrificing, and tend to over delegate	Rigid, over controlling, and micromanager
Dutiful	Reluctant in making decisions, eager, willing to please authority	Tend to resent authority and act independently	To a great extent worries about pleasing authority (management), team player, and considerate.

(Hogan & Kaiser, 2006; Hogan & Kaiser, 2015; Hogan, 2017).

The HDS contains 168 items developed in the form of statements. The responses will be using a 2-point scale (0 = disagree, 1 = agree), each of the 11 scales contains 14 items (range from 0 to 14), and no overlap among the 11 scales used in the assessment. For assessing leaders, the high score measures the more dysfunctional tendencies, derailers, or overused strengths. High scores may get leaders fired, derailed or forced to retire. Low scores can represent underused strengths overlooked by organizations. The HDS examines and interprets the full range of scores based on the 11 scales for predicting behaviors that may be critical to career success (Hogan & Kaiser, 2006; Hogan & Kaiser, 2015; Hogan, 2017).

According to Chamorro-Premuzic (2017), employees, managers, and leaders display three out of 11 dark side traits and 40% possess dark side traits that can be extreme and cause toxic and destructive behaviors at work, risk of career derailment, demotion, and fired (Kinicki, p. 475 #10). Dark side leaders can create havoc and destruction in organizations that affect employees, organizational culture, productivity, and morale. Personality disorders are extreme behaviors that are not resolved through coaching, mentoring, or self-reflection. The next section will provide an overview on personality disorders and comparison with HDS 11 dimensions to provide the difference between manageable and unmanageable (Hogan & Kaiser, 2006; Hogan & Kaiser, 2015; Hogan, 2017).

PERSONALITY DISORDERS BACKGROUND

Personality disorder definition “is a type of mental disorder in which you have a rigid and unhealthy pattern of thinking, functioning and behaving” (Mayo Clinic, 2017, p.1). Personality disorders can make it difficult for individuals to interact with people and situations. A dark side leader may not be aware of surroundings, difficulty understanding situations, or lack of appreciation for others in the organization.

As a result, this can create issues and problems in establishing relationships with employees, colleagues, and others. A person with a personality disorder may not realize this type of behavior is not normal and perceive it to be a natural way of thinking. For leaders with personality disorders, the effectiveness will be based on their distinctive negative characteristics or traits, including narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. As a result, leaders may be passionate and charismatic, although their behaviors provoke counterproductive work environment instead of influencing followers (Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2010; Pfeffer, 2010; Pfeffer, 2011)

Personality Cluster Types

For personality disorders, they are categorized based on three general types, including cluster A – individuals tend to act odd, have eccentric thinking or behavior (APA, 2017). Personality types may include schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoid personality disorder. Cluster B – individuals tend to be overly emotional or unpredictable thinking, unpredictable behavior, and dramatic (APA, 2017). Types may include histrionic, borderline, narcissistic, and antisocial personality disorders. Cluster C – individuals tend to be anxious, fearful behavior, and fearful thinking (APA, 2017). Personality types may include obsessive-compulsive, dependent, and avoidant. For dark side leaders, they tend to be Cluster Type B disorders, i.e., narcissistic and antisocial/psychopathy personality disorders. Individuals with personality disorders show signs in early teens and early adulthood. Based on the number of personality disorders, some individuals may not show signs until middle ages. For example, dark side leaders may not show signs until exposed to job pressures.

Causes

Based on research, the precise cause of personality disorders is unknown. However, personality disorders may be the combination of environmental influences (surroundings, events/situations, and relationships) and genes. When an individual possesses certain genes, they may become vulnerable to a personality disorder. If individuals are susceptible to an external event/situation, this may cause the development of a personality disorder (APA, 2017).

Risk Factors

Certain risk factors have the potential to develop or trigger a personality disorder; include (1) childhood with conduct/behavior disorder, (2) family members with personality disorders, (3) other mental disorders, variants in brain chemistry and structure, (4) abusive family, and (5) chaotic and unstable family life. Based on personality disorder types, causes, and risk factors, dark side leaders can be identified by one the following negative “dark side” traits: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy (APA, 2017).

COMPARE PERSONALITY DISORDER CONSTRUCTS AND HDS DIMENSIONS

The abundance of research has focused on solutions for minimizing unethical traits in dark leaders. Hogan & Hogan (1997) have been on the forefront for developing an assessment tool for predicting behaviors that can derail leaders resulting in negative outcomes in organizations. In table 2 (see below) a comparison between HDS dimensions and DSM–V constructs are provided.

TABLE 2
HOGAN DEVELOPMENTS SURVEY COMPARED TO DSM-V

HDS Dimension	Description – High Score	DSM – IV Construct	Description
Excitable	People may avoid due to emotional highs and lows	Borderline	Intense and unstable social relationships, self-image, identity disturbance, impulsivity that has potential damage.
Skeptical	May be risk averse and incisiveness, i.e., fewer mistakes	Paranoid	Pervasive distrust of others, including even friends, family, and partner
Cautious	May be mistrustful, vindictive, litigious and cynic with others	Avoidant	Inability to function in social setting, feel inferior and unattractive, and fear of rejection, criticized, or embarrassed.
Reserved	Insensitive to moral issues, lack of moral decision making, uncommunicative, and unresponsive to others.	Schizoid	Detached from social and sexual relationships, reserved, prone to examine own emotional and mental state.
Leisurely	Passive aggressive behaviors towards others, include aggression, stubbornness, and intentional inefficiency	Negativistic (Passive-Aggressive)	Procrastination, negative attitude, indolent, stubbornness, neglect, perfectionism, forgetfulness, intentional inefficiency, truancy, and outright sabotage.
Bold	Overly confident and self-promoting, not able to learn from mistakes, and admit wrongdoing	Narcissistic	Lacks empathy, sense of entitlement, grandiosity and need for admiration, envious of others, lies to others, and takes advantage of others to achieve personal needs.
Mischievous	Are deceptive, disregard rules, take advantage of others, and lies for personal gain.	Antisocial	Disregard for the feelings of others, does not conform to social norms, irritable and aggressive, impulsively, lack of remorse, and consistent irresponsibility.
Colorful	Theatrical, elicits excessive drama, attention seeker, and interrupts.	Histrionic	Excessive attention seeking, uncomfortable in social settings when not center of attention, exaggerated expression of emotions, and theatrical.
Imaginative	May be unpredictable, poor decision making leads to unusual ideas and loss of credibility	Schizotypal	Social and interpersonal deficits hinder close relationships, ideas of reference, magical thinking, odd speech, and paranoid ideation.
Diligent	Inflexible, excessive control over situations and others, and micromanager	Obsessive-compulsive	Perfectionism, orderliness, and control, lack of flexibility, openness, and efficiency, preoccupied with details, excessive devotion to work, and inflexible with matters pertaining to ethics, mortality, and values.
Dutiful	Extreme behaviors to please authority (management), team player, and considerate.	Dependent	Excessive need to be cared for, fear of separation, difficulty making decisions, difficulty initiating, feel helpless when alone, relationship needy

(Hogan & Hogan, 1997; APA, 2014).

For the table, each dimension and construct have provided details for understanding how this relates to a leader with dark side traits and behaviors. The dimensions provided by HDS are the high scores from the HDS assessments and closely resemble the constructs used in the DSM-IV for personality disorders. Based on the comparisons, the HDS high scores are a high risk and can be manageable with effective leader development, coaching, and willingness by the leader to change. In contrast, when comparing the HDS dimensions to the DSM-IV constructs provided are extreme risk and will not remit without professional clinical intervention (Hogan & Kaiser, 2015).

HOW TO HARNESS DARK SIDE PERSONALITY?

Organizations need leaders that are effective and successful in building a strong organizational culture, based on empowerment, collaboration, and diversity. Unfortunately, some leaders go off track for various reasons, including internal factors, external stimuli, organizational pressures, lack of skills, job fit, lack of ethical decision making, and ethical knowledge. The result is a leader transforming from an inspirational to toxic leader.

This section will explore solutions for the ethical development of an effective leader. Essentially, the solutions will mostly focus on dark side leaders with treatable behaviors, including behavior modification, 360-degree feedback, and self-assessments. For dark leaders with a clinical personality disorders, options will include psychotropic and psychotherapy. The information will evaluate treatment options assessed in the Hogan Development Survey (Hogan & Hogan, 1997) and Diagnostic Statistical Manual V (APA, 2018) symptoms related to clinical personality disorders. In a recent paper presented at 32nd Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Hayes, Foster, and Gaddis (2017) provide clarification between derailers and personality disorders. Behaviors that lead to leadership derailment called derailers. These behaviors are not as extreme and allow leaders to function in their job. Symptoms associated with personality disorders can be extreme and affect one's ability to function in their job and society. The abundance of research focuses on the normal working population with treatable dark side behaviors. The HDS assessment tool is the most widely used instrument developed to predict unethical behaviors in dark leaders. The clinical assessment tools used to diagnose personality disorders require treatment with a medical professional. The 11 dimensions (scales) in the HDS instrument will align with the Personality Inventory for DSM-V (PID) developed for measuring personality disorders (APA, 2018; Hogan & Kaiser, 2006; Hogan & Kaiser, 2015; Hogan, 2017).

Recommendations on Minimizing Dark Side Behaviors in Leaders

According to current research, dark leaders personality traits (low risk to high risk) can be assessed using multiple instruments, including HDS (Hogan 1997), dirty dozen scale (Jonason, and Webster, 2010), and research questionnaires (Page, Bergner, and Willis, 2017). Based on the assessment results, leaders have the option to change towards becoming an effective and ethical leader or follow the path of destruction resulting in negative outcome with followers and organizations.

Page, Bergner, and Willis Research

In a recent study of 349 leaders, Page et al., (2017) provide five recommendations for dark leaders to improve their personalities, including: (1) Dark leaders should acknowledge they have dark side characteristics – acknowledgment and acceptance will facilitate change. (2) Dark leaders need to know their dark side based on self-assessment and other perspectives. (3) How do others perceive your dark side characteristics? What changes will improve leadership performance? Understand and avoid triggers to keep personality in check? (4) What strategies implemented when dark side behaviors are emergent due to the work environment? (5) Work with a leadership coach to ensure effective leadership at all times.

Hogan Development Survey Guidelines

Dark leaders assessed using the HDS, receive a detailed report that identifies personality traits that may lead to elimination of job, leadership derailment, or other negative consequences. HDS also

identifies tendencies that can hinder relationships and productivity. One aspect of the survey is to enable leaders understand their self-awareness and how to act in various situations (Hogan, 2017).

How do dark leaders interpret the results of the HDS personality scales? How do they incorporate towards effective leadership? HDS interpretive guidelines provide best practices and cautions below:

- Best Practices: Evaluate the results as a whole versus the sum of the parts. Cautious: Do not over-emphasize or over-evaluate the subscales. The validity and predictive power assessed on the main scale level. For example, assess the score for Skeptical versus the configurations of the subscales, i.e., cynical, mistrusting, and grudges (Hogan, 2017).
- Best Practices: Use subscales to gain a deeper understanding of the behaviors for the entire scale. Cautious: Avoid over-analyzing sub-scales and interpretation of results (Hogan, 2017).
- Best Practices: Risk ratings for each subscale mirror the threshold ratings for the overall score, ranging from no score to high risk. Cautious: Avoid drawing conclusions from low scores (40% - 69%) because they have no inferences on behavior. For example, a score of 58% for Skeptical is either a low risk or high risk. The configuration of the subscales (cynical, mistrusting, and grudges) can provide more insights on the individual behaviors (Hogan, 2017).
- Best Practices: Focus on moderate to high scores between 70% - 100% and low scores (0 – 39%) are considered no risk. For example, a score of 90% for Skeptical may be bright, but cynical, mistrusting, and hold grudges. Dimension described as a high risk and negative behaviors may emerge if not self-monitored. Cautious: For assessment of low scores, additional training and certification will be required to interpret the results (Hogan, 2017).
- Best Practices: Use the information from the analysis for development of specific action plan for leadership development. Cautious: incorporate information into report instead of referencing subscales. The score from the main level and the interpretations of the sub-scales will provide contributions for the overall score (Hogan, 2017).
- Best Practices: Draw connections between the HDS subscales and other Hogan assessment tools. Cautious: Focus on extreme scores for the greatest impact.

Organizations can benefit from using the HDS tool for predicting dark side personality traits in managers and leaders. By reviewing the results, organizations can develop leadership development programs to foster positive behaviors, communication skills, decision-making, and high performing organizational culture (Hogan, 2017).

Unlike leaders with low to high-risk dark traits, leaders with DSM-IV/V personality disorders have limited treatment options, including psychotherapy and medications. The next section will discuss these options.

TREATMENT OPTIONS FOR LEADERS WITH PERSONALITY DISORDERS?

The abundance of research on assessing dark leaders, have focused on traits considered low risk to high risk in Hogan Development Survey (HDS). For leaders assessed, Hogan independent consultants and organization administrator can provide solutions, including coaching, feedback from peers, and leadership development program. In a comparison between HDS and DSM-IV constructs, the dimensions provided by HDS can be manageable (low-risk and high-risk traits) while the DSM-IV constructs are extreme risk and will not remit without professional clinical intervention (Hogan, 2017).

According to Brooks (2016), in a recent study of 261 executives indicated one in 5 or 21% are psychopaths. In comparing CEO's results to general prison populations, it is in proportion to that among prisoners considered psychopaths. In the new study, executives with psychopathic traits considered clinically significant resulting in unethical or illegal activities. CEO's with personality disorders may go unnoticed or untreated before bringing havoc on organizations. What are the options?

According to Webb (2015), explains Antisocial, Borderline, Narcissistic and Histrionic described in the DMS-5 are considered the most difficult to treat. According to a study conducted in 2014, Jorgensen, Boye, Anderson, Helene, Blaabjerg, Freund, Jordet, and Kjobye indicated approximately "75% of

borderline patients” symptoms improved in 18 months after mentalization-based treatment (MBT) and supportive group psychotherapy (SP). Based on current medical research on treating personality disorders, the following treatments will include psychotherapy and medications.

Psychotherapy

Psychotherapy is with a mental health professional and provide the opportunity to learn about your personality disorders. Because personality disorders produce symptoms due to poor or limited coping skills, psychotherapy aims to improve coping with stress and manage your disorder. Psychological therapies are develop for individuals with borderline personality disorder (Stoffers, Vollm, Rucker, Timmer, Huband, and Lieb, 2012).

Psychodynamic psychotherapy

Psychodynamic psychotherapy is typically an individual session with a therapist to examine the ways that patients perceive events, i.e., childhood is affecting current life. Patients and therapist work together to understand emotions, feelings, and actions on others. Sessions tend to last longer and generally more expensive (Webb, 2015).

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)

CBT focuses on exploring individual’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors and the relationship that effects their behavior. During CBT, therapists will help individuals learn how to uncover unhealthy patterns of thoughts. In addition, therapists will educate individuals on identifying behaviors and beliefs that may be self-destructive (NAMI, 2018).

Dialectic Behavior Therapy (DBT)

DBT is a preferred scientifically proven therapy for individuals with Borderline Personality Disorder. DBT focuses on a combination of maintaining awareness of our thoughts and feelings, using our interpersonal skills, understanding our pain or suffering tolerance, and regulating our emotions. A key takeaway of DBT, is directed towards the patients ability to understand how to regulate intense motions and activities. Sessions are done on a weekly basis individually or in groups. Compared to other treatments, DBT is more cost-effective and shorter in duration (NAMI, 2018).

Mentalization-Based Treatment (MBT)

MBT focuses on teaching the patient to “mentalize” or picture what others are feeling towards their behavior. In comparison with DBT, MBT depends on the relationship between the therapist and the patient and is less directive than DBT. This therapy relies heavily on the relationship between the therapists and patient, treatment can be longer in nature, and more expensive than DBT (Webb, 2015; NAMI, 2018).

Schema Therapy

Schema Therapy involves a combination of techniques from four other treatments, including cognitive-behavioral, experiential, interpersonal and psychoanalytic therapies. The purpose of treatment is to challenge the patient to change dysfunctional (maladaptive) thoughts and behaviors (schemas) that have developed since childhood. Schema Therapy can take longer than other therapies resulting in being more costly. However, the therapy is cost-effective with patients because the results are highly effective (Webb, 2015).

Social Skills Training

Social skills training is mostly done in groups and enables individuals with personality disorders, including schizoid, schizotypal, and paranoia may benefit from viewing people with similar feelings and behaviors. Social skills training targets individuals with similar behaviors, provides educational support

and group treatment are highly cost effective and usually brief compared to other treatment options (Webb, 2015).

Medications

Currently, there are no medications approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the treatment of personality disorders. Medications do not cure the disorder itself, although several types of psychiatric medications may help in reducing symptoms such as anxiety, psychosis, or depression (Webb, 2015). Medications can augment the treatment by alleviating some of the symptoms resulting in a better outcome for the patient. According to the Mayo Clinic (2017), provided several types of psychiatric medications that may help with various personality disorder symptoms:

- **Antidepressants.** Antidepressants are medications used for a number of disorders, including major depression, anxiety, obsession-compulsive disorder, and may be useful in personality disorders with symptoms of anger, depressed mood, irritability or hopelessness, impulsivity, and irritability. (Mayo Clinic, 2017).
- **Mood stabilizers.** Mood stabilizers help stabilize the highs and lows of mood swings, reduce impulsivity, aggression, and irritability symptoms (Mayo Clinic, 2017).
- **Antipsychotic medications.** Antipsychotics also called neuroleptics or major tranquilizers, used for treating psychosis in schizophrenic and bipolar disorder patients. Psychosis is a condition when patients have a difficulty understanding reality, due to irrational thinking, behaviors, and emotions. These medications may help in managing symptoms including psychosis, and patients with anger and anxiety problems (Mayo Clinic, 2017).
- **Anti-anxiety medications.** These may help if you have anxiety, agitation or insomnia. However, in some cases, they can increase impulsive behavior. So, certain types of personality disorders will not benefit from this type of medication (Mayo Clinic, 2017).

According to Webb (2015), the following psychotherapy and medication options provide the types of treatment for each personality disorder, including: (1) Borderline personality disorder treatments are Dialectic Behavior Therapy (DBT) and Mentalization-Based Treatment (MBT). (2) Antisocial personality disorder treatment would benefit from Schema Therapy. (3) Narcissistic personality disorder treatments are Psychodynamic therapy and Schema Therapy. (4) Histrionic personality disorder treatment would be Psychodynamic therapy. (5) Schizotypal, Schizoid, and Paranoid personality disorders treatments are Behavioral and Social Skills Training. (5) Avoidant, Obsessive-Compulsive, and Dependent personality disorder treatments are Psychodynamic Therapy and Medications (Webb, 2015).

For leaders with personality disorders or dark traits, it is important to differentiate between manageable dark behaviors (low-risk to high-risk) compared to extreme-risks. HDS assesses low-risk to high-risk treated with coaching and leader development programs. Personality disorders diagnosed using the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-V* will use clinical assessment tools. Due to the lack of expertise in clinical psychology, organizations would require training and consulting with psychologists, practitioners, and clinical researchers.

CONCLUSION

Leadership has been evolving for centuries, including Aristotle (384 – 322 B.C.), Plato (427 – 347 B.C.), and Socrates (470 – 399 B.C.) development of ethical theories that have been the framework for ethical leadership. Ethical leadership approaches have gained momentum due to the corporate scandals in organizations dating back to Medici Bank of 1492 (Parks, 2006). Since 2000, the following corporate scandals top the list, including Tyco, Enron, WorldComm, Bernie Madoff Ponzi scam, Wells Fargo, Health South, Volkswagen emissions, Samsung (Johnson, 2018; Mathews & Heimer, 2016; Mathews & Gandel, 2015).

Based on the ethical leadership approaches, one approach is authentic leadership with a focus on the authenticity (genuine) of leaders. Leaders that can be trusted, are honest, and are committed. Another

approach is servant leadership focused on the concerns of followers, empathize with them, and empower and develop to their fullest capacities (Hale & Fields, 2007). The last approach is spiritual leadership is focused in the workplace due to the linkage between spiritual values and increase in organizational performance (Oswick, 2009). All three approaches focus on organizational commitment, follower development, and organizational performance.

Dark side leaders emerge in organizations due to a number of reasons. This may lead to leadership derailment due to these factors, including unhealthy motivations, job pressures, leader weaknesses, “dark triad” traits (low-risk to high-risk), and personality disorder - extreme-risk behaviors (McCall & Lombardo 1983). Based on the research on leadership, evidence supports both good and bad leaders. Good leaders place ethics at the core of leadership, while bad leaders tend to follow unethical behaviors and cause destructive outcomes in organizations (Burns, 1978). Compared to good leadership that has positive outcomes, dark side leadership has a perceived destructive and toxic effect on employee morale, organizations culture, and performance.

For the assessment of leader’s potential, LTQ – Briggs Myers Personality Test, LBDQ, and MLQ are common assessment tools used by organizations to evaluate effective leadership potential. For assessing dark side leaders, HDS is the industry tool used by organizations to predict low-risk to high-risk behaviors. This tool helps to discover leader blind spots that can lead to derailment and other negative consequences in organizations. DSM-V personality disorders will be assessed using clinical assessment tools provided by clinical practitioners.

For organizations to minimize dark leaders behaviors from emerging, will need to take a proactive stance on using leadership assessment tools to screen leaders. Another approach, organizations can administer the Hogan Development Survey to assess the behaviors of current leader’s. Based on the results, leader’s willing to change are imperative. Coaching and leadership development programs are developed and implemented to reverse unethical destructive behaviors. In the end, ethical leaders focus on organizations work environment, followers morale needs, and meeting performance objectives.

REFERENCES

- Agerholm, H. (2016, September 15). 1 in 5 CEOs are psychopaths according to a new study -here's why. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/1-in-5-ceos-are-psychopaths-according-to-a-new-study-2016-9>
- American Institute of Stress (AIS) and Marlin Company. (2011). “The Workplace Stress Scale: Attitudes in the American Workplace VII,” 2009. Retrieved from <http://americaninstituteofstress.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/2001Attitude-in-the-Workplace-Harris.pdf>
- American Psychiatric Association. (2014). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.
- American Psychiatric Association (APA). (2018). Personality disorders: What are personality disorders? Retrieved from <https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/personality-disorders/what-are-personality-disorders>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Becker, J. A. H., O’Hair, D. 2007. Machiavellians’ motives in organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35: 246–267.
- Bentz, V. J. (1967). The Sears experience in the investigation, description, and prediction of executive behavior. In F. R. Wickert & D. E. McFarland (Eds.), *Measuring executive effectiveness* (pp. 147-206). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Bentz, V. J. (1985b). Research findings from personality assessment of executives. In J. H. Bernardin & D. A. Bownas (Eds.), *Personality assessment in organizations* (pp. 82-144). New York: Praeger.
- Bentz, V. J. (1990). Contextual issues in predicting high-level leadership performance. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 131-144). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

- Boddy, C. R. (2015) Organisational psychopaths: a ten year update, *Management Decision*, 53 (10), pp.2407-2432, <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-04-2015-0114>
- Boddy, C. R. (2014). Corporate psychopaths, conflict, employee affective well-being and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics* 121 (1):107-121
- Boddy, C. R., Ladyshevsky, R., and Galvin, P. (2010), Leaders without ethics in global business: Corporate psychopaths. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 10: 121–138. doi:10.1002/pa.352
- Boddy, C.R. (2006). The dark side of management decisions: Organisational psychopaths. *Management decision*, 44(10), pp.1461-1475.
- Brooks, D. (February 7, 2013). "Florence and the drones." *The New York Times*. P. A27.
- Brown, T. A., Sautter, J. A., Littvay, L., Sautter, A. C., & Bearnese, B. (2010). Ethics and personality: Empathy and narcissism as moderators of ethical decision making in business students. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85, 203–208. doi: [10.1080/08832320903449501](https://doi.org/10.1080/08832320903449501)
- Brunell, A. B., Gentry, W. A., Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Kuhnert, K. W., & DeMarree, K. G. (2008). Leader emergence: The case of the narcissistic leader. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 1663-1676.
- Burns, J.M. 1978. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row. [Google Scholar](#)
- Chamorro-Premuzic, J. (2017, September - October). Managing yourself: Could your personality derail your career? *Harvard Business Review*. pp. 138-141.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207-216. Retrieved from doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002
- Evans, S. (2013, April 6). The Saturday essay: How Machiavelli saved my family. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Gillis, T.L. (1995). *Machiavelli for modern times: An interpretation of Machiavelli's "The Prince" for the college president and the public relations officer*, unpublished manuscript.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Hale, J.R., & Fields, D.L. 2007. Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, 3: 397-417. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1742715007082964>
- Hayes, H., Foster, J., & Gaddis, B. (2017, April). Derailers vs. personality disorders: What are the differences? Poster presented at 32nd annual meeting Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology conference, Orlando, FL.
- Hill, H. (2009). Machiavellian – style – leadership. *The Times and Democrat*. Retrieved from http://thetandd.com/news/opinion/machiavellian-style-leadership/article_c8ea4911-839a-5c48-b1d9-c7e80ed3734f.html
- 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, 40-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00162>
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2006). Research report: The dark side of discretion. Retrieved from http://www.hoganassessments.com/sites/default/files/Dark%20Side%20of%20Discretion_0.pdf
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Kaiser, R. (2010). Management derailment: Personality assessment and mitigation. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *American Psychological Association Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2015). Research report: Reflections on the dark side. Retrieved from <http://www.hoganassessments.com/thought-leadership/reflections-dark-side>
- Hogan. (2017). Hogan development survey: The dark side of personality. Retrieved from <https://www.hoganassessments.com/assessment/hogan-development-survey/>
- Johnson, J. & Orange, M. (2003). The man who tried to buy the world: Jean-Marie Messier and Vivendi Universal. New York, NY: Portfolio.

- Johnson, O.A. 1965. *Ethics: Selections from Classical and Contemporary Writers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Jonason, P., & Webster, G. (2010). The dirty dozen: A concise measure of the dark triad. *Psychology Assessment, 22*(2), 420-432.
- Jones, D. (2006, June). "Not all successful ceos are extroverts." *USA Today*, p. B1
- Jørgensen, C. R., Bøye, R., Andersen, D., Blaabjerg, A. H. D., Freund, C., Jordet, H., & Kjølbye, M. (2014). Eighteen months post-treatment naturalistic follow-up study of mentalization-based therapy and supportive group treatment of borderline personality disorder: Clinical outcomes and functioning. *Nordic Psychology (Online), 66*(4), 254-273. DOI: 10.1080/19012276.2014.963649
- Judge, W.Q. 1999. *The leader's shadow: Exploring and developing executive character*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kessler, S. R., Bandelli, A. C., Spector, P. E., Borman, W. C., Nelson, C. E., & Penney, L. M. (2010). Re-examining Machiavelli: A three-dimensional model of Machiavellianism in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*, 1868-1896
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*. New York: Free Press.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians--and how we can survive them*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mathews, C. & Gandel, S. (2015, December 27). The biggest 5 corporate scandals of 2015. *Fortune*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2015/12/27/biggest-corporate-scandals-2015/>
- Mathews, C. & Heimer, M. (2016, December 28). The biggest 5 corporate scandals of 2016. *Fortune*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2016/12/28/biggest-corporate-scandals-2016/>
- Mayo Clinic. (2017). Patient care & health information, diseases & conditions: Personality disorders. Retrieved from <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/personality-disorders/symptoms-causes/syc-20354463>
- McCall, M. W. Jr., & Lombardo, M. M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed*. Technical Report No. 21. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- National Alliance on Mental Illness. (2018). Learn more – Treatment – Psychotherapy. Retrieved from <https://www.nami.org/Learn-More/Treatment/Psychotherapy>
- NIOSH (1999). *Stress at work*. U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Publication Number 99-101. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/99-101/default.html>
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and Practice (7th ed.)*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ormezi, O. (2011, February 17). Machiavelli's ideal leadership [blog post]. Retrieved from <http://ydemokrat.blogspot.com/2011/02/machiavellis-ideal-leadership.html>
- Oswick, C. (2009) 'Burgeoning Workplace Spirituality? A Textual Analysis of Momentum and Directions', *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion* 6(1): 15–25.
- Page, Bergner, and Willis. (2017). *From Dark to Light: managing the dark side of personality for effective leadership performance*. Berkhamsted, United Kingdom. Ashridge Executive Education at Hult International.
- Palmer, P.J. (1998). Leading from within. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership (pp.197-208)*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Parks, T. (2006). *Medici money: Banking, metaphysics, and art in fifteenth-century Florence*. London: Profile.
- Paulus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*(6), 556-563. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
- Pfeffer, J. (2011, October 24). Journal reports: Leadership "Don't dismiss office politics-teach it." *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Pfeffer, J. 2010. Power play. *Harvard Business Review* (July/August): 84-92.

- Porter, L. W., Bigley, G. A., & Steers, R. M. (2003). *Motivation and work behavior*. Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Stoffers J., Völlm B., Rucker G., Timmer A., Huband N., Lieb K. (2012). Psychological therapies for people with borderline personality disorder. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012; 8:CD005652
[Medline](#)
- Stone, B. (2013). *The everything store: Jeff Bezos and the age of Amazon*. New York, N.Y.: Back Bay Books.
- Treviño, L. K., M. E. Brown. (2005). The Role of Leaders in Influencing Unethical Behavior in the Workplace. Chapter 3 in *Managing Organizational Deviance*, pp. 69-87 R.E. Kidwell
- Twenge, J. M., & Foster, J. D. (2010). Birth cohort increases in narcissistic personality traits among American college students, 1982-2009. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1(1), 99-106. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1948550609355719>
- Twenge, J.M., & Campbell, W.K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. New York: Free Press.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Velesquez, M.G. (1992). *Business ethics: Concepts and cases* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Webb, J. (2015). Are personality disorders treatable? Personality Disorders Awareness Network (PDAN). Retrieved from <http://www.pdan.org/what-are-personality-disorders/can-pd-be-cured/>
- West, M. and Patterson, M. (1996) "Profitable Personnel," *People Management*. pp. 28-31.
- Zhang, Y., Leslie, J. B. and Hannum, K. M. (2013), Trouble Ahead: Derailment Is Alive and Well. *Thunderbird Int'l Bus Rev*, 55: 95–102. doi:10.1002/tie.21525

APPENDIX A

Leadership Trait Questionnaire (Ltq)

Instructions: The purpose of this questionnaire is to measure personal characteristics of leadership. The leader and five people who are familiar with the leader should complete the questionnaire.

Make five copies of this questionnaire. You and five people you know should complete this questionnaire (e.g., roommates, coworkers, relatives, and friends). Using the following scale, have each individual indicate the degree to which he or she agrees or disagrees with each of the 14 statements below. Do not forget to complete one for yourself.

_____ (leader's name) is

Key: 1 = Strongly 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly disagree agree

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Articulate: Communicates effectively with others | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Perceptive: Is discerning and insightful | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Self-confident: Believes in himself/herself and his/her ability | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Self-assured: Is secure with self, free of doubts | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Persistent: Stays fixed on the goals, despite interference | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Determined: Takes a firm stand, acts with certainty | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. Trustworthy: Is authentic and inspires confidence | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. Dependable: Is consistent and reliable | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. Friendly: Shows kindness and warmth | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. Outgoing: Talks freely, gets along well with others | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. Conscientious: Is thorough, organized, and controlled | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. Diligent: Is persistent, hardworking | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. Sensitive: Shows tolerance, is tactful and sympathetic | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. Empathic: Understands others, identifies with others | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Scoring

1. Enter the responses for Raters 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 in the appropriate columns as shown in Example 2.1. The example provides hypothetical ratings to help explain how the questionnaire is used.
2. For each of the 14 items, compute the average for the five raters and place that number in the "average rating" column.
3. Place your own scores in the "self-rating" column.

Results: Leadership Traits Questionnaire Ratings

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater Average-rating	Self-rating
1. Articulate						
2. Perceptive						
3. Self-confident						
4. Self-assured						
5. Persistent						
6. Determined						
7. Trustworthy						
8. Dependable						
9. Friendly						
10. Outgoing						
11. Conscientious						
12. Diligent						
13. Sensitive						
14. Empathic						

Scoring Interpretation

The scores you received on the LTQ provide information about how you see yourself and how others see you as a leader. The chart allows you to see where your perceptions are the same as those of others and where they differ. There are no best ratings on this questionnaire. The purpose of the instrument is to give you a way to assess your strengths and weaknesses and to evaluate areas where your perceptions are congruent with those of others and where there are discrepancies

(Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (7th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.)

APPENDIX B
Leadership Behavior Questionnaire

Instructions: Read each item carefully and think about how often you (or the person you are evaluating) engage in the described behavior. Indicate your response to each item by circling one of the five numbers to the right of each item.

Key: 1 = Never 2 = Seldom 3 = Occasionally 4 = Often 5 = Always

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Tells group members what they are supposed to do. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Acts friendly with members of the group. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Sets standards of performance for group members. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Helps others in the group feel comfortable. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Makes suggestions about how to solve problems. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Responds favorably to suggestions made by others. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. Makes his or her perspective clear to others. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. Treats others fairly. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. Develops a plan of action for the group. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. Behaves in a predictable manner toward group members. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. Defines role responsibilities for each group member. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. Communicates actively with group members. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. Clarifies his or her own role within the group. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. Shows concern for the well-being of others. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15. Provides a plan for how the work is to be done. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16. Shows flexibility in making decisions. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 17. Provides criteria for what is expected of the group. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 18. Discloses thoughts and feelings to group members. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 19. Encourages group members to do high-quality work. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 20. Helps group members get along with each other. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Scoring

The Leadership Behavior Questionnaire is designed to measure two major types of leadership behaviors: task and relationship. Score the questionnaire by doing the following: First, sum the responses on the odd-numbered items. This is your task score. Second, sum the responses on the even-numbered items. This is your relationship score.

Total scores: Task _____ Relationship _____

Scoring Interpretation

45–50 Very high range

40–44 High range

35–39 Moderately high range

30–34 Moderately low range

25–29 Low range

10–24 Very low range

The score you receive for task refers to the degree to which you help others by defining their roles and letting them know what is expected of them. This factor describes your tendencies to be task directed toward others when you are in a leadership position. The score you receive for relationship is a measure of the degree to which you try to make subordinates feel comfortable with themselves, each other, and the group itself. It represents a measure of how people oriented you are.

Your results on the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire give you data about your task orientation and people orientation. What do your scores suggest about your leadership style? Are you more likely to lead with an emphasis on task or with an emphasis on relationship? As you interpret your responses to the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire, ask yourself if there are ways you could change your behavior to shift the emphasis you give to tasks and relationships. To gain more information about your style, you may want to have four or five of your coworkers fill out the questionnaire based on their perceptions of you as a leader. This will give you additional data to compare and contrast to your own scores about yourself.

(Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and Practice (7th ed.)*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.)

APPENDIX C

Sample Items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5X-Short

These questions provide examples of the items that are used to evaluate leadership style. The MLQ is provided in both Self and Rater forms. The Self form measures self-perception of leadership behaviors. The Rater form is used to measure leadership. By thinking about the leadership styles as exemplified below, you can get a sense of your own belief about your leadership.

Key: 0 = Not 1 = Once in 2 = Sometimes 3 = Fairly 4 = Frequently, at all a while often if not always

Transformational Leadership Styles

Idealized Influence I go beyond self-interest for the good (Attributes) of the group.	0 1 2 3 4
Idealized Influence I consider the moral and ethical (Behaviors) consequences of decisions.	0 1 2 3 4
Inspirational I talk optimistically about Motivation the future.	0 1 2 3 4
Intellectual I reexamine critical assumptions Stimulation to question whether they are appropriate.	0 1 2 3 4
Individualized I help others to develop Consideration their strengths.	0 1 2 3 4

Transactional Leadership Styles

Contingent Reward I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.	0 1 2 3 4
Management by I keep track of all mistakes. Exception: Active	0 1 2 3 4

Passive/Avoidant Leadership Styles

Management by I wait for things to go wrong before Exception: Passive taking action.	0 1 2 3 4
Laissez-Faire I avoid making decisions.	0 1 2 3 4

SOURCE: Reproduced by special permission of the publisher, MIND GARDEN, Inc., www.mindgarden.com from the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio. Copyright © 1995, 2000, 2004 by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio. Further reproduction is prohibited without the publisher's written consent