10-2013

The Curious Case of Dr. E.: Detecting Dark Side Leaders Before We Hire One

K. A. Hasselfeld

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

Recommended Citation

Hasselfeld, K. A. and Smith, Daryl R., "The Curious Case of Dr. E.: Detecting Dark Side Leaders Before We Hire One" (2013). *Business Administration Faculty Presentations*. 87.
https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/business_administration_presentations/87

The Curious Case of Dr. E.

Detecting Dark Side Leaders Before We Hire One?

For the past century the focus of leadership research has been predominately focused on finding why some leaders are more effective than others. The economic literature clearly shows that good management will enhance organizational performance. A less well developed area of focus is looking at destructive leadership. Failed managers can cost time and resources to recruit new ones plus there are hidden costs of golden parachutes, lost intellectual and social capital, missed business objectives, and destroyed employee morale (Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2010). According to Hogan et al. (2010), a poll of senior human resource executives estimated the cost of derailment to be between $750,000 and $1,500,000 per senior manager. Hogan and colleagues reviewed twelve publications that estimated the base rate of managerial failure and found it ranged from 30 to 67 percent, with an average of 50 percent. Based on the data, Hogan suggests that two thirds of existing managers are insufferable and that half will eventually fail (DeVries & Kaiser, 2003).

The study of destructive leadership will often include looking at bullying, abusive supervision and the aversive leadership personalities of Machiavellianism, narcissim and psychopathy. According to Ouimet (2010) dark side, narcissistic leaders create a workplace environment that has been linked to the following variables:

- volatile and risky decision-making and organizational performance (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007);

- absence of a climate necessary to achieve sustainable performance (Higgs, 2009);

- destruction of subordinates' trust and degradation of organizational effectiveness (Benson & Hogan, 2008);

• a toxic work atmosphere, recently identified as organizational terrorism (Goldman, 2006);

• poor management rankings (supervisor ratings of interpersonal performance and integrity) (Blair, Hoffman, & Helland, 2008);

• dysfunctional management (difficulty learning from feedback) (Campbell & Campbell, 2009); and

• strong tendency to commit a white-collar crime (Blickle et al., 2006).

Once in an organization, destructive leaders are often misdiagnosed or mismanaged. This can result in victims that suffer from a form of social stress that is similar to post traumatic stress syndrome. Victims of a dysfunctional leader can suffer social, psychological, and psychosomatic effects, and become unable to perform his/her job (Einarsen, 1999).

Harmful leaders decrease employee performance, commitment and job satisfaction. Resources can be dedicated to train and monitor the performance of leaders. Executive coaches can be hired to ensure that leaders treat all employees with respect. Safe outlets can be developed so leaders engaging in destructive behaviors can be reported. However, while dark side leaders can clearly be dealt with once they are in place, ideally it would be better if they were not selected at the end of the interview screening process, thereby preventing the toxicity from even entering the workplace.

The purpose of this research was to design an instrument for measuring dark side leadership potential in candidates being hired for leadership positions. Phase 1 of our study started with a review of the literature to gather the following information: a listing of dark side leader personality traits and an exploration of assessment tools that could be used during a hiring process to look for dark side traits. Based on our findings we developed an instrument that could possibly be used to identify dark side leaders during the interviewing process.

In Phase 2 we transcribed a case study of a destructive leader. At the end of the case study we completed the instrument we developed based upon the behaviors listed in the case study. We also had subordinates of the leader in the case study complete the tool and recommend modifications based upon their experience.

In Phase 3 we took the information gathered and created a survey that included the instrument we designed as a component of the survey. We then posted a link to the survey on eight discussions groups on LinkedIn. We also posted several tweets on Twitter. The survey was completed by subordinates of destructive leaders. Based upon their responses we eliminated aspects of the tool that did not seem to be applicable based upon the number of responses. We also added behaviors and specific behaviors to our instrument from responses submitted to the survey. The result from these three phases is a potential leadership assessment instrument.

Phase 1

A literature search of articles was conducted to find journal articles on the topic of dark side leadership. Books were not included in the review. Articles published between 2002 and 2012 were reviewed to capture the facts and opinions from the past 10 years. Articles were reviewed to collect the following information:

- listing of dark side leader model concepts, personality traits and/or behaviors

- a listing assessment tools that could be used during a hiring process to look for dark side traits

Fifty-three articles on dark side leadership were reviewed. The two most common conceptual models cited in the literature were "dark side leader" and destructive leader."

Because we found "dark side" and "destructive" to be the most common descriptors we used both terms to describe the type of leader sought to be the subject in the survey instrument we develop. The most common behavior, characteristic or trait cited for these leaders was a form of the word narcissism, being cited in 15 out of 29 articles (52%). Because narcissism was such a common descriptor, we included these three specific characteristics in our instrument.

Hogan is clearly one of the major contributors to date for works studying dark side leadership. In their 2001 paper, Hogan and Hogan describe 11 themes that overlap with the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV), published by the American Psychiatric Association, Axis 2 (personality disorders and mental retardation) (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). We included his 11 themes in our survey instrument.

Shaw, Erickson and Harvey (2011) collected data from a web-based survey using scales they had developed to measure a behavior based taxonomy of destructive leaders from input of subordinates. We used behaviors they cited in their paper to describe leaders that cause significant misery and despair for their subordinates. Pelletier (2010) in his paper on toxic leadership provides a listing of harmful leader behaviors collected from subordinates of toxic leaders. We used the 51 behaviors listed from his paper in our survey instrument.

Table 1 lists the assessment tools that have been reported in the literature that could be used to detect dark side and/or destructive leaders. The Hogan Development Survey (HDS) was cited in several articles. HDS scales measure a variety of potentially dysfunctional behaviors. Furnham et al. (2012) mentioned that the HDS is now extensively used in organizational research and practice to measure dysfunctional personality in the "normal population" and it is

aimed to give an indication of how the subject will react under stress. **Appendix 1** depicts the instrument tool we developed after completing the review of the literature.

Phase 2

Our case takes place in the research department of a Midwestern hospital system. The department had been in existence since the 1960's and was known for its service first approach in supporting two teaching hospitals. The department had a history of exemplary physician leaders involved in medical research for the organization. In 2009 the department lost their Level 5 leader – the VP of Academic Affairs - of 20 years within two weeks of diagnosis of an acute leukemia.

The new VP appointed provided no strategic direction or ideas for new growth. He would sit in research staff meetings, shake his head, and proclaim, "I have no idea what I am doing in research." Despite the lack of leadership from the new VP, the department saw a 47% and 75% percent increase in projects and clinical trials respectively.

Eighteen months after the death of the Level 5 leader, the new VP hired a consultant to chair one of the research committees and help build the clinical trial division of the department. This consultant, a dark side and destructive leader, is the focus of our case study. We will refer to this individual as Dr. E.

As time went on, the new VP became more and more dependent on Dr. E for advice about research, however, it quickly became apparent to the subordinates that Dr. E did not know federal research laws he had claimed to know. He claimed he had many contacts in industry and had some fresh new ideas for the department. For 12 months there were no new contacts made and no new ideas presented while he was a consultant.

During month 13 of his consultant period, Dr. E suddenly showed up on the electronic payroll system as a full time employee with the title of a new position for the organization - medical director and head of the research department. The research staff members were not told until 10 days later. Dr. E's position was never posted, there wasn't a search committee, and no one else was given a chance to interview for the position.

The first week in the new leadership position Dr. E removed the administrative secretary who had been supporting the 45 research staff members and made her his personal administrative secretary. He stated he had heard she was the best, he deserved the best, so he was taking the best. He promised her a salary increase, but didn't bother to check organizational policies. On numerous occasions he stated that he didn't have to follow organizational policies - they are merely guidelines. The secretary never got a pay increase.

Dr. E would tell the administrative secretary that he was going out of town. Then he would show up for work on those days, stating he needed to check and see what everyone was doing. He would schedule some meetings on his own and would often take calls on his cell phone and would go outside so no one could hear the conversation.

He immediately took the biggest office. He spent countless hours picking out new furniture. He would make a selection and then the next day would change his mind. He even had the furniture supplier provide 3D drawings of how many different ways the furniture could be arranged in the office. It took about two months to finally settle on the furniture.

It took days to pick the right Keurig coffee maker for the department. Once it came in he provided coffee for free for the staff, then figured he better check how much that would cost the department, and then decided staff had to provide their own Keurig cups.

Dr. E told the staff they could no longer communicate directly with the new VP – all communication had to go through him. He met with every staff member for 20 minutes. He hinted to several that their job may be eliminated. He threatened one employee that he must make him look good or else he would find someone else who would. He told one female employee she talked too much because she was obviously Italian.

Dr. E ordered two female employees to spend a day cleaning out a storage room to create work stations for new staff that required heavy lifting beyond what is normally expected of individuals in these positions and when one of the male employees offered to help Dr. E told him no - it was "women's' work."

He was extremely arrogant and self-focused. He shared with staff that it had recently pleased him to be the best looking person at one of his school reunions. He was quick to mention he only traveled first class and constantly boasted about the number of expensive cars he owned. He was excited about the "sweet deal' he had negotiated with the organization and was anxious to show the staff the new Jaguar he was test driving.

He was quick to give the impression that he was licensed to practice medicine and even had "Heart Doc" for his license plate. Ironically, he was never licensed to practice medicine in the United States.

Dr. E immediately adjusted work hours without any concern for the needs of the employees and took away the ability to work from home. No consideration was taken into account that some of the work hours were in place to optimize patient enrollment in a study or optimize the chance to meet with a physician around a very busy work schedule. One staff member requested to come in at 8:00 instead of the 7:00 because she had leukemia and it was

very hard for to get in by 7:00. He said no. He also expected practicing physicians to travel to his office to meet with him in the middle of the day. He had no concern for the needs of subordinates or others.

From day one Dr. E stated that the staff had capacity - but he had never once looked any metrics for the department. Some days he would site 30% capacity, the next day it would be 25% and the next day it would be 35%. He immediately began to look at how to reorganize the entire department and re-write all of the job descriptions. Significant changes in staffing structures were proposed that would push work back on resident physicians. Dr. E modeled these changes without input or feedback from the residency program directors.

Staff were told to complete a task, then told that it wasn't right, then told to do it another way, and again, and on and on and on. Countless hours were spent on reworking requests.

He displayed bullying behaviors. When working on proposals or budgets he simply made up numbers but was quick to threaten staff that they had to make his made up numbers work because they were responsible for them, not him. He repeatedly questioned one of the male staff members if he was loyal to Dr. E and informed him that if he ever found out otherwise the male staff member would never have his trust again. Some of his plans and actions were illegal or unethical. But he stated any repercussions would not be his problem – they would be the problems of the people who hired him.

On numerous occasions Dr. E forced changes in research protocols against the advice of experienced research specialists, clinical trial staff, and physician faculty. If confronted about the changes, he would lie and say that he hadn't made them. He made changes in protocols to include inappropriate sample sizes in the project methods. He took away projects from research

specialists to personally work on them. He held "secret" meetings with physicians. He was given authority to approve research projects administratively, approve the budgets, sign the contracts and as chair of the Institutional Review Board approve protocols based on human subject protection. He was put in a position of absolute authority with no checks or balances in place.

He falsely accused a staff member of forgery, referred to a female physician as a "whore" and a "bitch" and lied about being a staff physician at a famous hospital system in the past. He said there were too many women in the department and not enough men. When it was reported to him that staff were looking to leave the organization he could be heard screaming from his office "I don't fucking care if 2 or 3 staff leave, I don't fucking care if they all leave."

Against the advice of senior staff members, Dr. E proposed to replace RNs with MAs for inpatient cardiovascular and oncology trials. The staff had grave concerns that this would severely compromise patient safety and well-being. He didn't care.

Dr. E could be seen pacing up and down the hallways and knocking on doors, checking to see if staff members were in their offices. Staff members began working with their doors closed and locked, pretending that they were not there so they could get some work done. Dr. E habitually sat at his desk and yelled out the name of his administrative assistant when he needed her to do something; when she was not there he yelled out the names of other staff.

Dr. E was extremely paranoid. He constantly probed staff to see what they thought about him. When greeted in the morning and asked how he was that day he would respond, "Well I'm here … no one has shot me yet."

By the end of the fifth month, two staff members had resigned. One of them was an outstanding senior member with over 10 years of experience. More staff looked to leave. Moral was horrible.

Finally one of the staff members shared all of the observations and concerns with the new VP, asking him to keep the information confidential. The new VP did not keep it confidential but shared all of the concerns with Dr. E. Dr. E denied all of them.

One staff member went back to check references listed on Dr. E's resume. His former boss and superiors stated that many of the things listed on his resume were "grossly exaggerated" and he had a terrible reputation as a leader. Co-workers shared that he had treated his previous staff horribly, was unethical and had poor scientific skills. His approach had been egotistical and dictatorial. One of his former bosses shared, "Do not let Dr. E hide behind his poor command of the English language to hide the gaps in his thought processes."

In desperation a number of the staff met off the main campus and made the decision that they had to speak up as a group or stand by and watch everything destroyed. There was also grave concern for the integrity of the research program and fear that patients could eventually be harmed by the actions of Dr. E. The administrative director for the department made an appeal to human resources and even requested a meeting with the CEO on behalf of the staff. Consultants were brought in to meet with various research staff and research leadership. The reports from the consultants went to the system COO. As a result, the COO had Dr. E resign from the director position but allowed him to continue to chair the Institutional Review Board. Within a couple of weeks Dr. E was given an office in senior administration and given a new director title. The COO forced the administrative director of the research department to resign,

stating a change in leadership was needed due to the unrest that had been present in the

department for the past five months. The COO was the person who hired Dr. E. The CEO never

made contact with the remaining staff. In the next 12 weeks two more senior staff members left.

After we completed writing the story of Dr. E, we reviewed the draft of our instrument

and found that all of our observations were captured. **Appendix 2** shows the case study with

components of the instrument responses in [], bold and gray shade that were checked on our

instrument. Next we had five workers review the survey with the same destructive leader in

mind. One individual added "Shows favoritism toward employees of leader's own gender." A

second individual added "Does not address issue of upper management not following policies

and procedures or makes subordinates address the issue." These are marked with "[5]" in

Appendix 2.

Phase 3

Next we submitted our protocol and survey to a College Institutional Review Board

(IRB) for approval to post the survey on discussion boards of several LinkedIn groups, linking

them to our survey on Survey Monkey. We were given approval by the IRB provided we turned

off the default setting that collects IP addresses and we use the version of Survey Monkey that

uses SSL encryption, which we did. We also sent out a general tweet on Twitter – "Ever worked

for a destructive leader? If so see *website listed*."

The first page of our survey included the required elements of informed consent for

research participants. We used the definition of a destructive leader that was cited by Aasland,

Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, and Einarsen, 2010 in their paper on destructive leadership

behavior (p. 439). We posted our survey on discussion boards on eight web groups:

Ninety-six individuals completed the survey and 91 finished the entire survey (94.8%). **Table 2** lists the number of responses collected for each of the eight groups plus the responses to our tweet posted on Twitter. Eighty-three percent of the individuals completing the survey were linked to the survey by posts on the Harvard Business Review group. The following is the breakdown of the time period since exposure to the dark side and/or destructive leader for the respondents:

Within the past 12 months	49.5% (n=47)
Past 2-3 years	25.3% (n=24)
Past 4-5 years	8.4% (n=8)
Greater than 5 years ago	16.8% (n=16)
Skipped question	n=1

Thirty-one (32.6%) of respondent's leader were women and 64 (67.4%) were men. One individual skipped this question. **Table 3** provides a listing of words and phrases collected from the survey. The following are 21 words that respondents cited that we had also pulled from the literature review but were not listed in our instrument: abusive, aggressive, arrogant, autocratic, bully, charismatic, coercive, demeaning, destructive, egocentric, exclusion, incompetent, irrational, micromanager, narcissistic, paranoid, rigid, ruthless, toxic, undermining, and unethical. The three words submitted by the respondents the most often were bully (n=10), controlling (n=13) and manipulative (n=17). All of these words will be added to our instrument.

Table 4 shows the percentage of times the behaviors were noted for the leader. All of the behaviors were checked by at least 15 respondents. "Lacks concern for others, devalues others" was reported the most (84.9%) and "Creative, but thinking and acting in unusual or eccentric ways" was reported the least (16.1%). **Table 5** shows the percentage of times a specific behavior

was reported. "Hanging a 'wall of shame' bulletin board to post employee blunders as a display" (6.6%) and "Promising you a promotion if you do something that involves bending a company policy" (6.6%) were reported the least amount of times and "Ignoring employees' comments" was reported the most often (74.7%). There were forty additional behaviors that were submitted that the respondents thought needed to be added to our list:

When asked if the respondent would be comfortable completing the survey as reference check for the destructive leader if their identity would be kept confidential 85.7% said yes (14.3% said no and 5 individuals skipped the question). When asked if the respondent would be comfortable completing the survey for the destructive leader if their identity could become known to the destructive leader 75.8% said no (24.2% said yes and 5 individuals skipped the question).

Discussion

Hogan and Kaiser (2005) have noted that executive decisions rarely include formal selection tools. Often the new leaders are recruited from outside of the organization, making it difficult to accurately assess the candidate. And narcissists and psychopaths excel during interviews. We need to be using good selection methods. Appendix 3 represents the instrument we proposed after completing the three phases of our project. This instrument has the additional information from survey data collected (highlighted in gray) and we have eliminated specific behaviors that were chosen by less than 25% of the respondents to shorten the time required to complete the survey (these items are crossed out). Next steps will be to contact the authors of parts of the survey that we gleamed from their articles to get their permission to include their

general behavior and specific behavior examples in our instrument. Then we will need to begin validating our instrument.

Many of the articles on dark side and/or destructive leaders feature high profile cases of leaders at the top very large organizations. While these cases are very interesting we believe there needs to be more publications highlighting cases of destructive leaders at all levels of organizations.

Our Advice for Organizations

It is essential that organizations use formal selection tools when filling <u>all</u> positions in the organization. The use of a "tapping" process, like the one used in our case study, where someone is appointed to a leadership position without the use of a selection committee, is dangerous.

Organizations need to involve peers and subordinates in the evaluation of a leader, not just supervisors in the evaluation process. Organizations need to focus on a balanced score card, not just profits, that takes a close look at the human costs involved in a manager's financial success.

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.

Aguilera, R.V., & Vadera, A.K. (2008). The dark side of authority: antecedents, mechanisms, and outcomes of organizational corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics* 77,431–449.

Allio, R.J. (2007). Bad leaders: how they get that way and what to do about them. *Strategy and Leadership* 35(3),12-17.

Babiak, P., & Hare, R. D. (2006). Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work. New York: Harper Collins.

Bamberger, P. A., & Bacharach, S.B. (2006). 'Abusive supervision and subordinate problem drinking: taking resistance, stress, and subordinate personality into account'. *Human Relations*, 59,1–30.

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

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

Blickle, G., Schlegel, A., Fassbender, P., & Klein, U. (2006). Some personality correlates of business white-collar crime. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 55,220-33.

Boddy, C. R., Ladyshewsky, R.K., & Galvin, P. (2010). The influence of corporate psychopaths on corporate social responsibility and organizational commitment to employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97,1–19.

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

Bollaert, H., & Petit, V. (2010). Beyond the dark side of executive psychology: current research and new directions. *European Management Journal*, 28(5),362–376.

Campbell, W.K. & Campbell, S.M. (2009). On the self-regulatory dynamics created by the peculiar benefits and costs of narcissism: a contextual reinforcement model and examination of leadership. *Self and Identity*, 8, 214-32.

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, rerailment potential behavior, and turnover. Journal of Business and Psychology.

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D.C. (2007). It's all about me: narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52,351-86.

De Fruyt, F., De Clercq, B., Milley, J., Rolland, J. P., Jung, S. C., Taris, R., *et al*. (2009). Assessing personality at risk in personnel selection and development. *European Journal of Personality*, 23, 51–69.

DeVries, D. L., & Kaiser, R. B. (2003, November). Going sour in the suite: What you can do about executive derailment. Workshop presented at the Maximizing Executive Effectiveness meeting of the Human Resources Planning Society, Miami, FL.

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 16–27.

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

Freking, R. (2012). The Real Employee Handbook. Copyright by Randy Freking, Cincinnati, Ohio. ISBN 147745134X.

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.

Gini, A., & Green, R.M. (2012). Bad leaders/misleaders. *Business and Society Review*, 117(2),143–154.

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. (1991) The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised by Robert D. Hare, 1991. Multi-Health Systems, 908 Niagara Falls Blvd, North Tonawanda, New York, USA, 14120-2060

Harms, P.D., Spain, S.M., & Hannah, S.T. (2011). Leader development and the dark side of personality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22,495–509.

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

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., & Kaiser, R.B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2),169–180.

Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B. (2010). Management Derailment. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20,855–875.

Ketola, T. (2006). From CR-psychopaths to responsible corporations: waking up the inner sleeping beauty of companies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 13, 98-107.

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.

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

Mullins-Sweatt, S. N., Glover, N. G., Derefinko, K. J., Miller, J. D., & Widiger, T. A. (2010). The search for the successful psychopath. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 554-558.

Najar, M.J., Holland, B.D. & Van Landuyt, C.R. (2004, April). Individual differences in leadership derailment. Paper presented at the 19th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago.

Nelson, E., Hogan, R. (2009). Coaching on the dark side. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 4(1),7-19.

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

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B. (2007). The toxic triangle: destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly* 18, 176–194.

Paulhus, D.L., & Williams, K.M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(1), 556-563.

Pech, R.J., & Slade, B.W. (2007). Organisational 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.

Porter, J. (2012). 3 personality types that can harm your business. Terra. Retreived Octover 2, 2012 from http://news.terra.com/3-personality-types-that-can-harm-your-business,aebb0140da7c8310VgnVCM20000099cceb0aRCRD.html?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social&utm_content=64c234fa-e146-4407-81e6-ed6ee41c32e3

Ro, S. "PETER SCHIFF: We Are Sailing Right Into The Perfect Storm." Business Insider. 02 October 2012 <http://www.businessinsider.com/peter-schiff-perfect-storm-2012-8>.

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.

Smith, S.E. "What do People Mean When They Talk About a "Perfect Storm"?." wiseGeek. 01 November 2012 <http://www.wisegeek.com/what-do-people-mean-when-they-talk-about-a-perfect-storm.htm>.

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.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision, *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178–190.

Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: review, synthesis, and research agenda, *Journal of Management*, 33, 261–289.

Thoroughgood, C.N., Hunter, S.T., & Sawyer, K.B. (2011). Bad apples, bad barrels, and broken followers? an empirical examination of contextual influences on follower perceptions and reactions to aversive leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 100:647–672.

VanFleet, D.D. & Griffin, R.W. (2006). Dysfunctional organizational culture: The role of leadership in motivating dysfunctional work behaviours. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 698–708.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B.J. & Duffy, M.K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1068–1076.

Appendix 1. Behavior and specific behaviors checklist.

Behaviors of a dark side and/or destructive leader:

€   Moody, easily annoyed, hard to please, and emotionally volatile [2]

€   Distrustful, cynical, sensitive to criticism, and focused on the negative [2]

€   Unassertive, resistant to change, risk-averse, and slow to make decisions [2]

€   Aloof, indifferent to the feelings of others, and uncommunicative [2]

€   Overtly cooperative, but privately irritable, stubborn, and uncooperative [2]

€   Overly self-confident, arrogant, with inflated feelings of self-worth [2]

€   Charming, risk-taking, limit-testing and excitement-seeking [2]

€   Dramatic, attention-seeking, interruptive, and poor listening skills [2]

€   Creative, but thinking and acting in unusual or eccentric ways [2]

€   Meticulous, precise, hard to please, and tends to micromanage [2]

€   Eager to please and reluctant to act independently or against popular opinion [2]

€   Preoccupied with power and wealth [2]

€   Excessive seeking of admiration [1]

€   Believe they are entitled to have whatever they want, willing to exploit others to get it [1]

€   Lacks concern for others, devalues others [1]

Specific behaviors of a dark side and/or destructive leader:

€   Inviting a select few to an important meeting. [4]

€   Publicly ridiculing an employee's work. [4]

€   Mocking employees as a display of humor. [4]

€   Yelling when a deadline is missed. [4]

€   Asking employees to work late to help a coworker complete a major project. [4]

€ Threatening to terminate a coworker, even if the statement is made in a joking manner. [4]

€ Asking one of your coworkers, 'Is this the best you can do?' [4]

€ Asking employees for ideas on how to resolve an organizational problem. [4]

€ Taking credit for an employee's work. [4]

€ Inviting specific employees to social events (e.g., golfing, company parties) and excluding others. [4]

€ Blaming others for the leader's mistakes. [4]

€ Ignoring employees' comments. [4]

€ Slamming a fist on the table to emphasize a point. [4]

€ Making an employee feel as though his or her job is in jeopardy. [4]

€ Using inspirational appeals to get employees to comply with a new policy. [4]

€ Lying about the organization's performance at a company meeting. [4]

€ Bending the rules to achieve productivity goals. [4]

€ Lying to employees to get his or her way. [4]

€ Continuing to do things the old way. [4]

€ Making false statements about the competitor. [4]

€ Making employees work until the job is done, even if it means they must work all night. [4]

€ Greeting all of your coworkers in the morning but ignoring you. [4]

€ Reprimanding employees when they make a mistake. [4]

€ Asking an employee to falsify productivity figures to meet a goal. [4]

€ Promising you a promotion if you do something that involves bending a company policy. [4]

€ Throwing a tantrum when goals are not met. [4]

€ Coercing employees to accept his or her ideas. [4]

€ Failing to disclose the reasons behind organizational decisions. [4]

€ Telling an employee in public that he or she is not a team player. [4]

€ Acknowledging other coworkers' contributions to a project but not yours. [4]

€ Raising voice when his/her point does not appear to be accepted by employees. [4]

€ Threatening to deny an employee's vacation request if a deadline is missed. [4]

€ Failing to respond to concerns of employees. [4]

€ Not sticking to the plan of action. [4]

€ Demoting an employee without giving a good reason for the decision. [4]

€ Saying to an employee 'you just don't understand the problem'. [4]

€ Seeking the advice of a select few to brainstorm ideas for a new project. [4]

€ Giving resources to departments whose functions make the leader look good. [4]

€ Creating contests between two employees where winning involves marginalizing the work of the other. [4]

€ Hanging a 'wall of shame' bulletin board to post employee blunders as a display [4]

€ Acts in a brutal bullying manner [3]

€ Lies and acts in an unethical way [3]

€ Micro-manages and over-controls [3]

€ Unable to deal with interpersonal conflict or similar situations [3]

€ Doesn't have the skills to match the job [3]

€ Unwilling to change mind and listen to others [3]

€ Shows favoritism toward employees of leader's own gender [5]

€ Does not address issue of upper management not following policies and procedures or makes subordinates address the issue [5]

[1] Gudmundsson & Southey, 2011

[2] Hogan & Hogan, 2001

[3] Shaw, Erickson & Harvey, 2011

[4] Pelletier, 2010

[5] Feedback from former co-workers of author, 2012

Appendix 2. Case study with components that were checked on the instrument in [], bold and shaded.

Our case study takes place in the research department of a Midwestern hospital system. The department had been in existence since the 1960's and was known for its service first approach in supporting two teaching hospitals. The department had a history of exemplary physician leaders involved in medical research for the organization. In 2009 the department lost their Level 5 leader – the VP of Academic Affairs - of 20 years within two weeks of diagnosis of an acute leukemia.

The new VP appointed provided no strategic direction or ideas for new growth. He would sit in research staff meetings, shake his head, and proclaim, "I have no idea what I am doing in research." Despite the lack of leadership from the new VP, the department saw a 47% and 75% percent increase in projects and clinical trials respectively.

Eighteen months after the death of the Level 5 leader, the new VP hired a consultant to chair one of the research committees and help build the clinical trial division of the department. This consultant, a dark side and destructive leader, is the focus of our case study. We will refer to this individual as Dr. E.

As time went on, the new VP became more and more dependent on Dr. E for advice about research **[charming]**, however, it quickly became apparent to the subordinates that Dr. E did not know federal research laws he had claimed to know. **[doesn't have the skills to match the job]** He claimed he had many contacts in industry and had some fresh new ideas for the department. **[overly self-confident]** For 12 months there were no new contacts made and no new ideas presented while he was a consultant. **[continuing to do things the old way]**

During month 13 of his consultant period, Dr. E suddenly showed up on the electronic payroll system as a full time employee with the title of a new position for the organization - medical director and head of the research department. The research staff members were not told until 10 days later. **[failing to disclose the reasons behind organizational decisions]** Dr. E's position was never posted, there wasn't a search committee, and no one else was given a chance to interview for the position.

The first week in the new leadership position Dr. E removed the administrative secretary who had been supporting the 45 research staff members and made her his personal administrative secretary. He stated he had heard she was the best, he deserved the best, so he was taking the best. **[promising you a promotion if you do something that involves bending a company policy]** He promised her a salary increase, but didn't bother to check organizational policies. **[coercing employees to accept his or her ideas]** On numerous occasions he stated that he didn't have to follow organizational policies - they are merely guidelines. The secretary never got a pay increase.

Dr. E would tell the administrative secretary that he was going out of town. Then he would show up for work on those days, stating he needed to check and see what everyone was doing. He would schedule some meetings on his own and would often take calls on his cell phone and would go outside so no one could hear the conversation.

He immediately took the biggest office. **[believe they are entitled to have whatever they want]** He spent countless hours picking out new furniture. He would make a selection and then the next day would change his mind. **[reluctant to act independently]** He even had the furniture supplier provide 3D drawings of how many different ways the furniture could be arranged in the office. It took about two months to finally settle on the furniture. **[slow to make decisions]**

It took days to pick the right Keurig coffee maker for the department. Once it came in he provided coffee for free for the staff, then figured he better check how much that would cost the department, and then decided staff had to provide their own Keurig cups. **[not sticking to the plan of action]**

Dr. E told the staff they could no longer communicate directly with the new VP – all communication had to go through him. **[micro-manages and over-controls]** He met with every staff member for 20 minutes. He hinted to several that their job may be eliminated. **[threatening to terminate a worker]** He threatened one employee that he must make him look good or else he would find someone else who would. He told one female employee she talked too much because she was obviously Italian.

Dr. E ordered two female employees to spend a day cleaning out a storage room to create work stations for new staff that required heavy lifting beyond what is normally expected of individuals in these positions and when one of the male employees offered to help Dr. E told him no - it was "women's' work." **[shows favoritism toward employees of leader's own gender]**

He was extremely arrogant and self-focused. **[excessive seeking of admiration]** He shared with staff that it had recently pleased him to be the best looking person at one of his school reunions. **[preoccupied with wealth]** He was quick to mention he only traveled first class and constantly boasted about the number of expensive cars he owned. He was excited about the "sweet deal' he had negotiated with the organization and was anxious to show the staff the new Jaguar he was test driving. **[indifferent to the feelings of others]**

He was quick to give the impression that he was licensed to practice medicine and even had "Heart Doc" for his license plate. **[inflated feeling of self worth]** Ironically, he was never licensed to practice medicine in the United States.

Dr. E immediately adjusted work hours without any concern for the needs of the employees and took away the ability to work from home. **[failing to respond to concerns of employees]** No consideration was taken into account that some of the work hours were in place to optimize patient enrollment in a study or optimize the chance to meet with a physician around a very busy work schedule. One staff member requested to come in at

8:00 instead of the 7:00 because she had leukemia and it was very hard for to get in by 7:00. He said no. **[indifferent to the feelings of others]** *He also expected practicing physicians to travel to his office to meet with him in the middle of the day.* **[uncooperative]** *He had no concern for the needs of subordinates or others.* **[lacks concern for others]**

From day one Dr. E stated that the staff had capacity - but he had never once looked any metrics for the department. Some days he would site 30% capacity, the next day it would be 25% and the next day it would be 35%. He immediately began to look at how to reorganize the entire department and re-write all of the job descriptions **[making an employee feel as though his or her job is in jeopardy]**. *Significant changes in staffing structures were proposed that would push work back on resident physicians. Dr. E modeled these changes without input or feedback from the residency program directors.*

Staff were told to complete a task, then told that it wasn't right, then told to do it another way, and again, and on and on and on. Countless hours were spent on reworking requests. **[making employees work until the job is done, even if it means they must work all night] [asking employees to work late to complete a major project]**

He displayed bullying behaviors. When working on proposals or budgets he simply made up numbers **[asking an employee to falsify productivity figures to meet a goal]** *but was quick to threaten staff that they had to make his made up numbers work because they were responsible for them, not him.* **[bending the rules to achieve productivity goals]** *He repeatedly questioned one of the male staff members if he was loyal to Dr. E and informed him that if he ever found out otherwise the male staff member would never have his trust again.* **[coercing employees to accept his or her ideas]** *Some of his plans and actions were illegal or unethical. But he stated any repercussions would not be his problem – they would be the problems of the people who hired him.* **[acts in a brutal bullying manner]**

On numerous occasions Dr. E forced changes in research protocols against the advice of experienced research specialists, clinical trial staff, and physician faculty. **[lies and acts in an unethical way]** *If confronted about the changes, he would lie and say that he hadn't made them.* **[publicly ridiculing an employee's work]** *He made changes in protocols to include inappropriate sample sizes in the project methods. He took away projects from research specialists to personally work on them.* **[tends to micromanage]** *He held "secret" meetings with physicians.* **[distrustful] [inviting a select few to an important meeting]** *He was given authority to approve research projects administratively, approve the budgets, sign the contracts and as chair of the Institutional Review Board approve protocols based on human subject protection. He was put in a position of absolute authority with no checks or balances in place.*

He falsely accused a staff member of forgery, referred to a female physician as a "whore" and a "bitch" and lied about being a staff physician at a famous hospital system in the past. He said there were too many women in the department and not enough men. When it was reported to him that staff were looking to leave the organization he could be

heard screaming from his office *"I don't fucking care if 2 or 3 staff leave, I don't fucking care if they all leave."* **[emotionally volatile]**

Against the advice of senior staff members, Dr. E proposed to replace RNs with MAs for inpatient cardiovascular and oncology trials. **[poor listening skills]** *The staff had grave concerns that this would severely compromise patient safety and well-being. He didn't care.* **[ignoring employees' comments] [unwilling to change mind and listen to others]**

Dr. E could be seen pacing up and down the hallways and knocking on doors, checking to see if staff members were in their offices. **[acting in unusual ways]** *Staff members began working with their doors closed and locked, pretending that they were not there so they could get some work done. Dr. E habitually sat at his desk and yelled out the name of his administrative assistant when he needed her to do something; when she was not there he yelled out the names of other staff.* **[interruptive]**

Dr. E was extremely paranoid. He constantly probed staff to see what they thought about him. When greeted in the morning and asked how he was that day he would respond, "Well I'm here ... no one has shot me yet." **[focused on the negative]**

By the end of the fifth month, two staff members had resigned. One of them was an outstanding senior member with over 10 years of experience. More staff looked to leave. Moral was horrible.

Finally one of the staff members shared all of the observations and concerns with the new VP, asking him to keep the information confidential. The new VP did not keep it confidential but shared all of the concerns with Dr. E. Dr. E denied all of them. **[blaming others for the leader's mistakes]**

One staff member went back to check references listed on Dr. E's resume. His former boss and superiors stated that many of the things listed on his resume were "grossly exaggerated" and he had a terrible reputation as a leader. Co-workers shared that he had treated his previous staff horribly, was unethical and had poor scientific skills. His approach had been egotistical and dictorial. One of his former bosses shared, "Do not let Dr. E hide behind his poor command of the English language to hide the gaps in his thought processes."

In desperation a number of the staff met off the main campus and made the decision that they had to speak up as a group or stand by and watch everything destroyed. There was also grave concern for the integrity of the research program and fear that patients could eventually be harmed by the actions of Dr. E. The administrative director for the department made an appeal to human resources and even requested a meeting with the CEO on behalf of the staff. Consultants were brought in to meet with various research staff and research leadership. The reports from the consultants went to the system COO. As a result, the COO had Dr. E resign from the director position but allowed him to continue to chair the Institutional Review Board. Within a couple of weeks Dr. E was given an office in senior administration and given a new director title. The COO forced the administrative director of the research department to resign, stating a change in leadership was needed due to the

unrest that had been present in the department for the past five months. The COO was the person who hired Dr. E. The CEO never made contact with the remaining staff.

In the next 12 weeks two more senior staff members left.

Appendix 3. Survey posted on LinkedIn.

Dark Side and/or Destructive Leader Survey

"A dark side or destructive leader is defined as a leader that demonstrates systematic and repeated behavior that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization's goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of his/her subordinates." (Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, and Einarsen, 2010)

If you have worked for a dark side and/or destructive leader in the past please take a few minutes to complete this brief survey.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Refusal to participate or discontinuation of participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. By completing this questionnaire, you indicate your consent to participate in this study"

The information being gathered is part of a research study looking at ways to assess potential leadership candidates for dark side and/or destructive leader traits and behaviors. Your response to this survey will complete your participation in the study. The only procedure in this study is the completion of the survey.

No identifying information is being captured. We are using Survey Monkey and have turned off the default setting that collects IP addresses and we are using the version of Survey Monkey that uses SSL encryption.

No compensation will be awarded for completing the survey.

Results will be posted to the LinkedIn groups surveyed.

How long has it been since you worked for the dark side/destructive leader?

€ Within past 12 months

€ Past 2-3 years

€ Past 4-5 years

€ Greater than 5 years ago

Was the dark side/destructive leader a female or a male?

€ Female

€ Male

Please list five words to describe the dark side and/or destructive leader :

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

Please check all of the behaviors you saw in the dark side and/or destructive leader you worked for …

€ Moody, easily annoyed, hard to please, and emotionally volatile

€ Distrustful, cynical, sensitive to criticism, and focused on the negative

€ Unassertive, resistant to change, risk-averse, and slow to make decisions

€ Aloof, indifferent to the feelings of others, and uncommunicative

€ Overtly cooperative, but privately irritable, stubborn, and uncooperative

€ Overly self-confident, arrogant, with inflated feelings of self-worth

€ Charming, risk-taking, limit-testing and excitement-seeking

€ Dramatic, attention-seeking, interruptive, and poor listening skills

€ Creative, but thinking and acting in unusual or eccentric ways

€ Meticulous, precise, hard to please, and tends to micromanage

€ Eager to please and reluctant to act independently or against popular opinion

€ Preoccupied with power and wealth

€ Excessive seeking of admiration

€ Believe they are entitled to have whatever they want, willing to exploit others to get it

€ Lacks concern for others, devalues others

From the following list, please check the specific behaviors you witnessed:

€ Inviting a select few to an important meeting.

€ Publicly ridiculing an employee's work.

€ Mocking employees as a display of humor.

€ Yelling when a deadline is missed.

€ Asking employees to work late to help a coworker complete a major project.

€ Threatening to terminate a coworker, even if the statement is made in a joking manner.

€ Asking one of your coworkers, 'Is this the best you can do?'

€ Asking employees for ideas on how to resolve an organizational problem.

€ Taking credit for an employee's work.

€ Inviting specific employees to social events (e.g., golfing, company parties) and excluding others.

€ Blaming others for the leader's mistakes.

€ Ignoring employees' comments.

€ Slamming a fist on the table to emphasize a point.

€ Making an employee feel as though his or her job is in jeopardy.

€ Using inspirational appeals to get employees to comply with a new policy.

€ Lying about the organization's performance at a company meeting.

€ Bending the rules to achieve productivity goals.

€ Lying to employees to get his or her way.

€ Continuing to do things the old way.

€ Making false statements about the competitor.

€ Making employees work until the job is done, even if it means they must work all night.

€ Greeting all of your coworkers in the morning but ignoring you.

€ Reprimanding employees when they make a mistake.

€ Asking an employee to falsify productivity figures to meet a goal.

€ Promising you a promotion if you do something that involves bending a company policy.

€ Throwing a tantrum when goals are not met.

€ Coercing employees to accept his or her ideas.

€ Failing to disclose the reasons behind organizational decisions.

€ Telling an employee in public that he or she is not a team player.

€ Acknowledging other coworkers' contributions to a project but not yours.

€ Raising voice when his/her point does not appear to be accepted by employees.

€ Threatening to deny an employee's vacation request if a deadline is missed.

€ Failing to respond to concerns of employees.

€ Not sticking to the plan of action.

€ Demoting an employee without giving a good reason for the decision.

€ Saying to an employee 'you just don't understand the problem'.

€ Seeking the advice of a select few to brainstorm ideas for a new project.

€ Giving resources to departments whose functions make the leader look good.

€ Creating contests between two employees where winning involves marginalizing the work of the other.

€ Hanging a 'wall of shame' bulletin board to post employee blunders as a display.

€ Acts in a brutal bullying manner.

€ Lies and acts in an unethical way.

€ Micro-manages and over-controls.

€ Unable to deal with interpersonal conflict or similar situations.

€ Doesn't have the skills to match the job.

€   Unwilling to change mind and listen to others.

€   Shows favoritism toward employees of leader's own gender.

€   Does not address issue of upper management not following policies and procedures or makes subordinates address the issue.

Are there additional behaviors that should be added to the list above? If so, please add them to the box below:

If you were asked to complete a reference check for the destructive leader would you be comfortable completing the behavior check lists above if your identity would be kept confidential?

€ Yes

€ No

If you were asked to complete a reference check for destructive leader would you be comfortable completing the behavior check lists above if your identity could become known to the destructive leader?

€ Yes

€ No

Thank you so much for your time. Look for the results in the next couple of weeks.

Appendix 4. Behavior and specific behaviors checklist. [NEW] indicates items I have added based upon our survey data collected.

Behaviors of a dark side and/or destructive leader:

- € Abusive, aggressive, or arrogant [NEW]

- € Aloof, indifferent to the feelings of others, and uncommunicative [2]

- € Autocratic, bully, or charismatic [NEW]

- € Believe they are entitled to have whatever they want, willing to exploit others to get it [1]

- € Charming, risk-taking, limit-testing and excitement-seeking [2]

- € Coercive, demeaning, or destructive [NEW]

- € Creative, but thinking and acting in unusual or eccentric ways [2]

- € Distrustful, cynical, sensitive to criticism, and focused on the negative [2]

- € Dramatic, attention-seeking, interruptive, and poor listening skills [2]

- € Eager to please and reluctant to act independently or against popular opinion [2]

- € Egocentric, exclusion, incompetent or irrational [NEW]

- € Excessive seeking of admiration [1]

- € Lacks concern for others, devalues others [1]

- € Meticulous, precise, hard to please, and tends to micromanage [2]

- € Micromanager, narcissistic, paranoid or rigid [NEW]

- € Moody, easily annoyed, hard to please, and emotionally volatile [2]

- € Overly self-confident, arrogant, with inflated feelings of self-worth [2]

- € Overtly cooperative, but privately irritable, stubborn, and uncooperative [2]

- € Preoccupied with power and wealth [2]

- € Ruthless, toxic, undermining or unethical [NEW]

- € Selfish, controlling or manipulative [NEW]

€   Unassertive, resistant to change, risk-averse, and slow to make decisions [2]

Specific behaviors of a dark side and/or destructive leader:

€   Acknowledging other coworkers' contributions to a project but not yours. [4]

€   Acts in a brutal bullying manner [3]

€   Ambiguous in describing work tasks and goals [NEW]

€   ~~Asking an employee to falsify productivity figures to meet a goal. [4]~~

€   Asking around if a co-worker could be trusted, planting a seed of mistrust [NEW]

€   Asking employees for ideas on how to resolve an organizational problem. [4]

€   ~~Asking employees to work late to help a coworker complete a major project. [4]~~

€   Asking one of your coworkers, 'Is this the best you can do?' [4]

€   Befriending staff and then using confidences against them [NEW]

€   Bending the rules to achieve productivity goals. [4]

€   Blaming others for the leader's mistakes. [4]

€   Charming and convincing to senior staff [NEW]

€   Coercing employees to accept his or her ideas. [4]

€   Continuing to do things the old way. [4]

€   Copies strategies from previous employers and implements them in new company as her own [NEW]

€   Creates a culture of compliance and fear [NEW]

€   Creates a mob mentality and bullying [NEW]

€   Creates factions and builds a camp of supporters, pitting them against the others through deception [NEW]

€   Creates suspicion among team members creating horizontal violence diffusing the actual issue [NEW]

€   Creating contests between two employees where winning involves marginalizing the work of the other. [4]

€   Curses in a team meeting [NEW]

€   Demoting an employee without giving a good reason for the decision. [4]

€   Dismisses employees skills and knowledge [NEW]

€   Does not address issue of upper management not following policies and procedures or makes subordinates address the issue [5]

€   Does not recognize the skills and strengths of employee [NEW]

€   Does not train employees or give them access to databases and information needed to complete their job duties [NEW]

€   Doesn't have the skills to match the job [3]

€   Doesn't show up for work [NEW]

€   Emotionally abuses employee through labeling, name calling [NEW]

€   Endlessly tells stories about his past success [NEW]

€   Excludes staff out of favor [NEW]

€   Failing to disclose the reasons behind organizational decisions. [4]

€   Failing to respond to concerns of employees. [4]

€   Finds fault in any performance or achievement of employees [NEW]

€   Gives demeaning tasks [NEW]

€   Giving resources to departments whose functions make the leader look good. [4]

€   Greeting all of your coworkers in the morning but ignoring you. [4]

€   ~~Hanging a 'wall of shame' bulletin board to post employee blunders as a display [4]~~

€   His favored managers are ALWAYS right [NEW]

€   Ignoring employees' comments. [4]

€   Individuals are either "in" or "out"; doesn't engage those who are "out"' [NEW]

€   Intolerance against other nationalities/races [NEW]

€   Invents fictitious complaints made about people to blackmail them with [NEW]

€   Inviting a select few to an important meeting. [4]

€ Inviting specific employees to social events (e.g., golfing, company parties) and excluding others. [4]

€ Lies and acts in an unethical way [3]

€ Lying about the organization's performance at a company meeting. [4]

€ Lying to employees to get his or her way. [4]

€ Makes unilateral decisions and ignores alternative advice [NEW]

€ Makes you follow her into bathroom in order to be listened to [NEW]

€ Making an employee feel as though his or her job is in jeopardy. [4]

€ ~~Making employees work until the job is done, even if it means they must work all night. [4]~~

€ ~~Making false statements about the competitor. [4]~~

€ Micro-manages and over-controls [3]

€ Mocking employees as a display of humor. [4]

€ Not sticking to the plan of action. [4]

€ One-on-one meetings before group meetings thus pre-empts knowledge base of group [NEW]

€ Passes aggressive threats of violence off as a joke [NEW]

€ Plain arrogance about self-worth at the expense of others [NEW]

€ ~~Promising you a promotion if you do something that involves bending a company policy. [4]~~

€ Publicly ridiculing an employee's work. [4]

€ Raising voice when his/her point does not appear to be accepted by employees. [4]

€ Reprimanding employees when they make a mistake. [4]

€ Saying one thing/giving one direction to a particular person that is purposely at odds with a direction they've given another person, so as to cause immediate friction between them [NEW]

€ Saying to an employee 'you just don't understand the problem'. [4]

€ Seeking the advice of a select few to brainstorm ideas for a new project. [4]

- € Sends gifts to favored employees and upper management for no reason [NEW]

- € Sets employees up to fail and blames the innocent for the failure of their favorite person(s) [NEW]

- € Sews discord [NEW]

- € Shoots the messenger [NEW]

- € Shows favoritism toward employees of leader's own gender [5]

- € Slamming a fist on the table to emphasize a point. [4]

- € Stating "It will be that way until the day I die" [NEW]

- € Surrounding themself with 'yes' people [NEW]

- € Taking credit for an employee's work. [4]

- € Talks constantly about their own achievements [NEW]

- € Telling an employee in public that he or she is not a team player. [4]

- € Terminates staff for no reason [NEW]

- € ~~Threatening to deny an employee's vacation request if a deadline is missed. [4]~~

- € Threatening to terminate a coworker, even if the statement is made in a joking manner. [4]

- € Throwing a tantrum when goals are not met. [4]

- € Unable to deal with interpersonal conflict or similar situations [3]

- € Undermines a person's reputation or integrity publicly or privately behind their back [NEW]

- € Underrates jobs [NEW]

- € Unwilling to change mind and listen to others [3]

- € Unwilling to dialogue with others when there is a disagreement or differing opinion on mission/values [NEW]

- € ~~Using inspirational appeals to get employees to comply with a new policy. [4]~~

- € Yelling when a deadline is missed. [4]

[1] Gudmundsson & Southey, 2011

[2] Hogan & Hogan, 2001

[3] Shaw, Erickson & Harvey, 2011

[4] Pelletier, 2010

[5] Feedback from former co-workers of author, 2012

[NEW] Items added from responses to survey

Table 1. Assessment tools that could be used during a hiring process to look for dark side and/or destructive traits

Author	Assessment tools
Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, and Einarsen, 2010	Destructive and Constructive Leadership (DCL) behavior model
Boddy, Ladyshewsky and Galvin, 2010	Psychopathy Measure-Management Research Version
Carson *et al*., 2012	Hogan Development Survey
De Fruyt *et al*., 2009	Five Factor Model combined with the Personality Disorder Inventory
Furnham, Trickey and Hyde, 2012	Hogan Developmental Survey
Goldman, 2006	DSM IV-TR: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders
Gudmundsson and Southey, 2011	The Psychopathy Checklist – Revised (PCL-R) (Hare, 1991)
Najar, Holland and Van Landuyt, 2004	Hogan Developmental Survey
Paulhus and Williams, 2002	The NPI (Raskin & Hall, 1979) to measure narcissism. The Mach-IV inventory (Christie & Geis, 1970) measure Machiavellianism. To measure subclinical psychopathy, use the SRP III (Hare, 1985) The Big Five inventory to measure extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness
Pelletier, 2010	Leader Behavior Assessment
Shaw, Erickson and Harvey, 2011.	Destructive Leadership Questionnaire

Table 2. Number of responses collected for each of the eight groups plus the responses to our tweet posted on Twitter.

Data Collection Sites	Number of Responses
Association of Certified Research Professionals	1
Authentic Leadership	4
College Program student, alumni and faculty	1
Harvard Business Review	80
Leadership Think Tank	0
Linked 2 Leadership	1
Linked Cincinnati	2
University Alumni	5
Twitter	2

Table 3. Descriptive words and phrases submitted by the respondents.

Descriptive words collected from respondents (n=times word listed)							
Descriptive word	n	Descriptive word	n	Descriptive word	n	Descriptive word	n
abrasive	1	disconnected	1	irrational	1	self-deluding	1
abusive	6	discriminating	1	jealous	1	self-focused	2
aggressive	8	disempowering	1	knowledgeable	1	selfish	9
aloof	1	dishonest	6	lazy	1	self-preservation	1
ambiguous	1	dismissive	1	liar	4	shallow	1
angry	4	disorganized	2	lies	1	shouts	2
arbitrary	1	disrespect	1	loser	1	single-minded	1
arrogant	9	distrust	1	loud	2	slimy	1
autocratic	1	divisive	3	Machiavellian	1	sneaky	1
back-stabbing	1	domineering	2	malicious	1	sociopath	1
belittling	1	dramatic	1	manipulative	17	subversive	3
bipolar	2	driven	1	mean	1	surreptitious	1
blaming	3	egocentric	2	mediocre	1	threats	2
bombastic	1	egoistic	1	megalomaniac	1	toxic	1
bossy	1	egotistical	5	micromanager	6	two-faced	2
bully	10	entitled	1	misogynistic	1	tyrant	1
calculating	1	entrepreneurial	1	moody	1	unaware	2
caustic	1	erratic	2	narcissistic	4	unclear	2
chameleon	1	evasive	1	near-sighted	1	underhanded	1
charismatic	4	evil	3	negative	4	undermining	2
charming	3	exclusion	1	non-communicative	1	undiversided	1
clever	1	fear	1	non-confrontational	1	unempathetic	1
close-minded	2	flawed	1	nongenerous	1	unethical	2
coercive	1	fraudulent	1	oblivious	1	unfair	2
competitive	1	frustrated	1	obtuse	1	unfocused	1
complacent	1	gossip	2	outgoing	1	unforgiving	2
complex	1	heedless	1	overbearing	1	ungrateful	2
complicit	1	hostile	1	overprotective	1	unintelligent	1
conceited	1	humiliating	1	over reactive	1	unorganized	1
condescending	3	hurtful	1	paranoid	3	unpredictable	1
confident	2	ignorant	2	passive	1	unproductive	1
conniving	1	immature	1	passive aggressive	5	unrealistic	2
controlling	13	impatient	2	paternalistic	1	unreasonable	1
convincing	1	Incompetent	2	patronizing	1	unrelenting	1

cruel	3	inconsiderate	1	phony	1	unsupportive	1
cunning	1	Inconsistent	3	political	4	untrusting	1
damaging	1	indifferent	1	powerful	1	untrustworthy	3
deceitful	1	ineffective	1	reactive	1	untruthful	1
deceptive	2	inexperienced	1	restless	1	vindictive	1
demeaning	4	inflexible	1	rigid	1	visionary	1
demoralizing	1	ignorant	1	rude	4	volatile	2
demotivates	1	insecure	7	ruthless	1	weak	2
destructible	1	insensitive	1	scary	1	whiner	1
destructive	3	insidious	1	school-marm	1	withholding	1
dictator	2	insulting	1	secretive	4	workaholic	1
diminisher	2	intelligent	1	self-absorbed	1		
directive	1	intimidating	4	self-centered	5		

Phrases collected from the respondents

"I'm the boss" attitude
Always hire women, have problems with men who have own opinion
Attack from the back
Attention seeker
Big ego
Blame any person who might be a potential threat
Career-focused, builds his own empire
Comments sarcastically
Complex of low value
Conflict avoidant
Constructive dismissal
Control freak
Dishonest performance review and negative impact on compensation
Does not work with people for a long, tries to replace people annually to his team
Easy to anger
Ego maniac
Emotionally unstable
Exclusion from important communication
False accusations
Feeling of isolation and rejection (silence)
Feels threatened by co-workers who want to learn
He is ingratiate
Hidden agenda
Hides behind a chair
His way or the highway
Ill tempered
Incompetent in her work and managing team

Inflexible/one-dimensional/narrow
Jekyll-Hyde
Lack of big picture thinking
Lack of empathy
Lack of performance feedback
Lack of understanding
Lacking empathy
Mis use her authority to ask team member to do her work for her.
Moral harassment, repetitive degrading comments in front of peers
My way or it's wrong
Naive as CEO
Narrow minded
No authority
No clear direction
No concern for other's feelings
No idea
No initiative
No leader personality/behavior
No option to discuss-participate to decision
No respect for self-esteem
Non appreciating
Not a disciplinarian
Not adaptable
NOT open to new ideas
Not straightforward
Not transparent with board
Only results/task oriented
Plays favorites
Poor communication
Poor listener
Power hungry
Proud that he fired people and continues to destroy their careers
Public embarrassment
Public humiliation
Pushy even with customers
Refused restrictions of any kind on his behavior
Repetitive explicits (!)
Self-described as "pragmatic"
Short sighted
Short tempered
Showed favoritism
Slow decision making
Status conscious

Strong moods
Subtle warm-cold alternance
Swear shouting
Sycophantic (to higher ups)
Systematic verbal debasing
Take others work as her work to deliver
Taking credit for my work
The boss
Time waster
Unapproachable/opposite of transparent
Uncaring of people
Unreasonable expectations/always changing direction
Untrained in management
Veiled threats behind closed doors
Verbal abuse
Verbal abuse, saying employee too old to understand (!)
Verbal intimidation generating fear
Verbally abusive
Withholding information which would help employee do her job better

Table 4. Behaviors checked by respondents for ones that they had witnessed for a dark side and/or destructive leader.

Behavior	Response Percent	Response Count
Moody, easily annoyed, hard to please, and emotionally volatile	63.4%	59
Distrustful, cynical, sensitive to criticism, and focused on the negative	76.3%	71
Unassertive, resistant to change, risk-averse, and slow to make decisions	33.3%	31
Aloof, indifferent to the feelings of others, and uncommunicative	49.5%	46
Overtly cooperative, but privately irritable, stubborn, and uncooperative	34.4%	32
Overly self-confident, arrogant, with inflated feelings of self-worth	73.1%	68
Charming, risk-taking, limit-testing and excitement-seeking	19.4%	18
Dramatic, attention-seeking, interruptive, and poor listening skills	50.5%	47
Creative, but thinking and acting in unusual or eccentric ways	16.1%	15
Meticulous, precise, hard to please, and tends to micromanage	46.2%	43
Eager to please and reluctant to act independently or against popular opinion	19.4%	18
Preoccupied with power and wealth	55.9%	52
Excessive seeking of admiration	41.9%	39
Believe they are entitled to have whatever they want, willing to exploit others to get it	49.5%	46
Lacks concern for others, devalues others	84.9%	79
Answered question		**93**
Skipped question		**3**

Table 5. Specific behaviors witnessed by the respondents.

Behavior	Response Percent	Response Count
Inviting a select few to an important meeting.	64.8%	59
Publicly ridiculing an employee's work.	68.1%	62
Mocking employees as a display of humor.	51.6%	47
Yelling when a deadline is missed.	48.4%	44
Asking employees to work late to help a coworker complete a major project.	23.1%	21
Threatening to terminate a coworker, even if the statement is made in a joking manner.	46.2%	42
Asking one of your coworkers, 'Is this the best you can do?'	27.5%	25
Asking employees for ideas on how to resolve an organizational problem.	30.8%	28
Taking credit for an employee's work.	62.6%	57
Inviting specific employees to social events (e.g., golfing, company parties) and excluding others.	42.9%	39
Blaming others for the leader's mistakes.	68.1%	62
Ignoring employees' comments.	74.7%	68
Slamming a fist on the table to emphasize a point.	34.1%	31
Making an employee feel as though his or her job is in jeopardy.	70.3%	64
Using inspirational appeals to get employees to comply with a new policy.	20.9%	19
Lying about the organization's performance at a company meeting.	35.2%	32
Bending the rules to achieve productivity goals.	39.6%	36
Lying to employees to get his or her way.	54.9%	50
Continuing to do things the old way.	35.2%	32
Making false statements about the competitor.	16.5%	15
Making employees work until the job is done, even if it means they must work all night.	23.1%	21
Greeting all of your coworkers in the morning but ignoring you.	28.6%	26
Reprimanding employees when they make a mistake.	49.5%	45
Asking an employee to falsify productivity figures to meet a goal.	18.7%	17
Promising you a promotion if you do something that involves bending a company policy.	6.6%	6
Throwing a tantrum when goals are not met.	47.3%	43
Coercing employees to accept his or her ideas.	49.5%	45
Failing to disclose the reasons behind	62.6%	57

organizational decisions.		
Telling an employee in public that he or she is not a team player.	38.5%	35
Acknowledging other coworkers' contributions to a project but not yours.	39.6%	36
Raising voice when his/her point does not appear to be accepted by employees.	47.3%	43
Threatening to deny an employee's vacation request if a deadline is missed.	15.4%	14
Failing to respond to concerns of employees.	67.0%	61
Not sticking to the plan of action.	42.9%	39
Demoting an employee without giving a good reason for the decision.	26.4%	24
Saying to an employee 'you just don't understand the problem'.	41.8%	38
Seeking the advice of a select few to brainstorm ideas for a new project.	47.3%	43
Giving resources to departments whose functions make the leader look good.	37.4%	34
Creating contests between two employees where winning involves marginalizing the work of the other.	39.7%	27
Hanging a 'wall of shame' bulletin board to post employee blunders as a display.	6.6%	6
Acts in a brutal bullying manner.	53.8%	49
Lies and acts in an unethical way.	60.4%	55
Micro-manages and over-controls.	69.2%	63
Unable to deal with interpersonal conflict or similar situations.	59.3%	54
Doesn't have the skills to match the job.	67.0%	61
Unwilling to change mind and listen to others.	58.2%	53
Shows favoritism toward employees of leader's own gender.	40.7%	37
Does not address issue of upper management not following policies and procedures or makes subordinates address the issue	33.0%	30
Answered question		**91**
Skipped question		**5**