

## ABSTRACT

MULLINS, ALEXANDRA KARI. The Dimensionality of Destructive Leadership: Toward an Integration of the Bright and Dark Sides. (Under the direction of Dr. S. Bartholomew Craig).

There have been many attempts to define destructive leadership (e.g., Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Einarsen et al., 2007; Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013). An important question is whether the label of destructive leadership should be reserved for actively counterproductive leader behaviors, or whether it should also include the *absence* of desirable leader behaviors (i.e., general leader ineffectiveness). Researchers have not yet reached a consensus as to whether destructive leadership and leader (in)effectiveness are distinct from one another. The main goal of this study was to determine whether or not destructive leadership and leader ineffectiveness are independent from one another. To conduct this investigation, destructive leadership and related constructs were separated into values-centric and performance-centric constructs. Values-centric constructs (e.g., destructive leadership, abusive supervision, ethical leadership) refer to the types of values underlying a leader's goals and the behavior that he or she demonstrates in the process of achieving those goals. Performance-centric constructs (e.g., managerial derailment, laissez-faire leadership) refer to how effective a leader is at leading the group to goals, irrespective of any values-based judgments about those goals. This study examined whether values-centric constructs were distinct from performance-centric constructs in terms of conceptual definition, factor structure, and external correlates, and how many unique dimensions underlay the values-centric constructs. Data were collected from 17 subject matter experts (SMEs) and 1,648 full-time employees. SMEs agreed that items belonged to either values-centric or performance-centric constructs,

not both. Employee data revealed that supervisors did not simultaneously exhibit highly destructive behaviors and high performance with meaningful frequency, nor score low in both categories. Exploratory factor analyses revealed a four-factor solution among the constructs: destructiveness, derailment, prosocial behavior, and task orientation. Follow-up confirmatory factor analyses confirmed an acceptable fitting four-factor model indicating that these factors are distinct, but related. Correlations indicated that the relationships between destructive leadership and several outcome variables were significantly different from derailment, prosocial behavior, and task orientation's relationships with those outcome variables. However, several performance-centric relationships with outcomes were not significantly different from destructive leadership's correlations. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that destructiveness predicted significant additional variance above and beyond performance-centric factors for all outcome variables except for follower well-being. Overall, these findings suggest that values-centric and performance-centric constructs are distinct in terms of conceptual definition and factor structure, but show similar patterns of relations to external correlates. Factor analyses revealed that two dimensions underlie the set of values-centric constructs: active destructive behavior and active prosocial behavior. Implications, limitations, and future directions for research are discussed.

© Copyright 2015 by Alexandra Kari Mullins

All Rights Reserved

The Dimensionality of Destructive Leadership: Toward an  
Integration of the Bright and Dark Sides

by  
Alexandra Kari Mullins

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
North Carolina State University  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Raleigh, North Carolina

2015

APPROVED BY:

---

Dr. S. Bartholomew Craig  
Committee Chair

---

Dr. Lori Foster Thompson

---

Dr. Shevaun D. Neupert

---

Dr. Mark A. Wilson

## **DEDICATION**

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my incredible parents, Al and Karen Mullins. You both are my biggest supporters and every single ounce of encouragement means more to me than you will ever know.

## **BIOGRAPHY**

Alexandra Mullins grew up in Cary, North Carolina. She then completed her undergraduate education at North Carolina State University in 2009, earning a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology. In the fall of 2009, Alexandra continued her education at North Carolina State University where she entered the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Doctoral program. She obtained her Master's degree in 2013 under the direction of Dr. Bart Craig. During her time at North Carolina State University, Alexandra worked as a Teaching Assistant and a Research Assistant for the North Carolina State Highway Patrol. She is currently working as an Organizational Consultant at Horizon Performance where she helps elite teams in the military select and develop the best people for the job.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are several individuals who deserve to be recognized. First, I would like to extend gratitude to my advisor, Bart Craig, for the countless number of hours he expended to review my paper, be my sounding board, meet with me multiple times in coffee shops around the city, and attend copious practice runs for my proposals and defenses. I am entirely grateful for having you as a mentor and advisor during my six years of graduate school. Thank you immensely for everything you have done. I'm beyond thrilled that we are continuing to work together even after I make my departure from NCSU. I would also like to thank my committee members, Lori Foster Thompson, Shevaun Neupert, and Mark Wilson. You all have provided tremendous insight and expertise and made this paper the best that it could be. A special thank you to Lori Foster Thompson and Mark Wilson who have also been my mentors. I am entirely grateful for the opportunities with which you have provided throughout my time here at NCSU. You helped me grow professionally and molded me into the I/O Psychologist I am today.

I want to give a special thank you to my family, Karen, Al, and Max Mullins. Thank you for giving me the support that I truly needed from day one. Even during the hardest times, you have helped me through it all, instilling confidence that I could finish graduate school. Although you did not experience graduate school first hand, you had a front row seat and know the trials, tribulations, and joy that accompany it. Thank you for being my rock every step of way and finishing this journey with me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>The Dimensionality of Destructive Leadership: Toward an Integration of the Bright and Dark Sides .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>The Bright Side of Leadership.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>The Dark Side of Leadership.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>What is Destructive Leadership? .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Previous Research on Destructive Leadership.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Definitional Issues in Destructive Leadership.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Ineffective Leadership .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>The Moral Side of Leadership .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>The Current Study .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Method .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Participants.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Procedure.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Measures .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Results .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Research Question 1A.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Research Question 1B.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Research Question 1C.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Research Question 2 .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Main Findings.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Theoretical, Research, and Practical Implications .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Limitations .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Future Research .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>91</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	<i>Summary of Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations</i> .....	44
Table 2.	<i>Number of Items Experts Identified as Indicators of Leadership Constructs</i> .....	46
Table 3.	<i>Summary of Co-Occurrence of Managers in Low/High and High/Low Patterns</i> .....	48
Table 4.	<i>Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance in Initial Four-Factor Solution</i> .....	52
Table 5.	<i>Summary of Correlations Between Empirically Derived Factors</i> .....	56
Table 6.	<i>Summary of Correlations Between Empirically Derived Factors and Outcome Variables</i> .....	58
Table 7.	<i>Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses for Factors Predicting Employee-Related Outcome Variables: Values-Centric Factor in Model 2, Performance-Centric Factors in Model 3</i> .....	61
Table 8.	<i>Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance in Initial Two-Factor Solution</i> .....	63

## The Dimensionality of Destructive Leadership: Toward an Integration of the Bright and Dark Sides

The importance of leadership to organizations cannot be overstated. Many leadership researchers would define leadership as the building and maintaining of cohesive, goal-oriented teams that perform well and achieve goals (e.g., Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Leadership is largely responsible for the ultimate success or failure of organizations (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). For example, one research study showed that high performing executives contributed an additional \$25 million in value to their organizations over the course of their tenure (Barrick, Day, Lord, & Alexander, 1991). In addition, leadership can contribute to the well-being of employees (Tichy & Bennis, 2007). Leaders have the ability to reduce employee stress during times of organizational change (Skagert, Dellve, Eklof, Poussette, & Ahlborg, 2008). However, not all leaders are equally effective at providing such guidance. Leadership effectiveness can be assessed in terms of how well a group is able to accomplish its goals (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Organizations spend billions of dollars annually on leadership development in an attempt to help individuals become more effective leaders (Riggio, 2008).

### **The Bright Side of Leadership**

The leadership literature has been traditionally dominated by research attempting to identify the ingredients necessary to make leaders successful or effective. This literature has been described as addressing the “bright side” of leadership. The bright side is concerned

with factors that contribute to leaders' effectiveness through the factors' *presence*, and has tended to emphasize behaviors exhibited by leaders when they are more concerned with how they are perceived and are attempting to make a positive impression on others (Kaiser & Hogan, 2010).

As leadership effectiveness can be characterized as how well a leader helps a group achieve its goals, early leadership research (e.g., Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957) sought to uncover the behavioral indicators of effective leadership. In this research, two important factors stood out. Consideration, also referred to as relationship-orientation, is the degree to which a leader is concerned for the well-being of others and able to build and maintain relationships. Initiating structure, also referred to as task orientation, is the degree to which the leader focuses on the accomplishment of tasks in order to achieve goals (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004). The most studied leadership theories, such as those of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) and charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987), focus on the positive side of leadership, the implications of it, and how leaders can become more effective by doing *more* key behaviors. Prior research has also shown perceived leader effectiveness, from the followers' perspective, to be positively associated with perceptions of leaders' honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness (Den Hartog et al., 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Posner & Schmidt, 1992). The term follower is a general term used to reference any individual who is under the influence of a leader, regardless of the context or setting. Furthermore, in a study across 62 cultures, Den Hartog and colleagues (1999) found

that the perception of being trustworthy was believed to be the most important characteristic for effective leadership.

However, leadership researchers tend to agree that highly effective leadership is far from common in organizations (e.g., DeVries & Kaiser, 2003, Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Historically, 60% to 75% of employed adults reported that the worst part of their jobs was their immediate supervisors (Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990). More recently, a survey conducted by the American Psychological Association (2014) revealed that about 29% of employed adults ( $N = 1,562$ ) stated that problems with their supervisors were significant factors contributing to stress on the job. This percentage of employed adults rose 2% from the previous year's findings. Additionally, survey results also showed that 32% of these employees believed that their employers are not always honest with them and 24% did not trust their employers. Supervisor issues such as these, have prompted increasing interest in what has been called the "dark side" of leadership.

### **The Dark Side of Leadership**

Whereas the bright side approach to leadership theory and research focuses on the factors that enhance leadership through their presence, the dark side approach to leadership research focuses on the destructive factors that enhance leadership through their *absence* (Craig & Kaiser, 2012), and often includes behaviors exhibited by leaders when they are not especially concerned with how they are perceived by others (e.g., a manager who does not self-monitor his behavior due to extreme pressure in the workplace; Kaiser & Hogan, 2010).

This is not to imply that leaders are necessarily destructive if they lack positive, bright-side qualities. This idea is illustrated by the concept of supererogation. Supererogatory behaviors are those that are morally commendable but not strictly required (Urmson, 1958). In the context of destructive leadership, for instance, a leader who does not exhibit charismatic behaviors may not necessarily be a destructive leader. Charismatic behaviors may be desirable, but are not required for effective leadership. Instead, the dark side of leadership implies the presence of negative behaviors that undermine effective leadership (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Dark side characteristics can sometimes arise as “dysfunctional extensions of bright side characteristics” (Kaiser & Hogan, 2010, p. 220). For example, self-confidence is a traditional bright side characteristic that many effective leaders possess, yet leaders who are too self-confident may become narcissistic and destructive in the long term.

There has been a surge of research on the dark side of leadership in recent years, as interest in this area has grown significantly. Schyns and Schilling (2013) suggest that there are two main streams of the increasingly popular dark side research: (1) determining its prevalence and costs to organizations and (2) the accumulation of research and evidence relating to the detrimental effects of destructive leader behaviors on followers. Some have also suggested that an additional reason for its rise in focus is the growing consensus that the dark side of leadership may be a stronger predictor of organizational and employee outcomes than the bright side (e.g., Baumeister, Bratlavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001; Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007; J. Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2010; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005;

Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2009). As the interest in destructive leadership continues to grow, a thorough understanding of the construct is vital to future research, theory, and application, but has not yet been achieved.

There have been many attempts to define destructive leadership (e.g., Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Einarsen et al., 2007; Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013). An important question is whether the label of destructive leadership should be reserved for actively counterproductive leader behaviors, or whether it should also include the *absence* of desirable leader behaviors (i.e., general leader ineffectiveness). Researchers have not yet reached a consensus as to whether destructive leadership and leader (in)effectiveness are distinct from one another. The main goals of this study are to 1) determine whether or not destructive leadership and leader ineffectiveness are independent constructs and 2) examine the dimensionality of destructive leadership.

### **What is Destructive Leadership?**

Many terms have been used to refer to factors on the dark side of leadership, such as abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000), negative leadership (Schilling, 2009), petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1987), perceived leader integrity (Craig & Gustafson, 1998), toxic leadership (Lipman-Blumen, 2005), and destructive leadership (Einarsen et al., 2007). Destructive leadership has lately been the most comprehensive and commonly accepted label to describe dysfunctional leaders (Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Krasikova et al., 2013). Some researchers have argued that the term destructive leadership should be used to refer to a higher, broader

category of leadership which allows more narrowly defined areas of destructive leadership (e.g., abusive supervision) to be subsumed under it (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Although this study will not examine each specific area of destructive leadership, it is important to provide an overview of what is included in the realm of this phenomenon.

Craig and Kaiser (2012) reviewed literature on six narrower areas of the dark side which are relevant to destructive leadership: abusive supervision, integrity, narcissistic leadership, toxic leadership, negligent or laissez-faire leadership, and the dark side of charisma. Each of these areas is considered to have destructive implications because research has demonstrated that they are linked to undesirable follower and organizational outcomes. Building upon an earlier definition proposed by Einarsen et al. (2007), Craig and Kaiser defined destructive leadership as “systematic or repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor, or manager that knowingly violates, or inappropriately risks violating, the legitimate interest of the organization, its members, or other legitimate stakeholders by undermining or sabotaging the goals, tasks, resources, well-being, job satisfaction, or effectiveness of such stakeholders” (p. 8). The first, and arguably the most commonly studied, area of destructive leadership is abusive supervision. Abusive supervision is defined as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Tepper emphasized the idea that abusive supervision is a perception; this means that two followers could have different assessments of the same supervisor’s behavior. One of the most commonly used instruments

to assess destructive leadership has been Tepper's (2000) Abusive Supervision Scale (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) were among the first to suggest that an abusive style of leadership is uncharacteristic of effective role models. Abusive supervision is very similar to Ashforth's (1987) construct of petty tyranny, although abusive supervision is specific to leadership settings while petty tyranny may refer to any instance in which one person exerts power over another (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Petty tyranny also includes behaviors that *may not* be considered hostile (Tepper, Moss, Lockhart, & Carr, 2007). For example, Tepper and colleagues (2007) contend that a manager who is merely not friendly or approachable may not be perceived as hostile.

Integrity is another area of destructive leadership. Craig and Gustafson (1998) have referred to integrity as the *absence* of actively devious, manipulative, and dishonest behavior. Research has demonstrated that instruments which purport to measure integrity primarily as the absence of negative behavior, such as the Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS; Craig & Gustafson, 1998), better identify managers who are perceived to have low integrity than instruments that purport to measure ethical leadership (Kaiser & Hogan, 2010). Like many areas of leadership, leader integrity has been typically studied from the observer perspective; most prior research has assessed impressions of a leader's integrity based on the reputation earned by the leader (Craig & Kaiser, 2012).

Narcissism is a personality trait commonly seen in leaders to varying degrees. At times, this trait may be beneficial to leadership, such as providing leaders with the self-

confidence needed to carry out organizational missions and achieve their goals. On the other hand, narcissistic leadership can become an issue in the long-term (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Problems arise with narcissism when leaders become too self-involved, with little concern for their followers, or force followers to achieve unrealistic goals with unrealistic expectations. Narcissism is typically characterized by feelings of arrogance, grandiosity, self-absorption, and entitlement (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

Toxic leadership is one of the areas where little to no consensus has been reached with regard to how to define the term in the empirical literature. However, toxic leadership is commonly referred to in popular press articles, where numerous themes have emerged. Common themes in toxic leadership include 1) abuse or neglect of followers' well-being, 2) intense micromanaging of followers, and 3) narcissism (Schmidt, 2008). In his unpublished dissertation, Schmidt added self-promotion and unpredictability to characterize toxic leadership, making this construct somewhat broader in scope than abusive supervision (Craig & Kaiser, 2012).

Negligent or laissez-faire leadership has not been as widely considered to fall within the destructive domain because it has been typically regarded as the absence of leadership (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Yet, some researchers have argued that passive forms of leadership can still be considered destructive when leaders intentionally avoid performing their duties and neglect their followers, therefore resulting in undesirable outcomes (e.g., Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2010). Not unexpectedly, research has found that

leaders' laissez-faire behavior was negatively associated with perceived leader effectiveness and satisfaction with supervisor (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Further, Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) found that passivity and lack of rewards from leaders can contribute to poor performance and low job satisfaction among followers. Whether these relations constitute evidence in support of considering a laissez-faire style to be a form a destructive leadership remains a matter of some debate.

Another area relevant to destructive leadership is the dark side of charisma (i.e., destructive charisma; Hogan et al., 2010). Research on the dark side of charisma examines leaders who seem charming on the outside, but are motivated by a selfish and manipulative agenda. Destructive charismatic leaders often have excellent social skills which help them come across in a positive light. Leaders who possess destructive charisma tend to have an excessive need for power (O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly, 1995). It should be emphasized that not all charismatic leaders are destructive leaders, yet Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007) have argued that most destructive leaders are charismatic.

### **Previous Research on Destructive Leadership**

Research has shown that destructive leadership is common in organizations with almost 33% of employees experiencing destructive leadership on a frequent basis (Aasland et al., 2010). Aasland and colleagues (2010) surveyed 2,539 employed adults and requested them to indicate how often they experienced or witnessed various forms of destructive leadership behavior (e.g., tyrannical behavior, derailed behavior, supportive-disloyal

behavior, laissez-faire behavior). Results indicated that 83.7% of employees had at least some exposure to destructive behavior by superiors, and 33.5% reported experiencing destructive behavior more frequently (Aasland et al., 2010). Namie and Namie (2000) estimated that about 10% to 16% of employees are subjected to abusive supervision, which is only one subset of destructive leadership. Due to the damaging effects of abuse, Sheehan, McCarthy, Barker, and Henderson (2001) estimated that the costs associated with abuse in the workplace range from \$17,000 to \$24,000 for each serious case due to absenteeism, turnover, health care costs, legal costs, and reduced productivity. Based on the number of employees subjected to abusive supervision and the estimated cost per case, Tepper, Duffy, Henle, and Lambert (2006) estimated that abusive supervision costs U.S. organizations almost \$24 billion dollars annually.

Based on these statistics, it is evident that destructive leadership is common and very costly for organizations, but how does destructive leadership come about? Wang, Sinclair, and Deese (2010) noted competing theories attempting to explain why leaders engage in destructive behavior; one theory suggests that destructive leader behaviors are intentional, whereas the other theory implies these behaviors are unintentional. First, the theory of planned behavior suggests that destructive behavior occurs because the leader possesses the intention to engage in this type of behavior. The leader's attitude toward the behavior, the subordinate, perceived norms for destructive behavior, and control over the behavior are all taken into account and influence a leader's intention to carry out the behavior. Together,

these factors subsequently determine whether the leader engages in the behavior. Wang and colleagues (2010) also suggested that self-regulatory processes may cause destructive leadership behavior to occur. Self-regulatory processes suggest that leaders may unintentionally engage in destructive behavior because they have depleted their cognitive resources. Job related stress adds to further exhaustion and makes leaders more likely to engage in destructive behavior (Wang et al., 2010).

Research on the dark side, as well as the bright side of leadership, tends to primarily focus on factors inherent in the leader (Kellerman, 2004; Craig & Kaiser, 2012). However, Padilla and colleagues (2007) proposed that destructive leadership is the result of what they have termed the “toxic triangle” (p. 176). The toxic triangle refers to the interplay between leader, follower, and environmental factors that make it possible for destructive leadership to occur. In fact, Schilling (2009) content analyzed 48 interviews finding that the individuals believe that their surrounding environment (e.g., followers, organizational culture) plays a larger role in the generation of negative leadership than individual leader characteristics.

Padilla and colleagues (2007) argued that the characteristics of a destructive leader include charisma, personalized need for power, narcissism, negative life themes (e.g., traumatic childhood experiences), and ideology of hate (e.g., inflicting a culture of intimidation). While these characteristics may be essential for destructive leadership, Padilla and colleagues also argued that there are specific follower and environmental factors that must also be present for destructive leadership to occur. Two types of followers allow

destructive leadership to come to fruition. Conformers are those who comply with their leaders out of fear; they are characterized by low maturity, negative core self-evaluations, and unmet basic needs, therefore making them more susceptible to pressures imposed by their leaders. Colluders are those who help leaders carry out their goals; they tend to be more ambitious and share the same values and belief systems as their leaders. The last factor that supports destructive leadership is a conducive environment. Destructive leaders will thrive in an environment that is unstable, perceived to be threatened, lacking the proper checks and balances of power, and reflecting certain cultural values such as collectivism (i.e., the preference cohesion within social groups) and uncertainty avoidance (i.e., the extent to which society feels comfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity). Padilla and colleagues (2007) argue that destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments are all necessary components to support destructive leadership.

**Consequences of destructive leadership.** Not only is it important for research and practice to understand how destructive leadership comes about, but it is necessary to understand the consequences of destructive leadership and how it impacts all affected. The consequences of destructive leadership have been studied quite extensively. Research has shown that destructive leader behavior is associated with negative effects ranging from micro-level outcomes, such as psychological distress for followers (Tepper et al., 2007), to more macro-level outcomes, such as lower organizational performance (Hmieleski & Ensley,

2007). Outcomes from the followers' point of view tend to receive much of the attention, in terms of how destructive leadership affects organizations (Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

A number of studies have investigated and found significant relationships between destructive leadership and several outcome variables, including follower turnover intentions (Ashforth, 1997, Craig & Gustafson, 1998, Tepper, 2000), follower counterproductive work behavior (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002), follower job satisfaction (Craig & Gustafson, 1998; Tepper, 2000), satisfaction with supervisor (Schyns & Schilling, 2013), perceptions of leader effectiveness (Tepper, 2000), follower well-being (Burris, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008; Hobman, Restubog, Bordia, & Tang, 2009), and even work family conflict (Tepper, 2000). Within the realm of destructive leadership, job satisfaction and well-being are two of the most studied outcome variables. Research has consistently shown that destructive leadership is negatively correlated with follower job satisfaction (Tepper, 2000, Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004), as dealing with an abusive or unpleasant leader can contribute to an unpleasant work environment. Hobman and colleagues (2009) found that followers who are frequently exposed to abusive supervisory behaviors also experience lower psychological well-being.

Recently, Schyns and Schilling (2013) conducted a meta-analysis to summarize the impact of destructive leadership on various outcomes. They summarized outcomes of destructive leadership into four categories: concepts that relate directly to the leader (e.g., attitudes toward leader), concepts that relate directly to the job (e.g., job satisfaction),

concepts that relate directly to the organization (e.g., turnover intentions, counterproductive work behavior), and concepts that relate directly to the individual follower (e.g., well-being). Schyns and Schilling coded and analyzed 57 studies. Overall, their findings showed that destructive leadership was negatively related to positive consequences and positively related to negative consequences. Schyns and Schilling found that destructive leadership correlated the highest with follower attitudes toward the leader ( $r = -.57$ ) and counterproductive work behavior ( $r = .37$ ). Additionally, turnover intentions and well-being also exhibited moderately high correlations with destructive leadership ( $r = .31$  and  $r = -.35$  respectively).

### **Definitional Issues in Destructive Leadership**

Despite the popularity of destructive leadership as a topic of research, there is no consensus among researchers regarding how to define this phenomenon. Researchers have argued that one reason this concept suffers from definitional issues is because of its novelty (Padilla et al., 2007; Schmidt, 2008). Differences among definitions arise from researchers studying the same phenomena yet using different terminology, lack of consensus regarding whether destructive leadership should be reserved for acts that are intentional or active in nature, and disagreements about the target(s) that must be harmed for the leadership to be considered destructive (e.g., the organization, followers, the public, and/or external environment; Craig & Kaiser, 2012). This lack of a unified definition of destructive leadership impedes a shared understanding of where poor job performance stops and destructive leadership begins.

Einarsen and colleagues (2007) defined destructive leadership as “the systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor, or manager 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 subordinates” (p. 208). Based on this definition, the label *destructive leadership* applies only to behaviors that are systematic and repeated, thereby excluding isolated acts. Their definition also emphasized that leadership is only destructive if it harms the in-group (i.e., the organization or its members). Legitimate interests are considered to be within the law regulating organizational activity, and support organizational functioning. Einarsen and colleagues’ (2007) conceptualization of the phenomenon does not require intentionality, thereby including leader behaviors that may unintentionally cause harm to be destructive (e.g., unwise decision making or general ineffectiveness).

Craig and Kaiser (2012) expanded upon Einarsen and colleagues’ (2007) conceptualization of destructive leadership. Craig and Kaiser defined destructive leadership as “systematic or repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor, or manager that knowingly violates, or inappropriately risks violating, the legitimate interest of the organization, its members, or other legitimate stakeholders by undermining or sabotaging the goals, tasks, resources, well-being, job satisfaction, or effectiveness of such stakeholders” (p. 8). Refining Einarsen et al.’s definition, Craig and Kaiser proposed that the targets of destructive leadership should not be limited to the organization and its members, but extend beyond the

organization to include legitimate external stakeholders that may be affected by the actions of leader. This addition to the definition allows behaviors that may cause harm to local communities or society to also be considered destructive leadership. Furthermore, Craig and Kaiser explicitly defined destructive leadership as limited to behaviors that are intentional in risking or causing harm to the targets. Clarifying the aspect of intentionality, Craig and Kaiser argued, allows researchers to draw a boundary between actively destructive leadership and merely ineffective leadership (e.g., incompetence). Additionally, as Craig and Kaiser proposed that destructive leadership is a subset of counterproductive work behavior, requiring intentionality aligns destructive leadership more consistently with accepted definitions of counterproductive work behavior (e.g., Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Integrating components of Einarsen and colleagues' (2007) definition with Craig and Kaiser's (2012) observation that leaders influence organizational outcomes primarily by setting group direction and by interpersonal influence processes, Krasikova and colleagues (2013) proposed yet another definition of destructive leadership. Krasikova and colleagues proposed that "destructive leadership is defined as volitional behavior by a leader that harms or intends to harm a leader's organization and/or followers by a) encouraging followers to pursue goals that contravene the legitimate interests of the organization and/or b) employing a leadership style that involves the use of harmful methods of influence with followers, regardless of justifications of such behavior" (p. 1310). Like Craig and Kaiser's (2012) proposed definition of destructive leadership, Krasikova and colleagues distinguished

destructive behavior from general ineffectiveness by clarifying that destructive leadership behavior should be defined as intentional. Following Craig and Kaiser's contention that direction-setting and interpersonal influence are the two primary means by which leaders influence organizational outcomes, Krasikova et al. also pointed out that destructive leadership behavior may be broken down further into two behavioral domains: behavior that encourages followers to attain destructive goals and behavior that utilizes destructive approaches to influence followers. Krasikova and colleagues noted that leaders may engage in counterproductive work behavior that is not destructive leadership, and that destructive leadership should be distinguished from non-leadership counterproductive work behavior as "harmful behavior imbedded [sic] in the process of leading" (p. 1310). For example, Krasikova and colleagues argued that the act of a leader stealing is not considered to fall under destructive leadership; rather this act is a counterproductive work behavior. If not situated in leadership, destructive leadership behaviors simply become destructive behaviors without the follower component, which is essential to leadership (Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

As is evident by the presentation of the above definitions, destructive leadership is a complex concept that has taken on many forms and continues to be redefined. A unified definition and understanding of this construct would do much to facilitate future research on this topic. There are points of agreement and disagreement, such as defining destructive leadership as volitional behavior, the target(s) that may be affected by destructive leadership, and whether ineffective leadership is subsumed under destructive leadership.

## **Ineffective Leadership**

Kellerman (2004) suggested that any negative leader behavior may be placed on a continuum, ranging from ineffective/incompetence to destructive/unethical. Schilling (2009) also acknowledged this polarity and has used the term negative leadership to describe any negative behaviors ranging from ineffective to destructive aspects of leadership. Ineffective leadership may be conceptualized as a leader's failure or lack of motivation to lead (e.g., Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Krasikova et al., 2013). More recently, however, it is evident in the destructive leadership literature that two lines of research have begun to develop: one stream of research focusing on destructive leadership and one focusing on ineffective leadership (e.g., Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Krasikova et al., 2013). Implicit in these two streams of research is that several researchers see destructive leadership as distinct from ineffective leadership; however this distinction has not yet been universally adopted or empirically established. Both types of leadership may have harmful effects, but whether these behaviors are volitional or unintentional appears to help distinguish destructive leadership from ineffective leadership (Krasikova et al., 2013). There are many leaders who have good intentions, yet still fail. In addition to "ineffectiveness," previous research on ineffective leadership has also used the terminology of "incompetence" and "derailment," with the latter focusing on managers' career outcomes.

**Managerial incompetence.** If destructive leadership requires intentionality, as argued by many researchers, then managerial incompetence occurs when leaders are

ineffective despite their good intentions (Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Krasikova et al., 2013). It has been estimated that the percentage of incompetent managers is anywhere from 30% to 75% (DeVries & Kaiser, 2003). Historically, some researchers have considered incompetent managers guilty of failing to possess the necessary characteristics that are needed to be successful (Bray & Howard, 1983), while others believed incompetent managers possess undesirable qualities (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). There were even some who believe incompetence is a combination of both. Bentz (1985) pioneered the study of managerial incompetence. In his research, he uncovered seven themes: unable to delegate and prioritize, being reactive rather than proactive, unable to maintain relationships with an extended network of contacts, unable to build a team, having poor judgment, being a slow learner, and having a maladaptive personality trait. Some years later, Leslie and Van Velsor (1996) replicated Bentz's research and further refined the themes present in managerial incompetence, including problems with interpersonal relationships, failure to meet business objectives, inability to build a team, and inability to adapt to transition.

**Managerial derailment.** Like managerial incompetence, managerial derailment is another term that has been used to describe the failure of managers and is often used interchangeably with managerial incompetence. Managerial derailment occurs when managers do not meet the level of achievement they were expected to due to being fired, demoted, or simply lacking the ability to progress (Lombardo, Ruderman, & McCauley, 1988). Whatever the specific reason, derailed managers do not plateau voluntarily (McCall &

Lombardo, 1983). Researchers have suggested that these managers fail because they prefer to do things their own way (Kovach, 1989) or are unable to adjust their behavior when necessary due to changes in the work environment (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2005). More specifically, there is incongruence between the demands of the job and a manager's preferences or skills (Leslie & Van Velsor, 1996). The effects of derailed managers can severely affect organizations, costing millions of dollars. DeVries and Kaiser (2003) argued that the estimated cost of derailment can amount to anywhere between \$750,000 and \$1,500,000 per senior manager. Smart (1999) estimated that the cost to the organization could be even more at \$2,700,000 for each case of ineffective leadership.

McCall and Lombardo (1983) examined and compared successful executives and derailed executives. Successful executives were skilled at handling stress, getting along with others, and solving problems with the help of their team members. On the other hand, derailed executives, most often failed because of their insensitivity to others, usually becoming "abrasive and intimidating" under pressure (p. 6). McCall and Lombardo found that derailed executives also failed because of specific business problems, arrogance, betrayed trust, failing to delegate, being overly ambitious, failing to staff effectively, failing to think strategically, failing to adapt to a boss with a different style, and being overly dependent on a mentor.

Aside from attempting to distinguish ineffective leadership from destructive leadership, research has not yet investigated the dimensionality of destructive leadership.

Measures of destructive leadership typically (though not always) assess (im)moral aspects of leadership. However, if leaders do not engage in actively prosocial behaviors, does that necessarily mean they are destructive? To fully understand destructive leadership and address this question, the moral side of leadership must be examined as well.

### **The Moral Side of Leadership**

Within the bright side approach to leadership research, ethics are thought to be an important part of leadership. Ciulla (2005) asserted that “a good leader is ethical *and* effective” (p. 333). Yet, Ciulla also proposed that sometimes a leader can be effective without being ethical. Ethical acts or behaviors are those that are, under the rule-based utilitarian approach, in accordance with a normative set of rules that, if followed by all, would maximize outcomes for the greatest number of people (Bentham, 1970). A behavior is labeled as wrong if it violates such a rule. Brown and Trevino’s (2006) conception of ethical leadership extends beyond the traditional notion of ethics as “not doing wrong” to include “actively doing right.” Research has paid significant attention to ethical behavior in organizations, yet the topic of actively prosocial (“ethical”) leadership has only recently begun to receive consideration (e.g., Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005; Brown & Trevino, 2006). In light of several high-profile ethical scandals that have taken place in recent years (e.g., Enron, Tyco), questions have been raised regarding what leaders can do to shape themselves as well as their employees into conducting themselves ethically (Brown et al., 2005).

Ethical leadership is a construct with a conceptual relationship to destructive leadership in that leaders who do not demonstrate the required ethical behaviors (e.g., promoting ethics in others) are presumably *unethical*. According to Brown et al. (2005), ethical leaders not only refrain from immoral and destructive behavior, but also actively demonstrate ethical behaviors and encourage them in others. Authentic leadership and servant leadership are similar to ethical leadership in that these forms of leadership contain an actively moral or prosocial component. Each of these prosocial forms of leadership will be discussed further.

**Ethical leadership.** Brown and colleagues (2005) defined ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (p.120). This definition of ethical leadership holds that what is and is not ethical is determined by behavioral norms within the organization. Brown and colleagues delineate ethical leadership from other values-related constructs by requiring that ethical leaders encourage ethical behavior from other members of the organization through reward and punishment (Trevino, Hartman, & Brown, 2000). Prior research has shown that ethical leadership is positively associated with affective trust in the leader and perceived leader effectiveness (Brown et al., 2005). Conversely, ethical leadership has been shown to be negatively associated with abusive supervision (Brown et al., 2005).

In 2000, Trevino, Hartman, and Brown asked individuals to describe the personal characteristics associated with ethical leaders. Two dimensions of ethical leadership emerged within their findings. First, findings showed that traits such as honesty and trustworthiness were most likely used to describe ethical leaders—these perceptions of an ethical leader’s character and personality were characterized as the moral person dimension. The second dimension was labeled the moral manager dimension or how the leader influences followers to engage in ethical behavior (e.g., openly communicating about ethics, keeping followers accountable for actions). According to Brown and colleagues (2005), ethical leadership is a construct that “emerges out of a combination of characteristics and behaviors that include demonstrating integrity and high ethical standards, considerate and fair treatment of employees, and holding employees accountable for ethical conduct” (p. 130). In other words, as Brown and colleagues argue, honesty and integrity contribute to ethical leadership, yet the moral manager component completes the construct.

**Authentic leadership.** A concept similar to ethical leadership is authentic leadership. Although numerous definitions have been offered for authentic leadership, researchers have worked toward refining the definition of authentic leadership. Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008) recently developed a definition of authentic leadership which captures the following underlying dimensions: self-awareness, relational transparency, moral perspective, and balanced processing. This four-dimensional model has been empirically supported through confirmatory factor analyses (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Walumbwa and

colleagues defined authentic leadership as “a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development” (p. 94).

Authentic leadership is considered by its originators to be the “root construct” of other forms of leadership, including ethical leadership (Luthans & Avolio, 2003, p. 4). However, researchers have argued that authentic leadership is theoretically (e.g., Brown & Trevino, 2006) distinguishable from ethical leadership. Walumbwa and colleagues (2008) later used confirmatory factor analyses to demonstrate that authentic leadership was indeed empirically distinct from ethical leadership. Authenticity (i.e., being true to one’s self) and self-awareness (i.e., being aware of how one impacts others) are components of authentic leadership, but are not part of the ethical leadership construct (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Rather, researchers have argued that concepts such as other-awareness and moral management are more aligned with ethical leadership than authentic leadership (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Ethical leadership and authentic leadership are similar in that both types of leaders consider the moral consequences of their actions, engage in role modeling of appropriate behaviors, and possess high integrity and concern for others (Brown & Trevino, 2006).

**Servant leadership.** Servant leadership is yet another construct overlapping with the prosocial leadership domain. Servant leadership has been defined as “an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader, emphasizing leader behaviors that focus on follower development and de-emphasizing glorification of the leader” (Hale & Fields, 2007, p. 397). Spears (2004) proposed there to be ten characteristics of servant leaders: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and building community.

Like ethical and authentic leadership, servant leadership includes an active moral component where these types of leaders seek to behave in an ethical manner and exhibit positive role modeling, inspirational communication, and altruistic behaviors (Brown & Trevino, 2006). According to Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010), there are two main aspects of servant leadership that separate servant leadership from ethical and authentic leadership. First, servant leadership is not only concerned about the success of the organization and its members, but the success of all organizational stakeholders. The second aspect that distinguishes servant leadership from related constructs is that servant leaders often engage in self-reflection behaviors to help keep these leaders grounded and humble.

Based on the literature, it is evident that the label “destructive leadership” has been used in connection with many dark side constructs (e.g., perceived leader integrity), bright side constructs (e.g., ethical leadership), and general ineffectiveness. Given the number of constructs used to refer to destructive leadership and the varying measures employed to

assess it, researchers need to bring some order to this domain in order to guide future theory and research.

### **The Current Study**

There have been many attempts to define destructive leadership, yet there is still no consensus as to whether destructive leadership and leader (in)effectiveness are distinct from one another. The first goal of this study was to determine the nature of their relationship. Part of the issue stems from the fact that there are a number of constructs within the literature used to refer to destructive leadership (e.g., abusive supervision, petty tyranny, perceived leader integrity). By extension, there are also a number of measures, such as the Destructive Leadership Questionnaire (Shaw, Erickson, & Harvey, 2011), Abusive Supervision Scale (Tepper, 2000), and Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (Craig & Gustafson, 1998), that have been utilized in research in an attempt to assess and identify destructive leadership in organizations.

If we examine the item content of the various measures intended by their authors to assess destructive leadership and related constructs, we might note that there appears to be a mixture of items with an ethical or moral aspect and items that assess more traditional forms of leadership effectiveness or performance. For example, Shaw and colleagues' (2011) Destructive Leadership Questionnaire is one such measure containing numerous items that simultaneously assesses leadership effectiveness (e.g., "my boss is very poor at solving problems and making decisions," "my boss deals very ineffectively with complex situations,"

“my boss is not very good at inspiring others”) and leadership integrity (e.g., “my boss rarely acts with a high level of integrity,” “my boss often acts in an unethical manner,” and “my boss often takes credit for work that others have done”). Additionally, Brown and colleagues’ (2005) Ethical Leadership Scale contains the item, “listens to what employees have to say.” One could argue that failing to listen is more indicative of poor performance rather than unethical behavior. Furthermore, some authors have explicitly defined destructive leadership as including effectiveness, regardless of ethical or moral considerations. Since Einarsen and colleagues’ (2007) definition of destructive leadership does not limit the term to only those who cause harm deliberately, cases of ineffective leadership, where harm is unintentional, are considered examples of destructive leadership, under their definition.

This raises the question of whether these more “values-centric” constructs are really distinct from the traditionally studied “performance-centric” constructs, or whether they simply represent different ranges along a single “performance” continuum as proposed by Kellerman (2004). After careful examination of the construct definitions, I propose that all of the aforementioned constructs may be categorized as either values-centric constructs or performance-centric constructs. Constructs that reflect how well or how effectively leaders perform are classified as performance-centric and constructs that reflect the values or internal processes that motivate leaders, or form the basis of their decisions are classified as values-centric. More specifically, values-centric constructs refer to the types of values or moral considerations underlying a leader’s goals and the behaviors that he or she demonstrates in

the process of achieving those goals. For example, ethical leaders may focus on how they influence followers to engage in ethical behaviors in the process of goal attainment, whereas destructive leaders may achieve their goals by manipulating others or initiating aggressive or hostile behavior. Performance-centric refers to constructs that represent how effective a leader is at leading the group to goals, irrespective of any values-based judgments or moral considerations about achieving those goals. More specifically, regardless of the means, performance-centric constructs refer to whether the leader was ultimately effective or ineffective in accomplishing his or her, or the organization's, objectives.

This categorization scheme may also apply to areas outside of destructive leadership, but for the purposes of this study, I sought to include constructs and pre-established measures that could aid in defining destructive leadership. Specifically, I argue that values-centric constructs include perceived integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership. This view is consistent with how many scholars view destructive leadership (e.g., Conger, 1990; Hogan et al., 1990; Howell, & Avolio, 1992); destructive leadership is less frequently viewed as an outcome (e.g., performance) and more often a process (i.e., what destructive leaders do). In this view, managerial derailment and laissez-faire leadership may be considered performance-centric constructs. This study sought to investigate whether these constructs and their subfacets are best categorized into these two distinct, overarching factors. Currently, due to the lack of consensus under the destructive leadership umbrella, and leadership in

general, these values-centric and performance-centric constructs are often intermixed within measures. If two overarching factors emerged, this would aid in the determining how destructive leadership should be defined. Therefore, the following research question was posed:

**Research Question 1:** Are values-centric leadership constructs distinct from performance-centric leadership constructs in terms of (1A) conceptual definition, (1B) factor structure, and (1C) external correlates?

It is evident that destructive leadership overlaps with many other constructs, therefore I sought to disentangle to these constructs. In addition to the dark side, destructive leadership also relates to moral forms of leadership. Although ethical leadership has been shown to be negatively associated with abusive supervision (Brown et al., 2005), if leaders do not demonstrate actively ethical behavior, does that imply they are destructive? Or, are forms of ethical leadership distinct from destructive leadership? The second goal of this study was to further examine the relationship between the ethical side of leadership and destructive leadership. Moreover, since authentic leadership and servant leadership overlap with ethical leadership, these two constructs were also examined to determine if they were distinct from ethical leadership. An empirical investigation into the dimensionality of these values-centric constructs was necessary to further refine the definition of destructive leadership and determine where these constructs overlap and where they do not. In an effort to better

understand the nature of these values-centric constructs, the current study addressed the following research question:

**Research Question 2:** How many distinct dimensions underlie the set of values-centric leadership constructs (i.e., perceived integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership)?

By focusing only on the set of values-centric constructs, I was able to address questions about which a priori constructs could be empirically supported as distinct, and how many empirically distinct dimensions actually underlie these related constructs.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Participants were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). MTurk is an online recruiting system which connects researchers to individuals who are paid to participate in these studies. Previous research on the quality of MTurk found that data acquired from these users met or exceeded the psychometric standards of published research (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). In order to participate in this study, participants were required to reside in the United States. Of the 2,154 individuals who accessed the survey through MTurk, data were available initially from 1,850 participants with no missing values. Participants who did not correctly respond to at least six of the careless response detection items, did not work at least 30 hours a week, or have not worked with their immediate supervisors for at least three months, were excluded from the analyses ( $n = 202$ ).

The final sample consisted of 1,648 participants. Approximately 44% of the sample was male and 56% of the sample was female. The mean age was 35.07 years. On average, participants worked about 41.25 hours per week, had worked with their supervisors about 3.46 years, and worked at their current organizations for 5.45 years. Of the supervisors that were evaluated ( $n = 1,648$ ), about 46% were female and 54% were male. About 16% were senior executives, 4% were other executives, 24% were general managers, 17% were functional heads, 14% were middle managers, 23% were first level supervisors, and 2% were labeled as “other.” Participant occupations were represented across the board with the largest proportion of participants coming from sales and related occupations (11%), business and financial operation occupations (10.7%), education/training/library occupations (8.8%), office/administration support occupations (7.5%), and computer/mathematical occupations (7.3%).

**Subject matter experts.** Seventeen individuals with expertise in leadership (e.g., university faculty, leadership researchers, and doctoral students) served as subject matter experts (SMEs). SMEs were recruited from universities and leadership consulting organizations. SMEs with a background or research interest in leadership were targeted. SMEs who took part in the development of any of the scales used in this study were not targeted and were excluded from the analyses. Fifty-one SMEs were invited to participate, and 17 participated, yielding a response rate of 33% (credentials reported in Appendix A).

## **Procedure**

A brief description of the study was created and posted on MTurk with a link to the informed consent form and survey in Qualtrics. The description indicated that participants would complete an online survey to evaluate behavior demonstrated by their immediate supervisors, their feelings towards work, and behaviors they engage in at work. Participants were instructed to read and accept the terms of informed consent prior to participation. The informed consent form indicated that no identifying information would be collected that their responses are anonymous. Given the sensitive nature of some of these measures, guaranteeing anonymity may have increased honest responding.

The informed consent form also indicated that MTurk users would be paid \$1.00 upon completion of the survey and providing quality data. MTurk users were only compensated if they passed at least six out of eight instructed response items, which were included to detect careless responding. As recommended by Meade and Craig (2012), an instructed response item (e.g., “Respond with ‘strongly disagree’ for this item) was used to evaluate participant attention on each page of the survey. Items were scored either as correct (1) or incorrect (0) and summed across the eight items. Scores ranged from 0 to 8 with higher scores indicating higher data quality.

After checking a box to indicate their informed consent, participants were asked to complete the survey. The survey contained measures of perceived leader integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, managerial derailment, ethical

leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership. Items from these measures were intermixed and presented randomly to participants. In addition, measures of leadership effectiveness, team productivity, team vitality, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, counterproductive work behavior, well-being, and demographic questions were also presented to participants.

**Subject matter experts.** Subject matter experts received a web link via e-mail, directly from me, and were asked to complete an online survey. Two versions were created in an effort to reduce the length of the survey for the SME. The individual measures were divided in half across the versions such that each version contained items from each measure (e.g., version 1 contained four Perceived Leader Integrity (PLIS) items, version 2 contained four PLIS items). Experts were only asked to complete one version of the survey. One SME elected to complete both versions. In total, nine SMEs completed each version of the survey. Within the surveys, experts were presented with definitions for each leadership construct as well as the items from each leadership measure described above (see Appendix B). For each item, experts were instructed to select the construct(s) for which the item best serves as an indicator. Ineffective Leadership was an additional category that was presented to experts even though it did not have a pre-established measure.

## **Measures**

**Perceived leader integrity scale.** The Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS; Craig & Gustafson, 1998) measured observers' overall impressions of leaders' integrity, in this

case via subordinates' perceptions of the likelihood that their leaders would engage in various destructive behaviors. These destructive behaviors included: hindering follower performance or development, avoiding responsibility or shifting blame, creating or fueling conflict, lying and manipulation, and acting against the organization (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). A short version of the PLIS was used in the current study, which highly correlates with the full version ( $r = .95$ , Craig, n.d.). The short version of the PLIS contains eight items (see Appendix C). Sample items include “[my manager] would allow someone else to be blamed for his/her mistake,” and “[my manager] would try to take credit for other people’s ideas.” For each of the eight items, participants were asked to indicate how well the item describes their leaders on a four-point response format (1 = *not at all* to 4 = *well*), thus higher values were indicative of greater destructiveness. Construct validity of the full version of the PLIS has been supported by convergent and discriminant validity evidence using measures of job satisfaction and ethical sensitivity, respectively, in previous research (Craig & Gustafson, 1998). Coefficient alphas for all measures are reported in Table 1.

**Destructive leadership questionnaire.** The Destructive Leadership Questionnaire (DLQ; Shaw et al., 2011) was incorporated as an additional measure to assess participants' perceptions of their leaders exhibiting destructive leadership behaviors. The DLQ contains 104 behavior-focused items (22 *a priori* dimensions), 19 personality-focused items (4 *a priori* dimensions), and four overall judgment items. For this 127-item measure, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with various descriptions

of their leaders' behaviors on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Higher values indicate higher levels of the constructs. The DLQ includes various behaviors and personality traits, such as making decisions based on inadequate information, lying and other unethical behavior, laziness and incompetence, and inability to develop and motivate subordinates. Sample items include "my boss often takes credit for the work others have done (behavior-focused)," "my boss is arrogant (personality-focused)," and "my boss is a terrible boss to work for (overall judgment)." Shaw and colleagues argue that there is some support for convergent and discriminant validity based on the intercorrelations among the various subscales. Items are reported in Appendix D.

Due to the large number of items utilized in this research, duplicate and almost identical items were removed from the survey in order to shorten the administration time. The specific removed items and rationale for removing the items can be found in Appendix E. Based on my best judgment, 11 items from the DLQ were removed prior to the data collection phase due to their extreme similarity with other items. The final number of items administered for this measure was 116.

**Abusive supervision.** Participants' perceptions of abusive supervision were measured using Tepper's (2000) 15-item Abusive Supervision Scale. Participants were asked how often they believe their leaders engaged in various abusive supervisory behaviors on a five-point response format (1= *I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me* to 5 = *He/she uses this behavior very often with me*). Sample items include "[my manager]

ridicules me,” and “[my manager] doesn’t give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort.” Items are reported in Appendix F. Based on my best judgment, two items from the Abusive Supervision Scale were removed prior to the data collection phase due to their extreme similarity with other items. The final number of items administered for this measure was 13.

**Petty tyranny.** Participants’ perceptions of their supervisors’ petty tyranny were measured using Ashforth’s (1987) 47-item Petty Tyranny Scale. Participants were asked to what extent their leaders engage in each behavior on a five-point response format (1= *not at all* to 5 = *frequently, if not always*). This measure utilizes six subfacets to assess petty tyranny: arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement, belittles subordinates, lack of consideration, a forcing style of conflict resolution, discouraging initiative, and noncontingent punishment. Sample items include “delegates work that he/she does not want to do (arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement),” and “criticizes subordinates in front of others (belittles subordinates).” This measure has demonstrated acceptable convergent and discriminant validity (Ashforth, 1994). Items are reported in Appendix G. Based on my best judgment, three items from the Petty Tyranny Scale were removed prior to the data collection phase due to their extreme similarity with other items. The final number of items administered for this measure was 44.

**Managerial derailment.** Participants’ perceptions of managerial derailment risk factors were measured using 36 items from the Benchmarks® 360-degree developmental assessment instrument (Lombardo & McCauley, 1994). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they believe their leaders display behaviors believed to indicate risk of

career derailment on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Benchmarks® utilizes five subscales to measure managerial derailment risk: problems with interpersonal relationships, difficulty in building and leading a team, difficulty in changing or adapting, failure to meet business objectives, and too narrow a functional orientation. Sample items include “[my manager] is arrogant (e.g., devalues the contributions of others),” and “[my manager] is emotionally volatile and unpredictable.” Previous research has shown that these items are significantly correlated with likelihood of derailment ( $r = .58$ ; Center for Creative Leadership, 2002). Leslie and Braddy (2013) demonstrated criterion-related validity evidence by correlating each subscale with superior effectiveness ratings.

**Laissez-faire leadership.** Participants’ perceptions of their supervisors’ laissez-faire leadership was measured using four items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990). A five-point response scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*frequently, if not always*) was used.

**Ethical leadership.** Participants’ perceptions of their supervisors’ ethical leadership were measured using the Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS; Brown et al., 2005). The ELS includes ten items (see Appendix H). The ELS measured subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which their leaders engage in actively ethical behaviors on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include “[my manager] listens to what employees have to say,” and “[my manager] sets an example of how to do

things the right way in terms of ethics.” Brown and colleagues demonstrated support for content and construct validity.

**Authentic leadership.** Participant perceptions of authentic leadership were measured using the Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI; Neider & Schreisheim, 2011). The ALI contains four subscales: self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and internalized moral perspective. Sample items include, “my leader is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others (self-awareness),” and “my leader openly shares information with others (relational transparency).” This 14-item instrument assessed the extent to which participants agree or disagree with each statement about their leaders’ behavior on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Neider and Schriesheim provided support for the content validity, construct validity, and criterion-related validity of the ALI. Items are reported in Appendix I. Based on my best judgment, one item from the Authentic Leadership Inventory was removed prior to the data collection phase due to its extreme similarity with another item. The final number of items administered for this measure was 13.

**Servant leadership.** Participants’ perceptions of servant leadership were assessed using Ehrhart’s (2004) 14-item Servant Leadership Scale. This measure includes seven dimensions: forming relationships with subordinates, empowering subordinates, helping subordinates grow and succeed, behaving ethically, having conceptual skills, putting subordinates first, and creating value for those outside the organization. Participants were

asked to evaluate their leaders on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include “my manager spends the time to form quality relationships with employees,” and “my manager’s decisions are influenced by employees’ input.” Convergent and discriminant validity evidence, conducted by Ehrhart, supported the construct validity of this measure. Items are reported in Appendix J.

**Leadership effectiveness and team performance.** Participants’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness and team performance were measured using seven items from the Leadership Versatility Index ® (LVI; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2003). Team performance was measured using two 3-item team productivity and team vitality subscales. One additional item measured perceived overall leadership effectiveness. Although one-item measures are often criticized as unreliable, evidence shows that this single-item measure of perceived overall leader effectiveness is reliable and valid (Kaiser, Overfield, & Kaplan, 2010). According to Kaiser and colleagues (2010), this overall leader effectiveness item correlates highly with other leader effectiveness scales, such as Tsui’s (1984) reputational effectiveness measure ( $r = .73$ ) and Quinn, Spreitzer, and Hart’s (1991) managerial effectiveness scale ( $r = .86$ ). The LVI was designed as a 360-degree developmental feedback survey, but for the purposes of this research, only subordinate (i.e., follower) ratings were collected. The response format varied by item. Items for this scale are reported in Appendix K.

**Turnover intentions.** Participants’ intentions to leave their current organization were measured using a 5-item scale from Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997). Sample items include

“as soon as I find a better job, I will leave my organization,” and “I often think about quitting my job at my current organization.” Participants responded to these items using a seven-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). Items are reported in Appendix L.

**Job satisfaction.** Participants’ overall satisfaction with their current jobs was measured using Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh’s (1979) 3-item scale. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) for each of the following statements: “all in all, I am satisfied with my job,” “in general, I don’t like my job (reverse scored),” and “in general, I like working here.”

**Satisfaction with supervisor.** Participants’ satisfaction with their supervisors was measured using a 2-item supervisory satisfaction scale from Hackman and Oldham’s (1974) Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS). The JDS utilizes three dimensions and several job facets to measure overall job satisfaction, but for the purposes of this study, only the supervisory satisfaction subscale was used. Participants were asked to indicate how satisfied they are (1 = *extremely dissatisfied* to 7 = *extremely satisfied*) with the following statements: “the amount of support and guidance I receive from my supervisor” and “the overall quality of the supervision I receive at work.” The original supervisory satisfaction subscale uses three items to measure this construct, but one item was removed due to its overlap with destructive leadership. The removed item was “the degree of respect and fair treatment I receive from my boss.”

**Counterproductive work behavior.** Participants' counterproductive work behavior was assessed using a 12-item organizational deviance measure developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000). Sample items from the organizational deviance measure include "taken property from work without permission" and "taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace." Participants were asked to indicate how frequently they engage in each behavior on a five-point response format (1 = *never* to 5 = *weekly*). Items are reported in Appendix M.

**Well-being.** Participants' psychological well-being was measured using an 18-item Psychological Well-Being developed by Ryff (1989). This measure assessed well-being on several facets, such as positive relations with others, self-acceptance, autonomy, personal growth, environmental mastery, and purpose in life. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each item. Sample items include "I like most parts of my personality" and "the demands of everyday life often get me down" (reverse scored). Participants responded to these items using a seven-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). Items are reported in Appendix N.

**Demographic variables.** Several demographic variables were measured, including type of employment (full-time or part-time), hours worked per week, tenure at current organization (in years), tenure with current supervisor (in years), age, gender, supervisor gender, and supervisor organizational level.

## Results

**Screening for careless responses.** In addition to instructed response items, Mahalanobis distance (D) was an additional index of inattentive responding employed to statistically identify careless responding. Mahalanobis D is a multivariate vector of a participant's item response distances from the vector of response means (Meade & Craig, 2012). Following the procedures of Meade and Craig, separate distance measures were calculated for each scale and averaged into a single Mahalanobis D value to reduce the computational burden of using the raw, item-level data across all items. Higher values for Mahalanobis D indicated decreased levels of data quality by detecting outliers. If a participant's averaged Mahalanobis D exceeded a critical value corresponding to  $D^2(17) = 40.79$ , ( $p < .001$ ), this participant was denoted as an outlier. Analyses were run with and without the outliers (72 total). Because the results of the analyses did not vary with the presence of outliers, they were included in the final sample.

**Testing assumptions.** As is commonly suggested by researchers (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), variables were also examined for normality and homogeneity of variance. According to Field, z-tests for normality are not recommended when large samples are used. Instead, Curran, West, and Finch (1996) have argued that univariate skewness greater than 2.0 and kurtosis greater than 7.0 are cause for concern. According to their guidelines, only five items were highly positively skewed and two items were highly kurtotic (from the abusive supervision scale). Composite scores (e.g., aggregated PLIS items) of each

measure were also evaluated. All measures fell within range of acceptable skewness and kurtosis.

Levene's test was conducted on all composite measures to examine homogeneity of variance. Variances were equal across male and female participants for all measures ( $p > .05$ ), except perceived leader integrity, petty tyranny, and team vitality. Log, square root, and reciprocal transformations were performed in an effort to correct for minor skewness and unequal variances on these measures. The resulting transformations either did not correct the minor skewness or made skewness more severe. In addition, all analyses (except for SME ratings and pattern frequencies because these analyses do not assume normality) were conducted using the transformed variables, but the transformations did not affect the conclusions for those analyses. Therefore, it was determined to keep the variables untransformed. In support of this decision, Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) have argued that if pre-established measures are used, transformations are not necessary.

**Descriptive statistics.** The means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and intercorrelations among study variables are presented in Table 1. Prior to calculating these descriptive statistics, items that had been previously removed during data collection were added back into their respective scales to ensure calculations were based on a complete item set. These descriptive statistics are drawn from the final sample (outliers included) using the untransformed variables.

Table 1

*Summary of Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. PLIS	1.66	0.84	.94																
2. DLQ	2.31	0.96	.85	.99															
3. Abusive Supervision	1.61	0.73	.85	.82	.94														
4. Petty Tyranny	2.21	0.86	.86	.92	.88	.98													
5. Managerial Derailment	2.19	0.84	.72	.91	.71	.84	.97												
6. Laissez-Faire Leadership	2.16	0.98	.62	.71	.61	.66	.62	.83											
7. Ethical Leadership	3.42	0.88	-.72	-.80	-.67	-.80	-.72	-.57	.91										
8. Authentic Leadership	3.28	0.77	-.63	-.73	-.59	-.74	-.67	-.55	.83	.90									
9. Servant Leadership	3.26	0.91	-.67	-.76	-.64	-.79	-.70	-.55	.85	.83	.94								
10. Leader Effectiveness	6.80	2.53	-.76	-.87	-.72	-.82	-.77	-.63	.76	.70	.75	*							
11. Team Productivity	3.77	0.98	-.59	-.70	-.53	-.62	-.63	-.56	.58	.53	.55	.73	.92						
12. Team Vitality	3.49	1.12	-.66	-.78	-.61	-.74	-.72	-.55	.70	.66	.71	.78	.72	.90					
13. Job Satisfaction	4.71	1.80	-.62	-.68	-.58	-.68	-.63	-.47	.64	.57	.62	.66	.53	.67	.92				
14. Satisfaction with Supervisor	4.57	1.99	-.73	-.84	-.70	-.81	-.77	-.60	.79	.73	.77	.84	.65	.77	.70	.97			
15. Turnover Intentions	3.76	1.95	.56	.64	.55	.62	.59	.44	-.57	-.52	-.56	-.61	-.50	-.63	-.80	-.65	.93		
16. Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.71	0.65	.26	.28	.27	.25	.28	.28	-.17	-.17	-.15	-.19	-.17	-.23	-.24	-.21	.27	.87	
17. Well-being	5.21	0.86	-.17	-.24	-.20	-.23	-.33	-.26	.21	.23	.18	.16	.21	.22	.32	.23	-.26	.36	.88

*Notes.* All correlations were significant at  $p < .001$ . Coefficient alphas are located along the diagonal. PLIS= Perceived Leader Integrity Scale. Higher values of PLIS indicate higher levels of destructive leadership. DLQ = Destructive Leadership Questionnaire. \*Coefficient alpha unable to be computed due to one item measure

### **Research Question 1A**

Research question 1A asked whether performance-centric and values-centric leadership constructs are conceptually distinct. Ratings from subject matter experts (SMEs) were one source of evidence in discovering if performance-centric and values-centric constructs are in fact distinct from one another. To address research question 1A, (i.e., are values-centric leadership constructs distinct from performance-centric leadership constructs in terms of conceptual definition?), percent agreement was the index used to calculate interrater agreement among the SMEs. Percent agreement was calculated for each item by dividing the number of SMEs who put an item in one category divided by the total number of SMEs (for each version of the survey). If percent agreement met or exceeded a threshold of 70% for a given construct, which is considered acceptable agreement (Stemler & Tsai, 2008), I considered that item to be an indicator of that construct.

Of the 257 items that SMEs were asked to assess, SMEs agreed that 106 items belonged to a certain construct(s). Of the 106 items, 89 items were identified as belonging to a single construct and 17 were designated as representing multiple constructs (see Table 2). For both single construct items (e.g., 89% agreement for servant leadership only) and multiple construct items (e.g., 100% agreement for servant leadership, 78% for authentic leadership), percent agreement had to meet or exceed 70%. Experts agreed that eight items represented both authentic leadership and servant leadership (both positive values-centric constructs), suggesting significant overlap among these constructs. Experts also agreed that three items represented both abusive supervision and petty tyranny (both negative values-

centric constructs), again suggesting that there is some overlap across constructs. Although there were other items that fell under multiple values-centric constructs (e.g., leader integrity and ethical leadership), there was zero overlap between performance- and values-centric constructs across all items. For all items, SMEs agreed that items belonged to either values-centric constructs or performance-centric constructs, not both, providing support that these two types of constructs are distinct from one another. See Appendix O for the constructs of which each item was identified as an indicator and percentage of SME agreement.

Table 2

*Number of Items Experts Identified as Indicators of Leadership Constructs*

One Construct	# of Items	Multiple Constructs	# of Items
Ineffective Leadership	35	Authentic /Servant	8
Abusive Supervision	16	Abusive /Petty Tyranny	3
Petty Tyranny	10	Integrity/Ethical	3
Servant Leadership	9	Ethical/Authentic	2
Laissez-Faire	5	Ethical/Servant	1
Destructive Leadership	4		
Authentic Leadership	4		
Leader Integrity	3		
Ethical Leadership	1		
None	2		
Managerial Derailment	0		
Item Totals	89		17

To provide additional information relevant to addressing research question 1A, frequencies of score patterns across the performance-centric and values-centric constructs were examined. For each leadership construct, the full sample was divided into three ranges,

although only the lowest scoring and highest scoring groups were examined. Scores that were greater than one standard deviation above the mean were considered “high” and scores that were more than one standard deviation below the mean were considered “low.” Frequency patterns were examined across individual constructs. The patterns that were examined were low performance and high values (e.g., high managerial derailment scores and low petty tyranny scores) and high performance and low values (e.g., low laissez-faire leadership scores and low ethical leadership scores). The percentage of managers that fell into each of these patterns was less than 1% per pattern. The frequencies are presented in Table 3.

Frequency patterns were also examined by aggregating constructs. A destructive construct was created by aggregating perceived leader integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, and petty tyranny. A performance construct was created by aggregating managerial derailment and laissez-faire leadership. At the aggregate level, zero leaders were simultaneously high on destructiveness and performance, in addition to low destructiveness and performance. This nonexistent rate of co-occurrence of high destructiveness (i.e., values-centric constructs) and high performance (i.e., performance-centric constructs), in addition to low destructiveness and low performance, does not provide evidence to support the proposition that those two constructs represent different continua rather than different points along the same continuum.

Table 3

*Summary of Co-Occurrence of Managers in Low/High and High/Low Patterns*

Pattern	Frequency
<b>Low Performance/ High Values</b>	
MD/PT	0
MD/AB	0
MD/DLQ	0
MD/PLIS	0
MD/EL	3
MD/AL	3
MD/SL	3
<b>Low Performance/ High Values</b>	
LF/PT	1
LF/AB	2
LF/DLQ	1
LF/PLIS	12
LF/EL	4
LF/AL	5
LF/SL	8
<b>High Performance/ Low Values</b>	
MD/PT	0
MD/AB	0
MD/DLQ	0
MD/PLIS	0
MD/EL	5
MD/AL	14
MD/SL	8

Table 3 Continued

<b>High Performance/ Low Values</b>	
LF/PT	7
LF/AB	4
LF/DLQ	6
LF/PLIS	5
LF/EL	9
LF/AL	11
LF/SL	10

*Note.*  $N = 1648$ . MD = Managerial Derailment, LF = Laissez- Faire Leadership, PT = Petty Tyranny, AB = Abusive Supervision, DLQ = Destructive Leadership Questionnaire, PLIS = Perceived Leader Integrity Scale, EL = Ethical Leadership, AL = Authentic Leadership, and SL = Servant Leadership

### **Research Question 1B**

To address research question 1B (i.e., are values-centric leadership constructs distinct from performance-centric leadership constructs in terms of factor structure?), a combination of exploratory factor analyses (EFA) and confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted to examine the factor structure underlying the leadership measures. The initial sample was randomly split into a primary sample and a hold-out sample as is recommended when performing EFA and CFA (Hinkin, 1998). This randomization procedure and EFA were conducted in IBM Statistics SPSS 19.

**Sample size adequacy.** Guidelines for the minimum sample size for conducting factor analysis have varied greatly in research. Some researchers have suggested minimum sample sizes, such as Comrey and Lee (1992) who argued that a sample size of 500 was acceptable. Other researchers suggested various rules-of-thumb, such as three to six respondents per item (Cattell, 1978) or at least five respondents per item (Gorsuch, 1983).

While researchers have made multiple recommendations for the sample size necessary for factor analysis, recent studies (e.g., Hogarty, Hines, Kromrey, Ferron, & Mumford, 2005; MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999; Velicer & Fava, 1998) have supported the notion that there is no absolute minimum number of participants or number of participants-to-item ratio (Bandalos & Boehm-Kaufman, 2009). Instead, several simulation studies have shown that while recovery of population factor loadings improves with increasing sample size, results are further improved with increases in item communalities (the proportion of variance in the item accounted for by the latent factor) and the number of variables per factor (factor overdetermination; Hogarty et al., 2005; MacCallum et al., 1999). In addition, researchers have suggested that the need for a larger sample size increases with the number of factors included in the model, not variables (MacCallum et al., 1999; Velicer & Fava, 1998).

Specifically, MacCallum et al.'s (1999) research showed that when communalities were high (.7) with three to four variables per factor, accurate estimates of population parameters could be obtained with a sample size as small as 100. Models with low communalities (< .5) and about three to four variables per factor would need a sample size of about 300, but a sample of 500 would be necessary if seven factors were present under these conditions. In the current study, four factors were found in the EFA, communalities were moderate with a mean of .57 (72.76% were greater than .5), and there were at least 18 variables per factor. Given these conditions (low number of factors, moderate to high communalities, and each factor was over-determined), a sample size of 300 would be

appropriate for the EFA according to these guidelines. For this study, the sample size for the primary sample was 900.

**Factor analysis results.** Following Hinkin's (1998) suggestions for EFA, principal axis factoring was used to examine the factor structure among 257 items. An advantage to using principal axis factoring is that this approach may be used when data vary from normality (Fabrigar, Wegener, Duane, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). An oblique rotation was used to avoid artificially constraining the resulting factors to be uncorrelated. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett test of sphericity were applied to ensure the data were suitable for factor analysis. The KMO for the primary sample was .99, which is considered excellent (Field, 2013; Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999). All KMO values were greater than .62, which is above the .5 cutoff (Field, 2013). Bartlett's test  $\chi^2(32896) = 248610, p < .001$ , indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large for factor analysis.

Initially, Kaiser's criterion originally identified 25 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. However, because Kaiser's criterion tends to overfactor, Stevens (2002) suggested using Kaiser's criterion to identify the number of factors only when a sample size exceeds 250 and the average communality is greater than 0.6. The average communality in this sample was 0.57, therefore Cattell's (1966) scree test was used identify factors. Based on the scree plot, I determined that the point of inflection occurred at the fifth factor, thus a four-factor solution was identified. This four-factor solution explained 56.96% of the variance. Table 4 displays the eigenvalues and percentage of variance accounted for by each of the

factors in the four-factor solution. Only 5% of non-redundant residuals were greater than .05, suggesting that the model fit is adequate (Field, 2013). Because the scree plot could be argued to be slightly ambiguous, a five-factor solution was also examined. A five-factor solution revealed four interpretable factors and one factor without any strong factor loadings, justifying that four factors be retained.

Table 4

*Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance in Initial Four-Factor Solution*

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance
1	126.35	49.16%
2	8.27	3.22%
3	6.82	2.65%
4	4.94	1.92%

Examination of the items that load highly onto the same factor suggest that Factor 1 represents actively destructive leadership, Factor 2 represents incompetence/career derailment risk, Factor 3 represents actively prosocial behavior, and Factor 4 represents task orientation (where all items loaded negatively onto this factor suggesting a lack of, or poor performance on, task orientation). The items in Factor 1 appear to have a strong active component (i.e., explicitly engaging in destructive behavior), while the items in Factor 2 appear to indicate the absence of desirable skills or competencies (i.e., can't/doesn't/not/hasn't, etc.). It is evident from the factor loadings that some DLQ items

appear to load onto the destructiveness factor, but others load onto the performance factors (e.g., task orientation). Examples of items from the DLQ that appear to measure managerial performance include, “is afraid to take action when action is required,” and “is very poor at solving problems and making decisions.” Communalities and factor loadings are presented in Appendix P. Based on the results from the EFA, follow-up CFA models were tested.

**CFA sample size adequacy.** Once again, there is no easy way to determine the most appropriate sample size for CFA as multiple recommendations have been proposed. Kline (2005) proposed that a sample size greater than 200 is acceptable for most models. Lee and Song (2004) argued that larger samples are needed with non-normally distributed data, but smaller samples may be used with robust estimators such as Maximum Likelihood estimation. In addition, MacCallum, Widaman, Preacher, and Hong (2001) concluded that conditions that support EFA (high communalities, overdetermined factors, and a low number of factors) should be valid for CFA as well. Adding support to MacCallum and colleagues’ argument, research by Meade and Bauer (2007) demonstrated that degree of factor overdetermination and the level of indicator communalities play important roles in precision of factor loadings in CFA. Using these findings and the same EFA recommendations for sample size, a sample size of 300 would again be sufficient for data analysis. The sample size for the holdout sample was 748.

**Confirmatory factor analysis results.** Using the hold-out sample ( $N=748$ ), confirmatory factor analyses were conducted. All CFA models were tested with maximum likelihood estimation using SAS® 9.4. Model fit was assessed via seven separate indices:

Chi-Square( $\chi^2$ ), Normed Chi-Square ( $\chi^2/df$ ), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Nonnormed Fit Index (NNFI), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The competing nonhierarchical models fitted with the same data were compared using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), where models with smaller AICs are preferred (Kline, 2010).

Because it can be difficult to obtain adequate fit with large numbers of indicators per factor (Kenny, 2012), items were aggregated into parcels. Following Little, Cunningham, Shahar, and Widaman's (2002) recommendation, a simple method to item parceling is to randomly assign items, from within a factor, to a parcel. Kenny (2012) recommends having around five indicators per factor, thus five parcels were created for each factor identified in the EFA. Each parcel was created by aggregating the values from the randomly selected items for that parcel. Because the directionality of some scores varied on the same factor (i.e., high scores could indicate high destructiveness or high ethics), the appropriate items were reverse-scored to ensure all scores were interpreted in the same manner.

The first CFA was conducted on a single factor model to test whether values-centric and performance-centric constructs represent different points along a single continuum, as some researchers believe. For this model, all parcels loaded onto a single factor. This model demonstrated extremely poor fit ( $\chi^2(9420, N=748) = 169, p < .0001, \chi^2/df = 55.74, CFI = .695, NFI = .691, NNFI = .657, SRMR = .11, RMSEA = .271, 90\% \text{ C.I.} = 0.266-0.275, AIC = 9502$ ). The second CFA was conducted on the four-correlated-factors model identified from the EFA results. In this model, all parcels loaded onto their respective primary factors as

exhibited in the EFA. This model did demonstrate adequate fit ( $\chi^2(845, N = 748) = 160, p < .0001, \chi^2/df = 5.28, CFI = .977, NFI = .972, NNFI = .973, SRMR = .040, RMSEA = .076, 90\% \text{ C.I.} = 0.07-0.08$ ) and fit the data better than the first CFA as evidenced by the smaller AIC = 945. Although the RMSEA is not below .05, which is considered excellent fit, MacCallum, Browne, and Sugawara (1996) argue that a RMSEA value below .08 is considered mediocre fit.

The EFA findings indicated that the actively prosocial factor is primarily comprised of items from the ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership measures. Although the authors' intent was that these scales were measuring relatively new constructs, distinct from traditionally studied leadership variables, examination of these items suggested that this factor bears a strong resemblance to the traditionally studied consideration component of leadership (also known as relationship-oriented leader behavior). The strongest loading items on this factor all concern relationships among people. Therefore, it is unclear as to whether this factor is best conceptualized as performance-centric or values-centric. To investigate further, correlations were examined to determine whether actively prosocial leader behavior was more strongly related to the destructiveness or performance-centric factor. Although the correlations were very close, factor correlations from the CFA determined that the prosocial factor (3) was strongly correlated with the destructiveness factor (see Table 5). However, Factor 3 was interpreted as primarily performance-centric in the current study, on the basis of its conceptual/content similarity to the traditionally studied relationship orientation/consideration construct.

Table 5

*Summary of Correlations Between Empirically Derived Factors*

<i>x</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>r<sub>xy</sub></i>
Destructive (1)	Incompetence/Derailment (2)	.65
Destructive (1)	Prosocial Behavior (3)	-.87
Destructive (1)	Task Orientation (4)	.91
Incompetence/Derailment (2)	Prosocial Behavior (3)	.65
Incompetence/Derailment (2)	Task Orientation (4)	.72
Prosocial Behavior (3)	Task Orientation (4)	-.88

*Notes.* (1) = Factor 1, (2) = Factor 2, (3) = Factor 3, (4) = Factor 4.

The third CFA was conducted on a second order factor model where I allowed the three performance factors to load onto a higher order factor and destructiveness remained a separate factor. This model demonstrated acceptable fit ( $\chi^2(880, N=748) = 161, p < .0001, \chi^2/df = 5.46, CFI = .976, NFI = .971, NNFI = .972, SRMR = .042, RMSEA = .077, 90\% C.I. = 0.07-0.08$ ), however, this model exhibited a higher AIC value of 978. Based on the AIC values, the four-factor model is the preferred model. Based on these findings, it is evident that these factors are better conceived as distinct, yet the inter-factor correlations and acceptable fitting higher order model clearly indicate that these factors are related. These results provide additional support that performance-centric constructs are distinct from values-centric constructs.

Results from research question 1B also revealed measures that were originally intended by their authors to measure values-centric constructs have shown to be comprised of both performance-centric and values-centric items. In light of this finding, and to aid in

interpretation of the rest of the analyses, only the empirically derived factors were utilized in subsequent analyses for research question 1 (i.e., 1C).

### **Research Question 1C**

To address research question 1C (i.e., are values-centric factors distinct from performance-centric leadership constructs in terms of external correlates?), the patterns of correlations between all measured outcomes (i.e., leader effectiveness, team productivity, team vitality, job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, turnover intentions, counterproductive work behavior, and well-being) and the empirically derived factors were examined on the full sample (see Table 6). Results showed that each empirically derived factor was significantly related to each outcome variable ( $p < .001$ ). In general, correlations for destructive leadership, derailment, and task orientation were similar in direction. The direction of task orientation is not surprising considering all items loaded negatively onto this factor. For example, as leaders that were perceived as having higher task orientation were associated with greater overall effectiveness. Prosocial behavior related to each outcome in the opposite direction.

Table 6

*Summary of Correlations Between Empirically Derived Factors and Outcome Variables*

	Destructive Leadership	Derailment	Prosocial Behavior	Task Orientation
Overall Effectiveness	-0.83	-0.566*	0.813*	-0.858*
Team Productivity	-0.628	-0.481*	0.611*	-0.723*
Team Vitality	-0.736	-0.533*	0.763*	-0.766*
Intentions to Quit	0.62	0.447*	-0.608	0.617
Job Satisfaction	-0.67	-0.474*	0.676	-0.651*
Well-Being	-0.235	-0.346*	0.225*	-0.25
CWB	0.267	0.261	-0.183*	0.282
Supervisor Satisfaction	-0.808	-0.581*	0.836*	-0.82

Note. \*Correlation was significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) from destructive correlation. For Task Orientation, higher scores indicate lower levels of the construct.

Steiger's z-test was then performed to determine if each destructive correlation was significantly different from the performance-centric factor correlations (e.g., is the correlation between destructiveness and overall effectiveness significantly different from derailment's relationship to overall effectiveness?). Steiger's z-test is used to compare two correlation coefficients, sharing one variable, that have been obtained from the same sample (Lee & Preacher, 2013; Steiger, 1980). Each correlation coefficient is converted into a z-score using Fisher's r to z transformation while taking into account the shared correlation between the two variables and the assumption that the variables come from a single sample. Because the correlations were prosocial behavior were opposite in direction, the absolute

values of the correlations were evaluated between destructive leadership and prosocial behavior.

Findings revealed that there were several correlations that were not significantly different from the destructive factor. Destructive leadership, derailment, and task orientation all exhibited correlations with CWB that were not significantly different from each other. Task orientation's correlations with intentions to quit, well-being, and satisfaction with supervisor were also not significantly different from destructive leadership's correlation with these variables. However, all correlations were significantly different for overall effectiveness, team productivity, team vitality, and job satisfaction. This indicates that there is mixed evidence as to whether destructiveness is distinct from the performance-centric factors based on their patterns of relationships to outcome variables.

To further investigate research question 1C, hierarchical multiple regression (HMR) was conducted to examine incremental variance in each outcome variable (leader effectiveness, team productivity, team vitality, satisfaction with supervisor, turnover intentions, counterproductive work behavior, and well-being) predicted by the four leadership factors. Regression diagnostics were run on the full sample to ensure data were suitable by identifying any outliers that may unduly impact the regression results (e.g., standardized residuals, Cook's, Leverage, and Mahalanobis Distance). Based on these results, 136 participants were removed from the sample because their responses fell out of acceptable ranges for the above diagnostics. Separate hierarchical regressions were conducted for each outcome variable for the full sample and the partial sample (i.e., 136

individuals removed) based on the regression diagnostics. Because the overall conclusions (e.g., explaining significant additional variance) did not vary between samples, the results from the full sample are reported.

HMR was conducted by first entering the five control variables (follower age, follower gender, tenure with supervisor, tenure with organization, and leader gender), followed by destructiveness in Model 2 and performance-centric factors in Model 3. As shown in Table 7, the three performance-centric factors significantly explained (all  $ps < .001$ ) additional variance above and beyond destructiveness. HMR was also implemented by entering the five control variables, followed by performance-centric factors in Model 2 and destructiveness in Model 3. Destructiveness significantly explained additional variance above and beyond the three performance-centric factors for all outcome variables except for well-being. These findings, that destructive behavior and performance-oriented factors each demonstrate incremental predictive validity beyond the other, provides further support that these two types of leadership variables are distinct from one another.

Table 7

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses for Factors Predicting Employee-Related Outcome Variables: Values-Centric Factor in Model 2, Performance-Centric Factors in Model 3*

Predictor	Outcome Variables							
	Leader Effectiveness	Team Productivity	Team Vitality	Job Satisfaction	Satisfaction with supervisor	Turnover Intentions	CWB	Well-Being
Step 1								
Follower Age	<.01	.02	<.01	.01	<.01	-.03	-.17**	.12***
Follower Gender	<.01	.01	<.01	<.01	-.02	.02	<.01	.06*
Tenure with Supervisor	.06***	.06**	.05**	.06**	.06***	-.09***	.04	<.01
Tenure with Organization	.01	<.01	-.02	.02	-.04*	-.06*	<.01	<.01
Leader Gender	-.02	-.03	-.04*	-.03	<.01	.01	-.06*	.03
Step 2								
Destructive Leadership	-.19***	.12**	.08*	-.28***	-.17***	.24***	.15***	-.02
$\Delta R^2$	.68***	.39***	.54***	.44***	.65***	.38***	.07***	.05***
Step 3								
Derailment	.06***	.04	<.01	-.04	-.02	.04	.13***	-.33***
Prosocial	.27***	.09**	.38***	.34***	.45***	-.22***	.18***	.06
Task Orientation	-.51***	-.78***	-.38***	-.09*	-.29***	.19***	.20***	.05
$\Delta R^2$	.09***	.13***	.10***	.04***	.10***	.03***	.03***	.07***
Total R <sup>2</sup>	.78	.53	.65	.51	.76	.44	.13	.14
Total Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.78	.53	.64	.50	.76	.44	.13	.14

*Note.* Standardized beta weights from the full model are reported. Follower gender and Leader gender: 0 = male, 1 = female. Tenure with supervisor and tenure with organization was measured in years. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## **Research Question 2**

To address research question 2 (i.e., how many distinct dimensions underlie the set of values-centric leadership constructs?), a combination of EFAs and CFAs was used to examine the factor structure underlying the (ostensibly) values-centric leadership measures of perceived leader integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership. Following the same procedures outlined above, a three-factor model was discovered. After reviewing the items, it was evident that many items, all from the DLQ, loaded strongly onto a task-oriented factor, as was discovered in the previous EFA where all leadership measures were included. The DLQ was intended by its authors to be values-centric; however, the current results suggest it to contain traditional bright-side / performance-centric facets as well. Because the purpose of this EFA was to evaluate only values-centric constructs, any DLQ items that loaded primarily onto either of the bright side factors in the earlier EFA and CFA were excluded from the analysis for research question 2 (see Appendix Q).

After eliminating the performance-centric items, leaving 152 items in the analysis, the EFA produced a scree plot with a two-factor solution. Table 8 displays the eigenvalues and percentage of variance accounted for by each of the factors in the two-factor solution. This two-factor solution explained 53.92% of the variance. The items that load highly onto the same factor suggest that factor 1 represents active destructive behavior and factor 2

represents active prosocial behavior. Factor loadings and communalities are reported in Appendix R.

Table 8

*Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance in Initial Two-Factor Solution*

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance
1	75.71	49.53%
2	7.19	4.39%

Using the holdout sample, two CFA models were tested: a single factor model and a two-factor model specifying an actively-bad destructive factor and an actively-good prosocial factor. Following procedures outlined above, parcels were created for research question 2 factor analyses. The first CFA was conducted on a single factor model to test if the destructive and prosocial factors are better conceptualized as facets of a single values-centric factor. For this model, all items that were retained in the EFA, and subsequently converted into parcels, were loaded onto a single factor. This model demonstrated extremely poor fit ( $\chi^2(2982, N=748) = 34, p < .0001, \chi^2/df = 87.71, CFI = .808, NFI = .806, NNFI = .746, SRMR = .123, RMSEA = .341, 90\% \text{ C.I.} = 0.330-0.351, AIC = 3024$ ). The second CFA was conducted on the model identified from the EFA. In this model, all items were loaded onto their respective primary factors as exhibited in the EFA. This model did demonstrate

acceptable fit ( $\chi^2(108, N=748) = 32, p < .0001, \chi^2/df = 3.38, CFI = .995, NFI = .993, NNFI = .993, SRMR = .008, RMSEA = .057, 90\% \text{ C.I.} = 0.045-0.069$ ). This acceptable fitting two-factor CFA provides further support to the notion that there are two distinct dimensions underlying the set of values-centric leadership constructs: active destructive behavior and active prosocial behavior.

### **Discussion**

As described earlier, destructive leadership is a complex construct that has been a topic of debate in recent years. Some researchers have argued that destructive and ineffective leadership lie on the same continuum (e.g., Einarsen et al., 2007, Kellerman, 2004), while others have argued for their distinctiveness (e.g., Craig & Kaiser, 2012, Krasikova et al., 2013). The notion of destructive leadership as being distinct from ineffective leadership is not a new idea, but had not yet been previously investigated empirically. Kaiser and Hogan (2010) argued that managerial incompetence is not the same as managerial malfeasance, where incompetence is due to lack of capability (i.e., low performance) and malfeasance is due to lack of character (i.e., low values). The current study's findings add substantial new discoveries to the destructive leadership literature. This current investigation provided an important contribution to the literature as this was the first study to attempt to tease apart destructive leadership from ineffective leadership. By extension, this study further refined the construct of destructive leadership by examining multiple similar constructs in a single study.

## **Main Findings**

To address the research questions that were posed, the current study employed a considerable number of measures that were similar to and had a conceptual relationship with destructive leadership. In addition, a diverse sample of participants and multiple analytic strategies were used to gather evidence for this investigation. Although a single study can never be definitive, this study provides initial evidence that distinctions between destructiveness and ineffectiveness, and between active and passive forms of ineffectiveness, might be useful moving forward. Several findings from research question 1 support the notion that values-centric and performance-centric constructs are distinct, yet related, constructs which parallels the argument made by Craig and Kaiser (2012) and Krasikova and colleagues (2013): destructiveness and ineffectiveness are not the same phenomenon.

In support of this argument, this study found that subject matter experts agreed that items belonged either to values-centric constructs or performance-centric constructs, but not both, supporting the idea that these two types of constructs are conceptually distinct from one another. The results from the EFA and CFA indicated that destructiveness, prosocial behavior, derailment, and task orientation are best modeled as unique factors, suggesting that these constructs are distinct in terms of factor structure. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses also provided evidence to support that these two sets of factors are unique, with destructiveness explaining additional significant variance in outcomes over performance-centric factors, and performance-centric factors also explaining significant additional

variance over destructiveness (with one exception in that destructiveness did not explain incremental variance beyond performance in predicting employee well-being).

Other results were less clear cut with regard to research question 1. Examination of the correlations indicated that, for the most part, the four empirically derived factors had significantly different relationships with each of the outcome variables. However, the relationship between destructiveness and CWB did not significantly differ from its relationship with derailment and task orientation. Although the occurrence of reported CWB was low in this study ( $M = 1.71$ ,  $SD = .65$ ), perhaps a significant difference may have been observed if supervisor-directed CWB had been measured instead of organizational deviance. In addition, task orientation's correlations with turnover intentions, well-being, and satisfaction with supervisor were also not significantly different from destructive leadership's correlations with these variables. It may be that certain outcomes are insensitive to whether leaders' harmful behavior was intentional or unintentional, as suggested by Krasikova et al. (2013).

After examining the frequencies with which full-time employees' supervisors were considered high or low in both destructiveness and performance, findings showed that the high destructiveness-high performance (i.e., high effectiveness) pattern did not occur with meaningful regularity. Similarly, supervisors did not often simultaneously exhibit low destructiveness and low performance (i.e., low effectiveness). This finding is more consistent with Kellerman's (2004) argument that destructive behavior and ineffectiveness may lie on a

single continuum. However, these analyses were conducted with all the items from the DLQ and Petty Tyranny measures categorized as destructiveness, whereas many of those items were later found to load more highly on performance-centric factors. Different results might be obtained if this analysis were repeated with the performance-centric DLQ items moved to the performance category. Additionally, it may be the case that the criterion in place to designate “high” and “low” (i.e., +/- 1.0 SD from the mean) was too strict to address this question. Based on this criterion, only 19.2% of leaders were considered highly destructive and 11% were considered low on destructiveness, leaving almost 70% of leaders unaccounted for.

Although conflicting findings arose in the additional analyses, the use of factor analysis highlighted several important discoveries. First, the EFA identified separate factors for values-centric (destructiveness) and performance-centric constructs (derailment, prosocial behavior, and task orientation). It became apparent that several measures (e.g., destructive leadership questionnaire, petty tyranny, managerial derailment) tapped into both values-centric and performance-centric factors. This finding indicates that these measures are each assessing multiple constructs, and the authors of purportedly values-centric leadership measures have not been effective at distinguishing between values- and performance-centric leader behavior. In addition, the destructive leadership factor consisted of several destructive-oriented leadership measures including abusive supervision and perceived leader integrity. This finding is consistent with Craig and Kaiser’s (2012) argument that destructive

leadership should refer to a broader category of leadership where narrower dimensions (e.g., abusive supervision) are subsumed under it.

Second, although the actively moral leadership measures (i.e., ethical, authentic, and servant leadership) were intended by their authors to be distinct, items from these three measures fell out onto to the same factor (prosocial behavior). Subsequently, as these measures were intended to measure actively ethical leadership, and therefore being considered values-centric constructs in the current study, the items cohered together in a single factor that strongly resembled the traditionally studied relationship-orientation / consideration construct. It was mentioned previously that relationship-orientation is a component of leadership that focuses on building interpersonal relationships and the general well-being of others, which has been found to strongly contribute to leader effectiveness (Judge et al., 2004).

The third trend evident from the EFA was the active versus passive nature of some of the factors. Items loading onto the destructive leadership factor and prosocial behavior had a strong active component (i.e., explicitly or deliberately engaging in behavior), while the items in the derailment factor and task orientation factor appear to have a strong passive/negative component (i.e., can't/doesn't/not/hasn't, etc.). For instance, items such as “belittles or embarrasses subordinates,” “puts me down in front of others,” and “ridicules me,” all loaded highly onto the destructive factor. Items such as “is not ready for more responsibility,” “is afraid to take action when action is required,” and “is poor at solving

problems and making decisions” load highly onto the incompetence/derailment and task orientation factors. These are important findings because some researchers (e.g., Einarsen et al., 2007) have argued for a definition of destructive leadership that excludes the requirement of intentionality, thereby labeling leaders as “destructive” that may unintentionally cause harm. Instead, these results support the claim that destructive leadership has an active or intentional component while passive ineffectiveness is better conceptualized as a job performance issue. This finding is consistent with Craig and Kaiser’s (2012) definition of destructive leadership and their argument that destructive leadership should be reserved for behaviors that are volitional on the part of the leader.

The final interesting trend was that items from the Destructive Leadership Questionnaire loaded onto the destructiveness factor and the task orientation factor. One could logically argue that the items that load onto the performance-centric factors are more aligned with performance-centric behaviors (e.g., “is afraid to take action when action is required,” “is very poor at solving problems and making decisions”) rather than a values-centric behaviors, as presumably intended by the author. This finding implies that many items from the DLQ are more like traditional indicators of poor performance (e.g., ineffectiveness) rather than values (e.g., destructiveness). It should be noted, however, that Shaw et al.’s (2011) DLQ was created based on Einarsen and colleagues’ (2007) all-inclusive definition of destructive leadership which considers (in)effectiveness to be a form of

destructive leadership. Therefore it is likely that excluding traditional effectiveness was not a design goal for authors of the DLQ.

Research question 2 was posed to tease apart the values-centric constructs, which consisted of destructive leadership and the actively moral leadership constructs. The values-centric constructs EFA replicated the results found in the initial EFA where all constructs were included. The analyses revealed a destructiveness factor and a prosocial behavior factor. The same trend was exhibited in that both factors were comprised of items that were inherently active in nature. The subsequent CFA supported the previous finding from research question 1 that destructiveness is distinct from prosocial behavior, with models combining the two fitting the data less well.

### **Theoretical, Research, and Practical Implications**

The primary theoretical contribution of this study is that it provided a thorough empirical investigation into the dimensionality of destructive leadership. It delivered several pieces of evidence to support the conceptual and structural distinction between destructive leadership and in(effectiveness) which has been debated in recent years. Findings from this study lend empirical support to further Craig and Kaiser's (2012) and Krasikova et al.'s (2013) argument that destructive leadership is distinct from general ineffectiveness. By identifying an active component in destructiveness, thereby clarifying the aspect of intentionality, these results allow researchers to draw that boundary between actively destructive leadership and ineffective leadership. These findings also lend support to Craig

and Kaiser's argument that destructive leader behavior could be considered a subset of counterproductive work behavior, as this class of behavior is limited to intentional acts only (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Findings from this study also have implications for research. In order to further the study of destructive leadership, the researcher must know exactly what it is that constitutes destructive leadership and how the measure being used to assess it could confound results. For example, a study using the DLQ (Shaw et al., 2011) to investigate the relation between destructive leader behavior and leaders' job performance would likely find an artificially inflated relation, due to the DLQ's contamination by performance-centric items. This study will aid future research in driving researchers to continue to focus on destructive leadership as the values underlying leaders' behavior, as opposed to defining it by its outcomes. In addition, researchers should avoid re-inventing the construct of destructive leadership by creating new measures that merge it with traditional conceptions of job performance. Instead, continue to use the current measures in place (e.g., abusive supervision, perceived leader integrity) to further leadership researchers' understanding of these current measures, and continue to investigate their limitations by recognizing what these various measures can *and* cannot predict.

In terms of practical implications, findings from this study could be used in facilitating how destructive leadership is appropriately measured, identified, and mitigated in organizations. Kaiser and Hogan (2010) found that measuring ethical leadership as a

competency rarely identified leaders who may lack integrity. This study further supports their finding by discovering that, although actively ethical/moral leadership measures and destructive leadership measures are related, they are conceptually and empirically distinct from one another. Low scores on actively ethical/moral leadership measures are not equivalent to high scores on destructive leadership measures. This distinction has implications for training needs assessment in the domain of leadership development. If an organization's goal is to implement training programs for reducing destructive behaviors, managers need to be trained on not only what they should do (e.g., desirable behaviors for effectiveness), but also on what they should not do (e.g., unethical behaviors).

### **Limitations**

While the findings of this study make an important contribution to the literature, several limitations should be acknowledged. The first limitation is the reliance on single source self-report data. Given the number of participants necessary to carry out the analyses, collecting data from multiple sources on leaders (e.g., multiple followers, peers) in a timely manner would have been an arduous undertaking. Therefore, the findings of this study rely on the participant's self-reported behavior and his/her perceptions of his/her supervisor. In addition, although responses were anonymous, participants may still have been somewhat reluctant to expose their leaders' negative behavior.

Another limitation was the nature of the questionnaire itself. The questionnaire took participants anywhere from 15 minutes to 1.50 hours (the time limit) to complete. Factors

affecting this may have been the rate at which an individual could read and how well they navigated a computer. Those who took longer to complete the questionnaire may have been subject to rater fatigue. I attempted to reduce the time it would take participants to complete the survey by removing several similar items, yet the number of items that remained was considerable. However, in an effort to combat rater fatigue and increase motivation to complete the survey, participants received a small payment upon completion. The number of items also necessitated the use of item parcels in the CFAs rather than using each individual item as an indicator.

### **Future Research**

In light of these findings, several avenues for future research may be noted. This study was the first study to examine the dimensionality of destructive leadership measures using commonly used measures. Research should continue to acknowledge this distinction between destructiveness and ineffectiveness and utilize measures that are assessing behaviors that are clearly destructive. Future research should attempt to replicate this study to provide further support of the dimensionality within these constructs.

In addition to replicating this study, future research may wish to specifically target organizations with known destructive leaders. Focusing the sample to include a larger number of destructive leaders may assist further research in identifying the base rates at which leaders are high performers as well as highly destructive individuals. Furthermore, assessing varying levels of destructiveness may help further tease out the dimensionality of

the construct by examining how different levels of destructiveness related to follower related outcome variables. Future research should also attempt to investigate whether the targets of destructive leadership should be limited to the leader's own organization, or if harm to legitimate external stakeholders is of concern as well.

Future research may also want to continue to investigate the relationship between relationship orientation and actively moral forms of leadership (e.g., ethical, authentic, servant). These actively moral forms of leadership possess a strong resemblance to relationship orientation as each of these constructs has a component that focuses on a leader's ability to develop followers and ability to build and maintain relationships with followers. It may be the case that Brown et al.' (2005) conception of ethical leadership is a facet of relationship orientation. Following Ciulla's (2005) argument, leaders can be effective without being ethical, but maybe exhibiting and encouraging ethical behavior boosts their effectiveness.

There is the possibility that a leader could transition in and out of destructive leadership over the course of a follower's tenure at the organization. It's possible that a leader may have been very effective and relationship-oriented with his or her subordinates, but over time, began to exhibit destructive behaviors due to pressure from within the organization. There very well may have been a proportion of leaders in this study who could have tapped into positive and negative areas of leadership at some point in time possibly confounding findings among pattern frequencies and/or correlations. Future research could

empirically investigate why leaders engage in destructive behaviors, and whether destructive leadership is stable over time or whether changes in the environment affect it.

## REFERENCES

- Aasland, M. S., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The prevalence of destructive leadership behavior. *British Journal of Management, 21*, 438-452.
- American Psychological Association. (2014). Employee distrust is pervasive in U.S. workforce [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2014/04/employee-distrust.aspx>.
- Ashforth, B. E. (1987). *Organizations and the petty tyrant: An exploratory study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, LA.
- Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*, 126-140.
- Bandalos, D. L., & Boehm-Kaufman, M. B. (2009). Four common misconceptions in exploratory factor analysis. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical methodological myths and urban legends: doctrine, verity and fable in the organizational and social sciences* (pp. 61- 87). Hove, GBR: Psychology Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Barrick, M. R., Day, D. V., Lord, R. G., & Alexander, R. A. (1991). Assessing the utility of executive leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*, 9-22.

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Transformational Leadership Development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 181-217.
- Baumeister, R., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. Review of general good. *Review of General Psychology*, *5*, 323–370.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). The development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 349-360.
- Bentham, J. (1970). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. London: Athlone Press.
- Bentz, V. J. (1985). *A view from the top: A thirty year perspective of research devoted to the discovery of research devoted to the discovery, description, and prediction of executive behavior*. Paper presented at the 93<sup>rd</sup> Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August.
- Bray, D. W., & Howard, A. (1983). The AT&T longitudinal studies of managers. In K. W. Shaie (Ed.), *Longitudinal studies of adult psychological development* (pp. 266–312). New York: Guilford Press.

- Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*, 117-134.
- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 595-616.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*(1), 3-5.
- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 912-922.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Cattell, R. B. (1978). *The scientific use of factor analysis in behavioral and life sciences*. New York: Plenum.
- Center for Creative Leadership. (2002). *Benchmarks® facilitator's manual*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

- Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 481-498.
- Ciulla, J. B. (2005). The state of leadership ethics and the work that lies before us. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 14*(4), 323-335.
- Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conger, J. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*, 44–55.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 637-647.
- Craig, S. B. (n.d.). A short form of the Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS). Retrieved from <http://www.sbcraig.com/plis/short.htm>
- Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived leader integrity scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. *The Leadership Quarterly, 9*(2), 127-145.
- Craig, S. B., & Kaiser, R. B. (2012). Destructive leadership. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.) *The Oxford handbook of leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 1*(1), 16-29.

- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., et al. (1999). Culturally specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 219–256.
- DeVries, D. L., & Kaiser, R. B. (2003, November). *Going sour in the suite*. Paper presented at the Maximizing Executive Effectiveness workshop, Miami, FL.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 331–351.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 57*, 61-94.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*, 207 –216.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*(3), 272–299.
- Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London, England: SAGE.
- Fleishman, E.A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 37*, 1-6.
- Foti, R. J., & Hauenstein, N. A. (2007). Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 347-355.

- Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1974). *The Job Diagnostic Survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects* (Tech. Rep. No. 4). New Haven, CT: Yale University, Department of Administrative Sciences.
- 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.
- Halpin, A.W., & Winer, B.J. (1957). A factorial study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 104-121.
- Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). An examination of nonleadership: From laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 1234-1248.
- Hmieleski, K. M, & Ensley, M. D. (2007). The effects of entrepreneur abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1-6.
- Hobman, E. V., Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., & Tang, R. L. (2009). Abusive supervision in advising relationships: Investigating the role of social support. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 58*, 233–256.

- Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2010). Management derailment: Personality assessment and mitigation. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *American Psychological Association handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 555-575). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, *49*, 493–504.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, *9*(2), 169-180.
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. Clark, & M. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Hogarty, K. Y., Hines, C. V., Kromrey, J. D., Ferron, J. M., & Mumford, K. R. (2005). The quality of factor solutions in exploratory factor analysis: The influence of sample size, communality, and overdetermination. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *65*, 202-226.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, *6*, 43–54.
- Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist*. London: Sage.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 755-768.

- Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 36-51.
- 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 traits paradigm. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 855-875.
- Kaiser, R. B., & Hogan, R. (2010). How to (and how not to) assess the integrity of managers. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(4), 216-234.
- Kaiser, R. B., Overfield, D. V., & Kaplan, R. E. (2010). *Leadership versatility index® version 3.0 facilitator's guide*. Greensboro, NC: Kaplan DeVries Inc. Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser, R. B. (2003). Developing versatile leadership. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 44*(4), 18-26.
- Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser, R. B. (2003). Developing versatile leadership. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 44* (4), 18-26.
- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kenny, D. A. (2012). *Multiple latent variable models: Confirmatory factor analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.davidakenny.net/cm/mfactor.htm>.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

- Kline, R. B. (2010). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kovach, B. E. (1989). Successful derailment: What fast-trackers can learn while they're off the track. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18 (2), 33-47.
- Krasikova, D. V., Green, S. G., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1308-1388.
- Lee, I. A., & Preacher, K. J. (2013, September). Calculation for the test of the difference between two dependent correlations with one variable in common [Computer software]. Available from <http://quantpsy.org>.
- Lee, S. Y., & Song, X. Y. (2004). Evaluation of Bayesian and maximum likelihood approaches in analyzing structural equation models with small sample sizes. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39, 653-686.
- Leslie, J. B., & Braddy, P. W. (2013). *Benchmarks*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Leslie, J. B., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). *A look at derailment today*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians—and how we can survive them*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Little T. D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 9(2), 151-173.
- Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2005). *Preventing derailment: What to do before it's too late*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership. (Original work published 1989).
- Lombardo, M., & McCauley, C. D. (1994). *Benchmarks®: A manual and trainer's guide*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lombardo, M. M., Ruderman, M. N., & McCauley, C. D. (1988). Explanations of success and derailment in upper-level management positions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 2, 199-216.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive development approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 130-149.

- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Preacher, K. J., & Hong, S. (2001). Sample size in factor analysis: The role of model error. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 36*(4), 611-637.
- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 4*, 84-99.
- 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.
- Meade, A. W., & Bauer, D. J. (2007). Power and precision in confirmatory factor analytic tests of measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling, 14*(4), 611-635.
- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods, 17*(3), 437-55.
- Namie, G., & Namie R. (2000). *The bully at work*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.
- Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 1146-1164.
- O'Connor, J., Mumford, M., Clifton, T., Gessner, T., & Connelly, M. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric study. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 529-555.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, vulnerable followers, and conducive environments. *Leadership Quarterly, 18*, 176-194.

- Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1992). Values and the American manager: An update updated. *California Management Review*, 34, 80–94
- Quinn, R.E., Spreitzer, G.M., & Hart, S. (1991). Challenging the assumptions of bipolarity: Interpenetration and managerial effectiveness. In S. Srivastva & R. Fry (Eds.), *Executive and organizational continuity* (pp. 222-252). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Riggio, R. E. (2008). Leadership development: The current state and future expectations. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(4), 383-392.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555-572.
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 617-633.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57, 1069-1081.
- Schilling, J. (2009). From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. *Leadership*, 5(1), 102-128.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). *Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland at College Park.
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 138-158.

- Shaw, J. B., Erickson, A., & Harvey, M. (2011). A method for measuring destructive leadership and identifying types of destructive leaders in organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 575-590.
- Sheehan, M., McCarthy, P., Barker, M., & Henderson, M. (2001). *A model for assessing the impacts and costs of workplace bullying*. Paper presented at the Standing Conference on Organisational Symbolism (SCOS), Trinity College, Dublin.
- Skagert, K., Dellve, L., Eklof, M., Poussette, A., & Ahlborg, G. R. (2008). Leaders' strategies for dealing with own and their subordinates' stress in public human service organizations. *Applied Ergonomics*, 39(6), 803-811.
- Smart, B. D. (1999). *Topgrading*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Spears, L. C. (2004). The understanding and practice of servant leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant-leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 9–24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Steiger, J. H. (1980). Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 245-251.
- Stemler, S.E., & Tsai, J. (2008). Best practices in estimating interrater reliability. In J. Osborne (Ed.), *Best Practices in Quantitative Methods* (pp. 29-49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*, 178–190.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*, 101-123.
- Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., Lockhart, D. E., & Carr, J. C. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 1169–1180.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 455–465.
- Tichy, N. M., & Bennis, W. G. (2007). Making judgment calls – The ultimate act of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*, 94.
- Treviño, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California Management Review*, *42*, 128–142.
- Tsui, A. S. (1984). A role-set analysis of managerial reputation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *34*, 64-96.

- Urmson, J. O. (1958). Saints and heroes. In A. I. Melden (Ed.), *Essays in Moral Philosophy* (pp. 198-216). Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Velicer, W. F., Eaton, C. A., & Fava, J. L. (2000). Construct explication through factor or component analysis: A review and evaluation of alternative procedures for determining the number of factors or components. In R. D. Goffin & E. Helmes (Eds.), *Problems and solutions in human assessment* (pp. 41-71). Boston: Kluwer.
- Walumba, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure? *Journal of Management*, *34*(89), 89-126.
- Walumba, R. O., Hartnell, C. A., Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(3), 517-529.
- Wang, M., Sinclair, R. R., & Deese, M. N. (2010). Understanding the causes of destructive leadership: A dual process model. In T. Hansbrough & B. Schyns (Eds). *When leadership goes wrong: Destructive leadership, mistakes and ethical failures* (pp. 73-97). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *40*(1), 82-111.

**APPENDICES**

## Appendix A

### Summary of SME Credentials

Survey Version	“Please list any credentials that qualify you to provide your opinion on leadership constructs”
1	Graduate coursework in I/O psychology
1	Graduate coursework in I/O psychology
1	I have a PhD in Psychology
1	Ph.D. I/O psychology
1	While getting my PhD in I/O Psychology, I took a graduate-level course in leadership development
1	Doctoral Student in I/O Psychology; I studied leadership and have experience as a manager
1	Doctoral Student and have taken graduate coursework in I/O psychology
1	IO Ph.D. with experience in leadership research
2	PhD in Psychology; Professor of Organizational Behavior Course
2	Doctoral Student in I-O program; Have taken Leadership Course
2	Doctoral Student in Industrial/Organizational Psychology; Very Interested in Leadership
2	Doctoral Student in I-O Psychology; 8 years management/leadership experience
2	Master’s Thesis on Destructive Leadership
2	Ph.D. in I-O Psych; 3 years working as an I-O consultant
2	Completed Advanced Courses in I-O psychology
2	Obtained PhD in I/O Psychology; Completed coursework in Leadership Research
1 & 2	PhD in I/O Psychology (with leadership coursework); Have taught leadership modules at the graduate and undergraduate levels

## Appendix B

### Instructions to SMEs

- **Please review the various leadership constructs and their associated definitions.**
- You will be presented with a series of statements from various leadership measures.
- For each statement, please select the construct or constructs for which the item best serves as an indicator.
- Please do NOT consider the direction of the wording (i.e. whether the positive or negative nature of the items is consistent with the construct's label or definition), and respond only on the basis of the actual behavior described in each item.
- You may select MORE THAN ONE CONSTRUCT for an item.
  - o If you believe the item does not serve as an indicator for any of the listed constructs, please select "none."
- At the end of the survey, please fill out the demographic questionnaire where you will be asked to provide your name and credentials.
- This survey may take you about 20 to 30 minutes to complete. Please complete the survey in one sitting.
- Although you may be able to complete the survey on a tablet or smartphone, the pages have not been optimized for small screens, so a computer is recommended.

*(following portion shown on each survey page)*

Please review the following definitions associated with each construct:

- Leader Integrity is defined as "the absence of actively devious, manipulative, unethical, dishonest behavior."
- Destructive Leadership is defined as "the systematic or repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor, or manager that knowingly violates, or inappropriately risks violating, the legitimate interest of the organization, its members, or other legitimate stakeholders by undermining or sabotaging the goals, tasks, resources, well-being, job satisfaction, or effectiveness of such stakeholders."
- Abusive Supervision is defined as "subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact."
- Managerial Derailment is defined as "being involuntarily plateaued, demoted, or fired below the level of anticipated achievement or reaching that level only to fail unexpectedly."
- Ineffective Leadership is defined as "a leader's failure or lack of motivation to lead the group towards its goals."

- Laissez-Faire Leadership is defined as "the absence of leadership, the avoidance of intervention, or both."
- Petty Tyranny is defined as "the lording of one's power over others."
- Ethical Leadership is defined as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making."
- Authentic Leadership is defined as "a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development."
- Servant Leadership is defined as "an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader, emphasizing leader behaviors that focus on follower development and de-emphasizing glorification of the leader."

## Appendix C

## Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS)

For each item below, indicate how well the item describes the manager you are rating:

Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Well
1	1	2	4

Would lie to me

Would allow someone else to be blamed for his/her mistake

Would falsify records

Is vindictive

Would deliberately distort what other people say

Would make trouble for someone who got on his/her bad side

Would try to take credit for other people's ideas

Would do things that violate organizational policy and then expect others to cover for him/her



My boss sees every negotiation issue as a win/lose conflict  
My boss often makes knee jerk reactions  
My boss is an ineffective communicator  
My boss does not systematically develop the skills of his or her subordinates  
My boss is unable to effectively manage change  
My boss is incompetent  
My boss often takes credit for the work that others have done  
My boss often acts in an unethical manner  
My boss holds grudges  
My boss could best be described as mean  
My boss does NOT have a clue what is going on in our business unit  
My boss is poor at developing a vision for our business unit  
My boss spends more time politicking than working  
My boss will act one way and then later acts in the exact opposite manner  
My boss treats many employees unfairly  
My boss demonstrates no concern for anyone outside his/her own unit  
Very few people see my boss as a credible manager  
My boss is unable to take a stand and stick to it  
My boss is pig headed i.e., extremely stubborn  
My boss manages interpersonal conflict poorly  
I rarely know what my boss thinks of my work  
My boss treats both good and bad performers the same way  
My boss does not provide an appropriate level of supervision and oversight  
My boss is very ineffective in persuading others  
My boss seems not to enjoy new technology  
If my boss screws something up, it stays screwed up forever  
My boss has no idea what it takes to motivate subordinates  
My boss rarely tells subordinates what he/she wants them to do  
My boss does not show trust in subordinates by assigning them important tasks  
My boss does NOT pay enough attention to what really matters  
My boss is very poor at building team spirit  
My boss does not seek out or pay attention to the opinions and wishes of subordinates  
My boss is a micro-manager  
My boss is autocratic  
My boss is one of the very worst  
I would prefer not to work for my boss compared to other possible bosses  
My boss has poor strategic planning skills  
My boss deals very ineffectively with complex situations

My boss is a poor negotiator  
My boss is an ineffective problem solver  
My boss is very poor at getting to the point quickly and clearly  
My boss is ineffective at educating and developing subordinates  
My boss does not adapt well to new and changing circumstances  
My boss lacks the skills and/or experience needed to function job effectively  
My boss rarely acts with a high level of integrity  
My boss blames others for his/her own mistakes  
Anyone who challenges my boss is dealt with brutally  
My boss enjoys making people suffer  
My boss has his/her head in the sand  
My boss can only talk about issues that are very short-term  
My boss will tell superiors what they want to hear  
You never know from day to day how my boss will behave  
My boss tends to show excessive favoritism  
My boss is ignorant of things are not part of the immediate environment  
My boss has lost credibility with stakeholders  
My boss is afraid to take action when action is required  
My boss is invulnerable to reason  
My boss does not understand the needs, strengths, weaknesses and responsibilities of subordinates  
My boss often fails to provide subordinates with information and resources  
My boss is an ineffective coordinator  
My boss often fails to monitor the actions of others  
My boss often says one thing while doing exactly the opposite  
Sometimes I think my boss is frightened by new technology  
If my boss makes a mistake, someone else usually has to fix the problem  
My boss actively demotivates his/her employees  
I often have to guess what my boss really expects of me  
My boss does NOT trust others to do tasks properly  
My boss is unable to focus very well on the most important issues  
My boss tends to act in ways that divide employees against one another  
My boss is very poor at listening to what others are saying  
My boss is unable to delegate properly  
My boss attempts to exert total control over everyone  
My boss is not a very good boss  
My boss often ignores the big picture  
My boss makes poor decisions under pressure or difficult conditions  
When negotiating with others, my boss is usually a total failure

My boss is very poor at solving problems and making decisions  
I have trouble understanding what my boss means or wants  
My boss is NOT very good at developing the skills of subordinates  
My boss has a difficult time dealing with change  
The skills of my boss do not match his/her job very well  
My boss lies a lot  
I have often seen my boss bully another employee  
My boss has often committed a serious breach of trust  
My boss places brutal pressure on subordinates  
My boss is a tyrant  
My boss does NOT know what subordinates are thinking  
My boss does NOT know what the goal of our unit is or should be  
My boss spends too much time promoting him/herself  
You can rarely predict how my boss is likely to behave  
My boss has personal favorites  
My boss does not care about things happening in other units  
My boss has a very poor reputation in our organization  
When action really needs to be taken, my boss is unable or unwilling to act  
Once my boss has made up his/her mind, there is no changing it  
My boss is very poor at dealing with personal or interpersonal issues  
The punishment my boss gives is often inappropriate for the offense  
My boss has difficulty mobilizing the efforts of others

## Appendix E

### Summary of Deleted Items

Deleted Item	Original Scale	Similar Item	Original Scale	Variable Name	Rationale for Deleted Item
My boss is arrogant	DLQ	Is arrogant (e.g., devalues the contributions of others)	Benchmarks	md1	The deleted item is very similar to another item in a more commonly utilized measure
My boss often gets emotional	DLQ	Is emotionally volatile and unpredictable	Benchmarks	md5	The similar items gets at more destructive behavior
My boss does not adapt well to new and changing circumstances	DLQ	My boss has a difficult time dealing with change	DLQ	dlq100	More specific than similar item on the same measure; similar item is worded in simpler language
My boss tends to show excessive favoritism	DLQ	Plays favorites among subordinates	Petty Tyranny	pt3	The similar item is worded in simpler and commonly used language
My boss has personal favorites	DLQ	Plays favorites among subordinates	Petty Tyranny	pt3	The similar item is worded in simpler and commonly used language
My boss does not systematically develop the skills of his or her subordinates	DLQ	My boss is not very good at developing the skills of subordinates	DLQ	dlq99	The similar item is more general
My boss is very poor at listening to what others are saying	DLQ	Listens to what employees have to say	Ethical Leadership	el1	The similar item is worded in simpler language
When negotiating with others, my boss is usually a total failure	DLQ	My boss is a poor negotiator	DLQ	dlq26	The similar item is worded in simpler language
My boss lies a lot	DLQ	Would lie to me	PLIS	plis1	PLIS has fewer items; "Would" language allows for not necessarily observing leader behaviors
Lies to me	Abusive Supervision	Would lie to me	PLIS	plis1	Same language; PLIS has fewer items; "Would" language allows for not necessarily observing leader behaviors
My leader encourages others to voice opposing points of view	Authentic Leadership	Encourages people to speak up when they disagree with a decision	Petty Tyranny	pt40	The similar item is worded in simpler language
My manager does what he or she promises to do	Servant Leadership	Breaks promises he or she makes	Abusive Supervision	ab8	Very similar to another item in a more commonly utilized measure
Fulfills his or her promises	Petty Tyranny	Breaks promises he or she makes	Abusive Supervision	ab8	Very similar to another item in a more commonly utilized measure

Claims credit for good work done by others	Petty Tyranny	Would try to take credit for other people's ideas	PLIS	plis7	Same language; PLIS has fewer items; "Would" language allows for not necessarily observing leader behaviors
My boss takes credit for the work that others have done	DLQ	Would try to take credit for other people's ideas	PLIS	plis7	PLIS has fewer items; "Would" language allows for not necessarily observing leader behaviors
Blames others for his/her mistakes	Petty Tyranny	Would allow someone else to be blamed for his/ her mistake	PLIS	plis2	Same language; PLIS has fewer items; "Would" language allows for not necessarily observing leader behaviors
Blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment	Abusive Supervision	Would allow someone else to be blamed for his her mistake	PLIS	plis2	More specific than similar item; PLIS has fewer items; "Would" language allows for not necessarily observing leader behaviors
My boss blames others for his/her own mistakes	DLQ	Would allow someone else to be blamed for his her mistake	PLIS	plis2	Very similar to another item in a more commonly utilized measure; "Would" language allows for not necessarily observing leader behaviors

---

## Appendix F

## Abusive Supervision

Please indicate the extent to which your manager engages in each behavior:

I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me 1	He/she very seldom uses this behavior with me 2	He/she very occasionally uses this behavior with me 3	He/she uses this behavior moderately often with me 4	He/she uses this behavior very often with me 5
---	---	---	--	--

## Ridicules Me

Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid

Gives me the silent treatment

Puts me down in front of others

Invades my privacy

Reminds me of my past mistakes and failures

Doesn't give me credits for jobs requiring a lot of effort

Blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment

Breaks promises he/she makes

Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason

Makes negative comments about me to others

Is rude to me

Does not allow me to interact with my coworkers

Tells me I'm incompetent

Lies to me

## Appendix G

## Petty Tyranny

Please indicate to what extent you believe your manager displays the following behaviors and characteristics:

Not at all    Once in a while    Sometimes    Fairly often    Frequently, if not always

1

2

3

4

5

Uses authority for personal gain

Administers organizational policies unfairly

Plays favorites among subordinates

Makes subordinates feel that he/she is doing the subordinate a favor when the supervisor is only doing his or her job

Guards his or her turf against others outside the department

Makes boasts, brags, or shows off

Makes subordinates follow rules that he/she breaks him or herself

Makes up arbitrary rules

Suggests that subordinates should feel grateful to him or her

Fulfills his or her promises\*

Delegates work that he/she does not want to do

Pulls rank on subordinates

Treats subordinates in a condescending or patronizing manner

Relies on authority or position to get work done

Claims credit for good work done by others

Blames others for his her mistakes

Yells at subordinates

Criticizes subordinates in front of others

Belittles or embarrasses subordinates

Loses his or her temper

Exaggerates the size of subordinate's errors and weaknesses

He or she "rides" subordinates who make mistakes

Criticizes subordinates about personal matters

Is unfair to subordinates as a group

Is not friendly and approachable

Looks out for the personal welfare of group members\*

Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group\*

Makes every effort to get to know subordinates\*  
Makes those under him or her feel at ease when talking to him or her\*  
Goes out of his or her way to help a subordinate\*  
Treats subordinates as individuals\*  
Treats all group members as his or her equals\*  
Forces acceptance of his/her point of view  
Demands to get his/her way  
Will not take no for an answer  
Insists on one solution  
Imposes his or her solution  
Encourages subordinates to participate in important decisions\*  
Trains subordinates to take on more authority\*  
Encourages initiative in group members\*  
Encourages people to speak up when they disagree with a decision\*  
Trusts members to exercise good judgment\*  
Expresses appreciation when a subordinate does a good job\*  
My supervisor is often displeased with my work for no apparent reason  
I frequently am reprimanded by my supervisor without my knowing why  
My supervisor is often critical of my work even when I perform well  
My supervisor frequently holds me accountable for things I have no control over

\*Item reverse scored

## Appendix H

## Ethical Leadership

Please indicate to what extent you believe your manager displays the following behaviors and characteristics:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Listens to what employees have to say

Disciplines employees who violate ethical standards

Conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner

Has the best interests of the employee in mind

Makes fair and balanced decisions

Can be trusted

Discusses business ethics or values with employees

Sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics

Defines success not just by results but also the ways that they are obtained

When making decisions, asks "what is the right thing to do?"

## Appendix I

## Authentic Leadership

Please indicate to what extent you believe your manager displays the following behaviors and characteristics:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

My manager clearly states what he/she means

My manager shows consistency between his/her beliefs and actions

My manager asks for ideas that challenge his/her core beliefs

My manager describes accurately the way that others view his/her abilities

My manager uses his/her core beliefs to make decisions

My manager carefully listens to alternative perspectives before reaching a conclusion

My manager shows that he/she understands his/her strengths and weaknesses

My manager openly shares information with others

My manager resists pressures on him/her to do things contrary to his/her beliefs

My manager objectively analyzes relevant data before making a decision

My manager is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others

My manager expresses his/her ideas and thoughts clearly to others

My manager is guided in his/her actions by internal moral standards

My manager encourages others to voice opposing points of view

## Appendix J

## Servant Leadership

Please indicate to what extent you believe your manager displays the following behaviors and characteristics:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

My manager spends the time to form quality relationships with employees

My manager creates a sense of community among department employees

My manager's decisions are influenced by employees' input

My manager tries to reach consensus among employees on important decisions

My manager is sensitive to department employees' responsibilities outside the workplace

My manager makes the personal development of employees a priority

My manager holds employees to high ethical standards

My manager does what he/she promises to do

My manager balances concern for day-to-day details with projections for the future

My manager displays wide-ranging knowledge and interests in finding solutions to work problems

My manager makes me feel like I work with him/her, not for him/her

My manager works hard at finding ways to help others be the best they can be

My manager encourages department employees to be involved in community service and volunteer activities outside of work

My manager emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community

## Appendix K

## Leadership Effectiveness and Team Performance

Please provide a rating of your manager's **overall effectiveness** as a leader on a 10-point scale where 5 is adequate and 10 is outstanding.

Please rate the **productivity** of the team that your manager is directly responsible for:

Quantity of output

Below Expectations					Exceeds Expectations
1	2	3	4	5	

Quality of output

Unacceptably Low					Extraordinarily High
1	2	3	4	5	

Overall productivity

Does not get much done					Gets a great deal done
1	2	3	4	5	

Please rate the **vitality** of the team that your manager is directly responsible for:

Morale on the team is

Low					Exceptionally High
1	2	3	4	5	

In terms of engagement with the work, the team is

Not fully committed					Highly committed
1	2	3	4	5	

In terms of cohesiveness, the team

Does not work well together					Works very well together
1	2	3	4	5	

## Appendix L

## Turnover Intentions

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I am actively looking for a job outside of my current organization

As soon as I find a better job, I will leave my current organization

I am seriously thinking about quitting my job

I often think about quitting my job at my current organization

I think I will be working at my current organization 5 years from now\*

\*Item reverse scored

## Appendix M

## Counterproductive Work Behavior

Please indicate how often you have engaged in the following behaviors:

Never	Once or twice a year	Several times a year	Once or twice a month	Weekly
1	2	3	4	5

Taken property from work without permission

Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working

Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for money than you spent on business expenses

Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace

Come in late to work without permission

Littered your work environment

Neglected to follow your boss' instructions

Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked

Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person

Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job

Put little effort into your work

Dragged out work in order to get overtime

## Appendix N

## Well-Being

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following items:

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Maintaining close relationships has been difficult for me\*

People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others

I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others\*

I like most parts of my personality

When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out so far

In many ways I feel disappointed about achievements in my life\*

I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions\*

I have confidence in my own opinions, even if they are different from the way most other people think

I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important

For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth

I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how I think about myself and the world

I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago\*

The demands of everyday life get me down\*

In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live

I am good at managing the responsibilities of daily life

Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them

I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future\*

I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life\*

\*Item reverse scored

## Appendix O

## Leadership Constructs and Associated Items as Indicated by Subject Matter Experts

Item	Item Text	Construct	Percent
ab1	Ridicules me	Abusive Supervision	88.89%
ab10	Makes negative comments about me to others	Abusive Supervision	77.78%
ab11	Is rude to me	Abusive Supervision	88.89%
ab13	Tells me I'm incompetent	Abusive Supervision	77.78%
ab2	Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid	Abusive Supervision	100%
ab4	Puts me down in front of others	Abusive Supervision	100%
ab9	Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason	Abusive Supervision	88.89%
dlq104	Places brutal pressure on subordinates	Abusive Supervision	77.78%
dlq60	Could best be described as mean	Abusive Supervision	88.89%
md3	<i>Managerial Derailment Item*</i>	Abusive Supervision	88.89%
md4	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Abusive Supervision	88.89%
pt12	Treats subordinates in a condescending or patronizing manner	Abusive Supervision	77.78%
pt14	Yells at subordinates	Abusive Supervision	100%
pt15	Criticizes subordinates in front of others	Abusive Supervision	77.78%
pt16	Belittles or embarrasses subordinates	Abusive Supervision	88.89%
pt42	I am frequently reprimanded by my supervisor without knowing why	Abusive Supervision	77.78%
dlq102	I have often seen my boss bully another employee	Abusive Supervision; Petty Tyranny	100%; 88.89%
dlq115	The punishment my boss gives is often inappropriate for the offense	Abusive Supervision; Petty Tyranny	88.89%; 77.78%
plis6	Would make trouble for someone who got on his/her bad side	Abusive Supervision; Petty Tyranny	77.78% **
pt39	Encourages initiative in group members	Authentic Leadership	88.89%
au8	Openly shares information with others	Authentic Leadership	77.78%
sl2	Creates a sense of community among department employees	Authentic Leadership	77.78%
sl4	Tries to reach consensus among employees on important decisions	Authentic Leadership	77.78%
pt19	Expresses appreciation when a subordinate does a good job	Authentic; Servant	88.89% **
pt24	Is not friendly and approachable	Authentic; Servant	77.78%; 100%
pt25	Looks out for the personal welfare of group members	Authentic; Servant	77.78%; 88.89%
pt28	Makes those under him/her feel at ease when talking to him/her	Authentic; Servant	77.78%; 88.89%

pt37	Encourages subordinates to participate in important decisions	Authentic; Servant	77.78%; 88.89%
pt40***	Encourages people to speak up when they disagree with a decision	Authentic; Servant	88.89%; 77.78%
sl10	Makes me feel like I work with him/her, not for him/her	Authentic; Servant	77.78%; 88.89%
sl11	Works hard at finding ways to help others to be the best they can be	Authentic; Servant	88.89%; 77.78%
dlq87	Actively demotivates his/her employees	Destructive Leadership	88.89%
dlq91	Tends to act in ways that divide employees against one another	Destructive Leadership	88.89%
plis4	Is vindictive	Destructive Leadership	77.78%
plis8	Would do things that violate organizational policy and then expect others to cover for him/her	Destructive Leadership	88.89%
au13	Is guided in his/her actions by internal moral standards	Ethical Leadership	88.89%
e110	When making decisions, asks "what is the right thing to do?"	Ethical; Authentic	100%; 77.78%
e17	Discusses business ethics or values with employees	Ethical; Authentic	100%; 77.78%
pt30	Treats subordinates as individuals	Ethical; Servant	77.78% **
dlq100	Has a difficult time dealing with change	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq107	Does not know what the goal of our unit is or should be	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq116	Has difficulty mobilizing the efforts of others	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
dlq16	Is not very good at inspiring others	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
dlq19	Is unable to prioritize very well	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq20	Is not a very good coalition builder	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq24	Has poor strategic planning skills	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq27	Is an ineffective problem solver	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
dlq29	Is ineffective at educating and developing subordinates	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq30	Lacks the skills and/or experience needed to function effectively	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq40	Is afraid to take action when action is required	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq46	Does not understand the big picture well	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq52	In an ambiguous situation, my boss has great difficulty making a decision	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq55	Is an ineffective communicator	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
dlq56	Is unable to effectively manage change	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
dlq77	Has no idea what it takes to motivate subordinates	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
dlq81	Is very poor at building team spirit	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%

dlq88	I often have to guess what my boss really expects of me	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq92	Is unable to delegate properly	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq94	Is not a very good boss	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
dlq95	Often ignores the big picture	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq97	Is very poor at solving problems and making decisions	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
dlq98	I have trouble understanding what my boss means or wants	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
md11	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	100.00%
md12	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
md13	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
md14	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
md15	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
md20	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
md21	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
md22	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
md23	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	88.89%
md27	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
md30	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	77.78%
md9	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Ineffective Leadership	100.00%
dlq112	When action really needs to be taken, my boss is unable or unwilling to act	Laissez-Faire Leadership	77.78%
dlq50	Often fails to monitor the actions of others	Laissez-Faire Leadership	77.78%
lf4	<i>Laissez-Faire Leadership item****</i>	Laissez-Faire Leadership	77.78%
lf2	<i>Laissez-Faire Leadership item</i>	Laissez-Faire Leadership	88.89%
lf3	<i>Laissez-Faire Leadership item</i>	Laissez-Faire Leadership	77.78%
dlq1	Is compulsive	None	77.78%
dlq75	Seems not to enjoy new technology	None	88.89%
dlq103	Has often committed a serious breach of trust	Perceived Leader Integrity	77.78%
dlq31	Rarely acts with a high level of integrity	Perceived Leader Integrity	77.78%
e16	Can be trusted	Perceived Leader Integrity	88.89%
au9	Resists pressures on him/her to do things contrary to his/her beliefs	Perceived Leader Integrity; Ethical	77.78% **
e18	Sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics	Perceived Leader Integrity; Ethical	77.78%; 100%
e19	Defines success not just by results but also the ways that they are obtained	Perceived Leader Integrity; Ethical	77.78%; 100%
dlq105	Is a tyrant	Petty Tyranny	100%

dlq32	Anyone who challenges my boss is dealt with brutally	Petty Tyranny	100%
dlq33	Enjoys making people suffer	Petty Tyranny	88.89%
dlq93	Attempts to exert total control over everyone	Petty Tyranny	88.89%
md2	<i>Managerial Derailment Item</i>	Petty Tyranny	88.89%
pt1	Uses authority or position for personal gain	Petty Tyranny	77.78%
pt32	Forces acceptance of his/her point of view	Petty Tyranny	88.89%
pt33	Demands to get his/her way	Petty Tyranny	88.89%
pt34	Will not take “no” for an answer	Petty Tyranny	77.78%
pt36	Imposes his/her solution	Petty Tyranny	77.78%
el4	Has the best interests of employees in mind	Servant Leadership	88.89%
pt23	Is unfair to subordinates as a group	Servant Leadership	77.78%
pt26	Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group	Servant Leadership	100%
pt27	Makes every effort to get to know subordinates	Servant Leadership	88.89%
pt29	Goes out of his/her way to help a subordinate	Servant Leadership	100%
pt31	Treats all group members as his or her equals	Servant Leadership	77.78%
pt38	Trains subordinates to take on more authority	Servant Leadership	100%
sl12	Encourages department employees to be involved in community service and volunteer activities outside of work	Servant Leadership	77.78%
sl6	Makes the personal development of employees a priority	Servant Leadership	88.89%

*Notes.* \*Interested readers can contact Center for Creative Leadership for information on propriety Benchmarks. \*\*Percentages were equivalent for both constructs. \*\*\*Similar item deleted from Authentic Leadership measure. \*\*\*\*Interested readers can contact Mindgarden, Inc. for more information on the proprietary MLQ

## Appendix P

## Factor Loadings and Commuality Estimates for Four-Factor Solution

Item	Factor				Communalities
	1	2	3	4	
pt16 –Belittles or embarrasses subordinates	<b>.88</b>	-.07	-.03	.06	.69
ab4 –Puts me down in front of others	<b>.87</b>	-.17	.09	-.04	.60
ab1 –Ridicules me	<b>.81</b>	-.08	.13	-.04	.53
pt15 –Criticizes subordinates in front of others	<b>.81</b>	-.07	-.04	-.01	.65
pt14 –Yells at subordinates	<b>.81</b>	-.10	.08	.05	.49
ab11 –Is rude to me	<b>.80</b>	-.06	-.06	.01	.65
ab9 –Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason	<b>.79</b>	-.11	.02	-.06	.58
dlq102 –I have often seen my boss bully another employee	<b>.78</b>	.07	-.08	.04	.72
pt12 –Treats subordinates in a condescending or patronizing manner	<b>.78</b>	.01	-.13	.08	.68
ab6 –Reminds me of my past mistakes and failures	<b>.76</b>	-.02	.07	.01	.50
pt21 –He or she “rides” subordinates who make mistakes	<b>.74</b>	.13	-.05	.12	.61
dlq60 –Could best be described as mean	<b>.74</b>	.09	-.17	.10	.71
pt22 –Criticizes subordinates about personal matters	<b>.74</b>	-.02	.06	-.08	.56
plis4 –Is vindictive	<b>.73</b>	-.11	-.10	-.11	.64
dlq105 –Is a tyrant	<b>.73</b>	.11	-.09	.01	.71
ab10 –Makes negative comments about me to others	<b>.72</b>	-.14	.00	-.11	.52
pt17 –Loses his/her temper	<b>.72</b>	-.08	.04	-.01	.44
md3 –	<b>.71</b>	.15	-.08	-.03	.75
md7 –	<b>.71</b>	.21	-.10	.07	.74
pt9 –Suggests that subordinates should feel grateful to him/her	<b>.71</b>	-.09	-.02	-.08	.53
dlq33 –Enjoys making people suffer	<b>.70</b>	.09	-.10	-.02	.68
ab5 –Invades my privacy	<b>.70</b>	-.12	.08	-.13	.46
ab2 –Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid	<b>.70</b>	-.09	.20	-.10	.39
dlq32 –Anyone who challenges my boss is dealt with brutally	<b>.70</b>	.19	-.06	.00	.72
dlq104 –Places brutal pressure on subordinates	<b>.69</b>	.21	-.04	.04	.67
pt1 –Uses authority or position for personal gain	<b>.69</b>	-.10	-.06	-.15	.59
md5 –	<b>.67</b>	.14	-.07	-.08	.71
pt6 –Makes boasts, brags, or “shows off”	<b>.66</b>	-.09	-.07	-.07	.50
pt20 –Exaggerates the size of subordinate’s errors and weaknesses	<b>.66</b>	.12	-.12	.03	.61
md4 –	<b>.65</b>	.16	-.19	.01	.74

pt42 –I am frequently reprimanded by my supervisor without knowing why	<b>.65</b>	.18	.04	-.08	.62
plis6 –Would make trouble for someone who got on his/her bad side	<b>.65</b>	.03	-.18	-.01	.63
pt11 –“Pulls rank” on subordinates	<b>.65</b>	.09	-.09	.04	.53
md2 –	<b>.64</b>	.25	-.17	.12	.71
dlq93 –Attempts to exert control over everyone	<b>.63</b>	.28	-.17	.10	.75
dlq13 –Seems to have huge mood swings	<b>.63</b>	.22	-.03	-.10	.72
pt43 –Is often critical of my work even when I perform well	<b>.63</b>	.19	-.04	-.07	.66
dlq22 –Is one of the very worst	<b>.63</b>	.04	-.13	-.18	.73
ab13 –Tells me I’m incompetent	<b>.62</b>	-.08	.14	-.07	.32
dlq44 –Wants to dominate/control everything	<b>.62</b>	.30	-.17	.14	.71
pt33 –Demands to get his/her way	<b>.62</b>	.20	-.19	.09	.66
plis5 –Would deliberately distort what other people say	<b>.62</b>	-.14	-.12	-.25	.63
pt41 –Is often displeased with my work for no apparent reason	<b>.61</b>	.21	.01	-.12	.66
pt23 –Is unfair to subordinates as a group	<b>.59</b>	.07	-.16	-.11	.65
pt32 –Forces acceptance of his/her points of view	<b>.59</b>	.13	-.20	.06	.58
dlq58 –Often acts in an unethical manner	<b>.59</b>	-.02	-.15	-.23	.68
pt7 –Make subordinates follow rules that he/she breaks him or herself	<b>.59</b>	-.07	-.08	-.23	.58
dlq103 –Has often committed a serious breach of trust	<b>.59</b>	.04	-.12	-.20	.67
md1 –	<b>.59</b>	.24	-.21	.01	.76
pt4 –Makes subordinates feels that he/she is doing the subordinate a favor when the supervisor is only doing his/her job	<b>.58</b>	.00	-.13	-.17	.60
dlq65 –Treats many employees unfairly	<b>.57</b>	.10	-.25	-.12	.76
dlq9 –Lacks self-control	<b>.57</b>	.10	-.03	-.28	.71
dlq87 –Actively demotivates his/her employees	<b>.57</b>	.18	-.17	-.10	.73
dlq45 –Is a terrible boss to work for	<b>.57</b>	.11	-.24	-.12	.77
plis7 –Would try to take credit for other people’s ideas	<b>.56</b>	-.03	-.14	-.18	.58
dlq115 –The punishment my boss gives is often inappropriate for the offense	<b>.56</b>	.23	-.06	-.10	.64
dlq18 –Rarely shows a high level of respect for others	<b>.56</b>	.19	-.18	-.12	.76
pt34 –Will not take “no” for an answer	<b>.54</b>	.11	-.08	.12	.34
dlq69 –Is pig headed (i.e., extremely stubborn)	<b>.54</b>	.17	-.26	.01	.65
dlq6 –Is an inconsiderate person	<b>.53</b>	.17	-.23	-.11	.75
dlq5 –When my boss wants something, he/she obsesses about it	<b>.53</b>	.21	.01	-.10	.52
pt35 –Insists on one solution	<b>.53</b>	.18	-.07	.02	.44
pt44 –Frequently holds me accountable for things I have no control over	<b>.52</b>	.21	-.07	-.14	.64

md8 –	<b>.52</b>	.29	-.19	-.03	.75
dlq109 –You can rarely predict how my boss is likely to behave	<b>.52</b>	.23	-.10	-.09	.62
pt36 –Imposes his/her solution	<b>.52</b>	.11	-.18	.13	.40
pt5 –Guards his/her turf against others outside the department	<b>.52</b>	-.01	.06	-.02	.25
plis8 –Would do things that violate organizational policy and then expect others to cover for him/her	<b>.52</b>	-.11	-.06	-.32	.54
plis3 –Would falsify records	<b>.52</b>	-.15	-.09	-.26	.46
dlq108 –Spends too much time promoting him/herself	<b>.51</b>	.19	-.09	-.22	.70
dlq59 –Holds grudges	<b>.51</b>	.12	-.25	-.08	.65
dlq83 –Is a micro-manager	<b>.51</b>	.31	-.04	.14	.44
pt13 –Relies on authority or position to get work done	<b>.51</b>	.02	-.07	-.02	.33
pt8 –Makes up arbitrary rules	<b>.50</b>	-.04	-.11	-.25	.52
dlq1 –Is compulsive	<b>.50</b>	.20	.02	-.21	.59
dlq8 –Is self-centered	<b>.50</b>	.18	-.26	-.10	.73
dlq7 –Seems extremely paranoid about many things	<b>.50</b>	.15	.00	-.24	.58
dlq37 –You never know from day to day how my boss will behave	<b>.50</b>	.22	-.16	-.11	.66
ab8 –Breaks promises he/she makes	<b>.49</b>	-.12	-.15	-.23	.48
md18 –	<b>.49</b>	.15	-.07	-.21	.59
plis1 –Would lie to me	<b>.48</b>	-.12	-.30	-.21	.60
ab12 –Does not allow me to interact with my coworkers	<b>.48</b>	-.02	.08	-.10	.24
plis2 –Would allow someone else to be blamed for his/her mistake	<b>.48</b>	-.06	-.24	-.24	.62
ab7 –Doesn't give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort	<b>.48</b>	.02	-.20	-.13	.51
dlq31 –Rarely acts with a high level of integrity	<b>.47</b>	.09	-.15	-.20	.58
dlq53 –Sees every negotiation issues as a win/lose conflict	<b>.47</b>	.12	-.17	-.03	.45
pt2 –Administers organizational policies unfairly	<b>.47</b>	-.02	-.17	-.22	.52
dlq113 –Once my boss has made up his/her mind, there is no changing it	<b>.46</b>	.32	-.18	.08	.56
dlq89 –Does not trust others to do tasks properly	<b>.46</b>	.29	-.17	-.05	.65
ab3 –Gives me the silent treatment	<b>.46</b>	.01	-.07	-.12	.35
pt24 –Is not friendly and approachable	<b>.45</b>	.14	<b>-.42</b>	.11	.64
dlq41 –Is invulnerable to reason	<b>.45</b>	.26	-.11	-.13	.61
dlq21 –My boss tends to alienate certain groups	<b>.45</b>	.18	-.21	-.16	.68
pt3 –“Plays favorites” among subordinates	<b>.45</b>	.01	-.25	-.12	.51
dlq91 –Tends to act in ways that divide employees against one another	<b>.44</b>	.19	-.21	-.20	.72
dlq111 –Has a very poor reputation in our organization	<b>.44</b>	.16	-.13	-.26	.67
dlq84 –Is autocratic	<b>.43</b>	.32	-.09	-.05	.56

dlq64 –Will act one way and then later acts in the exact opposite manner	<b>.41</b>	.18	-.23	-.16	.64
dlq54 –Often makes knee jerk reactions	<b>.41</b>	.17	-.08	-.25	.57
dlq2 –Lacks emotional intelligence	<b>.41</b>	.19	-.20	-.23	.70
dlq3 –Is indiscrete	<b>.41</b>	.16	-.07	-.25	.55
dlq51 –Often says one thing while doing exactly the opposite	<b>.40</b>	.19	-.22	-.23	.71
dlq23 –I would prefer not to work for my boss compared to other possible bosses	<b>.40</b>	.20	-.31	-.13	.71
dlq94 –Is not a very good boss	.39	.16	-.32	-.22	.77
dlq79 –Does not show trust in subordinates by assigning them important tasks	.39	.18	-.20	-.18	.59
dlq63 –Spends more time politicking than working	.38	.04	-.14	-.33	.56
dlq43 –Does not share power with the people with whom he/she works	.37	.23	-.28	-.07	.59
md16 –	.34	.34	-.04	-.22	.58
dlq82 –Does not seek out or pay attention to the opinions and wishes of subordinates	.34	.26	-.33	-.16	.76
pt10 –Delegates work that he/she does not want to do	.33	-.01	-.14	-.25	.37
dlq114 –Is very poor at dealing with personal or interpersonal issues	.33	.16	-.26	-.30	.70
dlq66 –Demonstrates no concern for anyone outside his/her own unit	.33	.16	-.19	-.25	.56
pt18 –Trusts members to exercise good judgment	.32	.16	-.29	.04	.38
md6 –	.32	.29	-.31	-.05	.61
md33 –	-.08	<b>.77</b>	-.02	.02	.53
md35 –	-.12	<b>.77</b>	.01	-.07	.55
md29 –	-.07	<b>.74</b>	.08	-.01	.48
md34 –	-.09	<b>.73</b>	-.01	-.05	.51
md22 –	-.08	<b>.73</b>	-.07	.04	.49
md25 –	-.03	<b>.72</b>	.01	-.06	.54
md32 –	-.13	<b>.71</b>	.10	-.05	.42
md21 –	.02	<b>.70</b>	-.08	.00	.56
md30 –	-.04	<b>.69</b>	-.06	-.10	.56
md28 –	-.08	<b>.68</b>	.05	-.08	.44
md24 –	.00	<b>.67</b>	.03	-.10	.51
md31 –	.13	<b>.67</b>	.01	.06	.50
md20 –	.02	<b>.63</b>	-.11	.02	.46
md27 –	.03	<b>.62</b>	.10	-.17	.48
md26 –	.04	<b>.62</b>	.04	-.07	.44
md23 –	-.07	<b>.61</b>	-.09	-.11	.47
md36 –	.03	<b>.61</b>	-.01	-.13	.49

md19 –	.10	<b>.59</b>	.03	-.04	.43
md10 –	.09	.36	.03	-.22	.30
sl6 –Makes the personal development of employees a priority	.00	-.03	<b>.74</b>	.08	.63
sl11 –Works hard at finding ways to help others be the best they can be	-.02	-.03	<b>.72</b>	.12	.65
sl2 –Creates a sense of community among department employees	-.11	-.04	<b>.71</b>	.02	.65
sl1 –Spends the time to form quality relationships with employees	-.14	-.07	<b>.69</b>	-.01	.65
sl13 –Emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community	-.03	.09	<b>.66</b>	.02	.42
sl4 –Tries to reach consensus among employees on important decisions	-.14	-.06	<b>.65</b>	-.09	.52
sl12 –Encourages department employees to be involved in community service and volunteer activities outside of work	-.01	.07	<b>.64</b>	.00	.38
el7 –Discusses business ethics or values with employees	.03	-.05	<b>.62</b>	.04	.41
au4 –Describes accurately the way that others view his/her abilities	-.03	.00	<b>.60</b>	.13	.47
au7 –Shows that he/she understands his/her strengths and weaknesses	-.09	.03	<b>.60</b>	.17	.54
pt29 –Goes out of his/her way to help a subordinate	.11	.15	<b>-.60</b>	-.06	.62
pt37 –Encourages subordinates to participate in important decisions	.08	.17	<b>-.58</b>	.00	.52
sl10 –Makes me feel like I work with him/her, not for him/her	-.25	-.09	<b>.58</b>	-.04	.60
pt38 –Trains subordinates to take on more authority	-.06	.10	<b>-.57</b>	-.05	.37
el4 –Has the best interests of employees in mind	-.24	-.09	<b>.57</b>	.08	.69
sl3 –His/her decisions are influenced by employees’ input	-.23	-.08	<b>.57</b>	-.20	.45
sl5 –Is sensitive to department employees’ responsibilities outside the workplace	-.18	-.05	<b>.56</b>	-.07	.45
el8 –Sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics	-.18	.03	<b>.55</b>	.17	.58
au6 –Carefully listens to alternative perspectives before reaching a conclusion	-.18	-.12	<b>.55</b>	.06	.59
pt40 –Encourages people to speak up when they disagree with a decision	.17	.14	<b>-.55</b>	.06	.49
pt25 –Looks out for the personal welfare of group members	.16	.10	<b>-.55</b>	-.10	.59
el1 –Listens to what employees have to say	-.27	-.10	<b>.54</b>	.08	.69
el6 –Can be trusted	-.30	-.03	<b>.54</b>	.09	.68
el5 –Makes fair and balanced decisions	-.24	-.11	<b>.54</b>	.12	.70
au8 –Openly shares information with others	-.12	-.06	<b>.53</b>	.01	.41
au3 –Asks for ideas that challenge his/her core beliefs	-.05	.03	<b>.53</b>	-.04	.28
pt27 –Makes every effort to get to know subordinates	.18	.19	<b>-.53</b>	.04	.55

pt26 –Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group	.00	.10	<b>-.52</b>	.00	.33
el10 –When making decisions, asks “what is the right thing to do?”	-.17	.02	<b>.52</b>	.01	.40
sl9 –Displays wide-ranging knowledge and interests in finding solutions to work problems	.03	-.01	<b>.52</b>	.29	.47
pt31 –Treats all group members as his/her equals	.30	.19	<b>-.51</b>	.06	.63
au12 –Expresses his/her ideas and thoughts clearly to others	-.05	-.03	<b>.51</b>	.24	.49
el9 –Defines success not just by results but also the ways that they are obtained	.00	.01	<b>.50</b>	.08	.28
au10 –Objectively analyzes relevant data before making a decision	-.03	-.03	<b>.49</b>	.19	.41
au5 –Uses his/her core beliefs to make decisions	.07	.00	<b>.49</b>	.05	.23
sl8 –Balances concern for day-to-day details with projections for the future	-.03	.01	<b>.49</b>	.25	.44
sl7 –Holds employees to high ethical standards	-.08	.04	<b>.47</b>	.17	.37
pt39 –Encourages initiative in group members	.14	.13	<b>-.47</b>	-.11	.50
pt28 –Makes those under him/her feel at ease when talking to him/her	.37	.16	<b>-.45</b>	.09	.60
au1 –Clearly states what he/she means	-.06	-.07	<b>.44</b>	.30	.52
au2 –Shows consistency between his/her beliefs and actions	-.13	-.02	<b>.43</b>	.19	.43
el3 –Conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner	-.26	.01	<b>.43</b>	.00	.38
pt30 –Treats subordinates as individuals	.31	.10	<b>-.42</b>	-.03	.54
el2 –Disciplines employees who violate ethical standards	.18	.08	<b>.42</b>	.19	.17
pt19 –Expresses appreciation when a subordinate does a good job	.20	.18	<b>-.41</b>	-.01	.45
au11 –Is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others	.08	-.08	<b>.41</b>	.20	.28
au13 –Is guided in his/her actions by internal moral standards	-.03	-.02	.39	-.04	.16
dlq77 –Has no idea what it takes to motivate subordinates	.17	.15	-.37	-.36	.71
dlq55 –Is an effective communicator	-.08	-.07	.37	.29	.44
dlq81 –Is very poor at building team spirit	.24	.22	-.35	-.29	.76
au9 –Resists pressures on him/her to do things contrary to his/her beliefs	.14	.12	.35	-.09	.08
dlq42 –Rarely seeks opinions from a wide variety of people	.24	.25	-.33	-.15	.60
md11 –	.24	.25	-.33	-.26	.74
md15 –	.27	.24	-.31	-.27	.75
dlq40 –Is afraid to take action when action is required	-.01	.13	-.05	<b>-.69</b>	.61
dlq97 –Is very poor at solving problems and making decisions	.20	.13	-.08	<b>-.62</b>	.78
dlq52 –In an ambiguous situation, my boss has great difficulty making a decision	.01	.08	-.13	<b>-.62</b>	.55

dlq30 –Lacks the skills and/or experience needed to function job effectively	.19	.12	-.10	<b>-.60</b>	.73
dlq61 –Does not have a clue what is going on in our business unit	.09	.04	-.20	<b>-.59</b>	.62
dlq24 –Has poor strategic planning skills	.17	.19	-.09	<b>-.59</b>	.76
dlq19 –Is unable to prioritize very well	.16	.18	-.06	<b>-.59</b>	.70
dlq112 –When action really needs to be taken, my boss is unable or unwilling to act	.17	.12	-.08	<b>-.58</b>	.66
dlq107 –Does not know what the goal of our unit is or should be	.16	.13	-.08	<b>-.57</b>	.64
lf3 –	.06	-.01	-.06	<b>-.56</b>	.40
dlq68 –Is unable to take a stand and stick to it	.08	.06	-.16	<b>-.56</b>	.54
dlq62 –Is poor at developing a vision for our business unit	.07	.08	-.28	<b>-.56</b>	.68
dlq101 –The skills of my boss do not match his/her job very well	.12	.17	-.14	<b>-.55</b>	.67
dlq95 –Often ignores the big picture	.16	.16	-.16	<b>-.55</b>	.72
dlq57 –Is incompetent	.22	.05	-.11	<b>-.55</b>	.63
dlq90 –Is unable to focus very well on the most important issues	.18	.18	-.11	<b>-.55</b>	.73
dlq10 –Is not very smart	.22	.13	-.01	<b>-.55</b>	.61
dlq4 –Lacks drive and energy	.19	.16	.00	<b>-.54</b>	.59
dlq27 –Is an ineffective problem solver	.21	.16	-.13	<b>-.53</b>	.72
dlq56 –Is unable to effectively manage change	.18	.13	-.17	<b>-.52</b>	.69
dlq28 –Is very poor at getting to the point quickly and clearly	.20	.16	-.02	<b>-.52</b>	.58
dlq34 –Has his/her head in the sand	.15	.17	-.19	<b>-.52</b>	.71
dlq26 –Is a poor negotiator	.20	.20	-.08	<b>-.52</b>	.69
dlq50 –Often fails to monitor the actions of others	.01	.18	-.17	<b>-.52</b>	.54
dlq74 –Is very ineffective in persuading others	.05	.11	-.13	<b>-.51</b>	.47
dlq46 –Does not understand the big picture well	.13	.21	-.17	<b>-.51</b>	.70
dlq73 –Does not provide an appropriate level of supervision and oversight	.15	.09	-.21	<b>-.51</b>	.62
dlq116 –Has difficulty mobilizing the efforts of others	.14	.20	-.16	<b>-.51</b>	.68
dlq96 –Makes poor decisions under pressure or difficult conditions	.24	.19	-.10	<b>-.50</b>	.73
dlq12 –Is lazy	.29	.07	-.03	<b>-.50</b>	.59
dlq25 –Deals very ineffectively with complex situations	.23	.19	-.11	<b>-.49</b>	.72
dlq92 –Is unable to delegate properly	.15	.23	-.17	<b>-.49</b>	.71
lf1 –	.18	-.01	-.10	<b>-.48</b>	.42
dlq38 –Is ignorant of things that are not part of the immediate environment	.18	.19	-.16	<b>-.48</b>	.68
dlq100 –Has a difficult time dealing with change	.19	.23	-.08	<b>-.47</b>	.64
dlq35 –Can only talk about issues that are very short-term	.15	.25	-.10	<b>-.46</b>	.61

dlq11 –Is often careless when dealing with situations	.32	.19	-.10	<b>-.44</b>	.74
dlq78 –Rarely tells subordinates what he/she wants them to do	.03	.10	-.08	<b>-.43</b>	.31
lf2 –	.22	-.02	-.09	<b>-.43</b>	.39
dlq76 –If my boss screws something up, it stays screwed up forever	.32	.10	-.05	<b>-.43</b>	.57
dlq80 –Does not pay enough attention to what really matters	.18	.13	-.33	<b>-.42</b>	.72
dlq85 –Sometimes I think my boss is frightened by new technology	.14	.24	.12	<b>-.42</b>	.37
dlq49 –Is an ineffective coordinator	.15	.19	-.16	<b>-.41</b>	.55
dlq29 –Is ineffective at educating and developing subordinates	.23	.18	-.26	<b>-.41</b>	.76
dlq86 –If my boss makes a mistake, someone else usually has to fix the problem	.27	.19	-.11	<b>-.40</b>	.63
dlq67 –Very few people see my boss as a credible manager	.27	.10	-.23	<b>-.40</b>	.67
dlq14 –Avoids having to use new technology	.19	.22	.10	<b>-.40</b>	.39
dlq20 –Is not a very good coalition builder	.23	.18	-.27	-.38	.73
dlq39 –Has lost credibility with stakeholders	.26	.19	-.12	-.38	.60
dlq75 –Seems not to enjoy new technology	.06	.18	.04	-.38	.26
dlq48 –Often fails to provide subordinates with information and resources	.19	.16	-.28	-.36	.62
md12 –	.19	.22	-.08	-.36	.48
md13 –	.24	.18	-.27	-.36	.70
dlq16 –Is not very good at inspiring others	.20	.22	-.31	-.35	.73
dlq47 –Does not understand the needs, strengths, weaknesses and responsibilities of subordinates	.18	.19	-.35	-.35	.72
dlq98 –I have trouble understanding what my boss means or wants	.25	.23	-.15	-.34	.60
dlq17 –I rarely know what my boss expects of me	.27	.22	-.11	-.34	.57
dlq99 –Is not very good at developing the skills of subordinates	.19	.20	-.30	-.34	.68
dlq15 –When my boss makes a mistake, he/she rarely corrects it	.32	.24	-.10	-.34	.66
lf4 –	.26	.04	-.17	-.34	.44
dlq110 –Does not care about things happening in other units	.18	.19	-.21	-.33	.53
md9 –	.22	.22	-.25	-.32	.63
dlq106 –Does not know what subordinates are thinking	.18	.19	-.29	-.31	.59
dlq88 –I often have to guess what my boss really expects of me	.27	.24	-.13	-.31	.58
md17 –	.29	.27	-.01	-.31	.52
md14 –	.23	.27	-.21	-.30	.65
dlq71 –I rarely know what my boss thinks of my work	.02	.19	-.23	-.29	.35

dlq70 –Manages interpersonal conflict poorly	<b>.27</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>-.27</b>	<b>-.29</b>	<b>.60</b>
dlq72 –Treats both good and bad performers the same way	<b>-.08</b>	<b>-.03</b>	<b>.05</b>	<b>-.27</b>	<b>.05</b>
dlq36 –Will tell superiors what they want to hear	<b>.16</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>-.23</b>	<b>-.25</b>	<b>.42</b>

---

*Notes.* Factor loadings  $\geq .40$  are bold.

## Appendix Q

## Summary of DLQ Items Removed from Values-Centric Constructs EFA

Item
dlq40 –Is afraid to take action when action is required
dlq24 –Has poor strategic planning skills
dlq97 –Is very poor at solving problems and making decisions
dlq19 –Is unable to prioritize very well
dlq30 –Lacks the skills and/or experience needed to function job effectively
dlq52 –In an ambiguous situation, my boss has great difficulty making a decision
dlq101 –The skills of my boss do not match his/her job very well
dlq95 –Often ignores the big picture
dlq90 –Is unable to focus very well on the most important issues
dlq26 –Is a poor negotiator
dlq107 –Does not know what the goal of our unit is or should be
dlq112 –When action really needs to be taken, my boss is unable or unwilling to act
dlq46 –Does not understand the big picture well
dlq116 –Has difficulty mobilizing the efforts of others
dlq10 –Is not very smart
dlq27 –Is an ineffective problem solver
dlq92 –Is unable to delegate properly
dlq61 –Does not have a clue what is going on in our business unit
dlq28 –Is very poor at getting to the point quickly and clearly
dlq34 –Has his/her head in the sand
dlq100 –Has a difficult time dealing with change
dlq25 –Deals very ineffectively with complex situations
dlq62 –Is poor at developing a vision for our business unit
dlq56 –Is unable to effectively manage change
dlq96 –Makes poor decisions under pressure or difficult conditions
dlq4 –Lacks drive and energy
dlq50 –Often fails to monitor the actions of others
dlq38 –Is ignorant of things that are not part of the immediate environment
dlq68 –Is unable to take a stand and stick to it
dlq57 –Is incompetent
dlq35 –Can only talk about issues that are very short-term
dlq74 –Is very ineffective in persuading others
dlq73 –Does not provide an appropriate level of supervision and oversight

dlq85 –Sometimes I think my boss is frightened by new technology  
dlq11 –Is often careless when dealing with situations  
dlq14 –Avoids having to use new technology  
dlq49 –Is an ineffective coordinator  
dlq29 –Is ineffective at educating and developing subordinates  
dlq12 –Is lazy  
dlq86 –If my boss makes a mistake, someone else usually has to fix the problem  
dlq20 –Is not a very good coalition builder  
dlq80 –Does not pay enough attention to what really matters  
dlq16 –Is not very good at inspiring others  
dlq75 –Seems not to enjoy new technology  
dlq39 –Has lost credibility with stakeholders  
dlq98 –I have trouble understanding what my boss means or wants  
dlq78 –Rarely tells subordinates what he/she wants them to do  
dlq47 –Does not understand the needs, strengths, weaknesses and responsibilities of subordinates  
dlq76 –If my boss screws something up, it stays screwed up forever  
dlq17 –I rarely know what my boss expects of me  
dlq15 –When my boss makes a mistake, he/she rarely corrects it  
dlq77 –Has no idea what it takes to motivate subordinates  
dlq67 –Very few people see my boss as a credible manager  
dlq99 –Is not very good at developing the skills of subordinates  
dlq48 –Often fails to provide subordinates with information and resources  
dlq110 –Does not care about things happening in other units  
dlq88 –I often have to guess what my boss really expects of me  
dlq106 –Does not know what subordinates are thinking  
dlq81 –Is very poor at building team spirit  
dlq71 –I rarely know what my boss thinks of my work  
dlq70 –Manages interpersonal conflict poorly  
dlq36 –Will tell superiors what they want to hear  
dlq55 –Is an effective communicator  
dlq72 –Treats both good and bad performers the same way  
dlq42 –Rarely seeks opinions from a wide variety of people

---

## Appendix R

## Summary of Factor Loadings and Communalities for Values-Centric EFA

Item	Factor		Communalities
	1	2	
pt16 –Belittles or embarrasses subordinates	<b>.85</b>	.10	.64
dlq102 –I have often seen my boss bully another employee	<b>.84</b>	.00	.70
dlq105 –Is a tyrant	<b>.82</b>	-.03	.71
ab4 –Puts me down in front of others	<b>.82</b>	.19	.53
dlq32 –Anyone who challenges my boss is dealt with brutally	<b>.82</b>	-.04	.71
pt41 –Is often displeased with my work for no apparent reason	<b>.82</b>	.01	.66
ab1 –Ridicules me	<b>.81</b>	.23	.50
pt42 –I am frequently reprimanded by my supervisor without knowing why	<b>.81</b>	.06	.61
dlq104 –Places brutal pressure on subordinates	<b>.81</b>	-.02	.68
pt15 –Criticizes subordinates in front of others	<b>.81</b>	.05	.61
pt22 –Criticizes subordinates about personal matters	<b>.80</b>	.13	.54
pt43 –Is often critical of my work even when I perform well	<b>.80</b>	-.02	.65
dlq33 –Enjoys making people suffer	<b>.79</b>	-.02	.65
ab11 –Is rude to me	<b>.79</b>	.02	.61
dlq13 –Seems to have huge mood swings	<b>.79</b>	-.05	.67
dlq22 –Is one of the very worst	<b>.79</b>	-.10	.72
plis4 –Is vindictive	<b>.79</b>	.00	.61
ab9 –Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason	<b>.79</b>	.12	.53
pt12 –Treats subordinates in a condescending or patronizing manner	<b>.78</b>	-.04	.65
pt21 –He or she “rides” subordinates who make mistakes	<b>.78</b>	.01	.59
dlq9 –Lacks self-control	<b>.77</b>	-.06	.66
pt20 –Exaggerates the size of subordinate’s errors and weaknesses	<b>.77</b>	-.02	.62
pt44 –Frequently holds me accountable for things I have no control over	<b>.77</b>	-.05	.63
ab6 –Reminds me of my past mistakes and failures	<b>.76</b>	.15	.47
dlq115 –The punishment my boss gives is often inappropriate for the offense	<b>.76</b>	-.04	.62
dlq60 –Could best be described as mean	<b>.76</b>	-.09	.67
pt1 –Uses authority or position for personal gain	<b>.76</b>	.00	.57
dlq93 –Attempts to exert control over everyone	<b>.75</b>	-.14	.71
dlq45 –Is a terrible boss to work for	<b>.75</b>	-.19	.77
dlq7 –Seems extremely paranoid about many things	<b>.75</b>	-.02	.58
pt9 –Suggests that subordinates should feel grateful to him/her	<b>.75</b>	.07	.51
dlq103 –Has often committed a serious breach of trust	<b>.75</b>	-.11	.66

dlq18 –Rarely shows a high level of respect for others	<b>.74</b>	-.17	.73
plis5 –Would deliberately distort what other people say	<b>.74</b>	-.05	.60
pt14 –Yells at subordinates	<b>.74</b>	.18	.43
dlq58 –Often acts in an unethical manner	<b>.74</b>	-.11	.65
ab10 –Makes negative comments about me to others	<b>.73</b>	.09	.47
dlq6 –Is an inconsiderate person	<b>.73</b>	-.20	.74
dlq1 –Is compulsive	<b>.73</b>	-.05	.58
dlq87 –Actively demotivates his/her employees	<b>.73</b>	-.19	.73
dlq108 –Spends too much time promoting him/herself	<b>.73</b>	-.15	.68
dlq44 –Wants to dominate/control everything	<b>.73</b>	-.14	.66
ab2 –Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid	<b>.72</b>	.25	.38
pt17 –Loses his/her temper	<b>.72</b>	.14	.43
plis6 –Would make trouble for someone who got on his/her bad side	<b>.72</b>	-.09	.60
dlq37 –You never know from day to day how my boss will behave	<b>.71</b>	-.15	.65
dlq65 –Treats many employees unfairly	<b>.71</b>	-.23	.76
ab5 –Invades my privacy	<b>.71</b>	.13	.42
pt4 –Makes subordinates feels that he/she is doing the subordinate a favor when the supervisor is only doing his/her job	<b>.71</b>	-.10	.60
pt23 –Is unfair to subordinates as a group	<b>.71</b>	-.15	.64
pt33 –Demands to get his/her way	<b>.71</b>	-.11	.61
pt7 –Make subordinates follow rules that he/she breaks him or herself	<b>.71</b>	-.08	.58
dlq8 –Is self-centered	<b>.71</b>	-.22	.73
pt6 –Makes boasts, brags, or “shows off”	<b>.71</b>	.02	.48
plis8 –Would do things that violate organizational policy and then expect others to cover for him/her	<b>.70</b>	.01	.49
plis7 –Would try to take credit for other people’s ideas	<b>.70</b>	-.08	.56
dlq5 –When my boss wants something, he/she obsesses about it	<b>.70</b>	-.01	.50
pt11 –“Pulls rank” on subordinates	<b>.70</b>	-.03	.51
dlq109 –You can rarely predict how my boss is likely to behave	<b>.69</b>	-.11	.58
dlq2 –Lacks emotional intelligence	<b>.69</b>	-.21	.68
dlq21 –My boss tends to alienate certain groups	<b>.69</b>	-.19	.66
dlq91 –Tends to act in ways that divide employees against one another	<b>.68</b>	-.23	.70
dlq89 –Does not trust others to do tasks properly	<b>.68</b>	-.18	.64
dlq111 –Has a very poor reputation in our organization	<b>.68</b>	-.17	.63
pt8 –Makes up arbitrary rules	<b>.68</b>	-.07	.52
dlq31 –Rarely acts with a high level of integrity	<b>.68</b>	-.15	.60
dlq41 –Is invulnerable to reason	<b>.68</b>	-.15	.60
pt32 –Forces acceptance of his/her points of view	<b>.67</b>	-.12	.56
dlq51 –Often says one thing while doing exactly the opposite	<b>.67</b>	-.25	.71

dlq84 –Is autocratic	<b>.67</b>	-.13	.57
plis3 –Would falsify records	<b>.67</b>	.02	.43
dlq69 –Is pig headed (i.e., extremely stubborn)	<b>.67</b>	-.20	.64
dlq59 –Holds grudges	<b>.67</b>	-.18	.62
plis2 –Would allow someone else to be blamed for his/her mistake	<b>.66</b>	-.17	.59
dlq64 –Will act one way and then later acts in the exact opposite manner	<b>.66</b>	-.23	.65
dlq94 –Is not a very good boss	<b>.66</b>	-.32	.77
dlq54 –Often makes knee jerk reactions	<b>.65</b>	-.13	.54
ab13 –Tells me I’m incompetent	<b>.65</b>	.20	.31
dlq3 –Is indiscrete	<b>.65</b>	-.11	.51
dlq23 –I would prefer not to work for my boss compared to other possible bosses	<b>.64</b>	-.30	.72
pt2 –Administers organizational policies unfairly	<b>.63</b>	-.13	.51
dlq114 –Is very poor at dealing with personal or interpersonal issues	<b>.62</b>	-.29	.67
dlq83 –Is a micro-manager	<b>.62</b>	-.04	.41
dlq79 –Does not show trust in subordinates by assigning them important tasks	<b>.61</b>	-.21	.57
plis1 –Would lie to me	<b>.61</b>	-.21	.56
dlq82 –Does not seek out or pay attention to the opinions and wishes of subordinates	<b>.61</b>	-.35	.74
dlq63 –Spends more time politicking than working	<b>.61</b>	-.17	.52
dlq53 –Sees every negotiation issues as a win/lose conflict	<b>.60</b>	-.15	.49
ab8 –Breaks promises he/she makes	<b>.60</b>	-.10	.44
dlq113 –Once my boss has made up his/her mind, there is no changing it	<b>.60</b>	-.17	.51
pt35 –Insists on one solution	<b>.60</b>	-.08	.42
dlq66 –Demonstrates no concern for anyone outside his/her own unit	<b>.60</b>	-.22	.55
pt3 –“Plays favorites” among subordinates	<b>.59</b>	-.17	.49
ab7 –Doesn’t give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort	<b>.58</b>	-.19	.50
pt13 –Relies on authority or position to get work done	<b>.57</b>	-.03	.35
dlq43 –Does not share power with the people with whom he/she works	<b>.57</b>	-.27	.57
ab3 –Gives me the silent treatment	<b>.56</b>	-.03	.33
ab12 –Does not allow me to interact with my coworkers	<b>.55</b>	.10	.25
pt34 –Will not take “no” for an answer	<b>.54</b>	-.01	.30
pt5 –Guards his/her turf against others outside the department	<b>.54</b>	.09	.24
pt36 –Imposes his/her solution	<b>.53</b>	-.12	.37
pt24 –Is not friendly and approachable	<b>.52</b>	-.36	.62
el6 –Can be trusted	<b>-.49</b>	<b>.45</b>	.69
pt10 –Delegates work that he/she does not want to do	<b>.49</b>	-.13	.32
pt30 –Treats subordinates as individuals	<b>-.45</b>	.39	.55
pt28 –Makes those under him/her feel at ease when talking to him/her	<b>-.43</b>	<b>.41</b>	.55
pt18 –Trusts members to exercise good judgment	.39	-.29	.36

sl11 –Works hard at finding ways to help others be the best they can be	-.17	<b>.70</b>	.65
sl6 –Makes the personal development of employees a priority	-.14	<b>.69</b>	.61
sl2 –Creates a sense of community among department employees	-.19	<b>.69</b>	.65
sl1 –Spends the time to form quality relationships with employees	-.21	<b>.66</b>	.63
sl4 –Tries to reach consensus among employees on important decisions	-.14	<b>.63</b>	.52
sl13 –Emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community	-.03	<b>.61</b>	.39
sl12 –Encourages department employees to be involved in community service and volunteer activities outside of work	.02	<b>.60</b>	.35
au4 –Describes accurately the way that others view his/her abilities	-.10	<b>.59</b>	.43
el7 –Discusses business ethics or values with employees	-.05	<b>.58</b>	.38
au6 –Carefully listens to alternative perspectives before reaching a conclusion	-.28	<b>.58</b>	.60
sl9 –Displays wide-ranging knowledge and interests in finding solutions to work problems	-.15	<b>.57</b>	.45
au7 –Shows that he/she understands his/her strengths and weaknesses	-.23	<b>.57</b>	.52
sl8 –Balances concern for day-to-day details with projections for the future	-.18	<b>.56</b>	.46
pt29 –Goes out of his/her way to help a subordinate	-.31	<b>.55</b>	.60
el4 –Has the best interests of employees in mind	-.38	<b>.55</b>	.69
pt38 –Trains subordinates to take on more authority	-.11	<b>.55</b>	.38
pt37 –Encourages subordinates to participate in important decisions	-.25	<b>.55</b>	.52
sl5 –Is sensitive to department employees’ responsibilities outside the workplace	-.19	<b>.54</b>	.45
au12 –Expresses his/her ideas and thoughts clearly to others	-.24	<b>.54</b>	.49
au5 –Uses his/her core beliefs to make decisions	.07	<b>.53</b>	.24
el1 –Listens to what employees have to say	<b>-.41</b>	<b>.53</b>	.69
au10 –Objectively analyzes relevant data before making a decision	-.17	<b>.53</b>	.41
pt25 –Looks out for the personal welfare of group members	-.33	<b>.53</b>	.59
au8 –Openly shares information with others	-.17	<b>.53</b>	.41
sl3 –His/her decisions are influenced by employees’ input	-.17	<b>.53</b>	.41
el5 –Makes fair and balanced decisions	-.42	<b>.52</b>	.69
el8 –Sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics	-.32	<b>.52</b>	.57
sl10 –Makes me feel like I work with him/her, not for him/her	-.31	<b>.52</b>	.55
pt40 –Encourages people to speak up when they disagree with a decision	-.27	<b>.52</b>	.50
pt27 –Makes every effort to get to know subordinates	-.31	<b>.52</b>	.54
sl7 –Holds employees to high ethical standards	-.17	<b>.51</b>	.40
au11 –Is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others	-.08	<b>.50</b>	.30
au1 –Clearly states what he/she means	-.29	<b>.50</b>	.49
el9 –Defines success not just by results but also the ways that they are obtained	-.08	<b>.50</b>	.30
au3 –Asks for ideas that challenge his/her core beliefs	-.04	<b>.50</b>	.27
pt26 –Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group	-.13	<b>.49</b>	.33
au2 –Shows consistency between his/her beliefs and actions	-.25	<b>.49</b>	.44

e110 –When making decisions, asks “what is the right thing to do?”	-.23	<b>.47</b>	.40
pt31 –Treats all group members as his/her equals	<b>-.45</b>	<b>.46</b>	.64
pt39 –Encourages initiative in group members	-.34	<b>.46</b>	.50
e12 –Disciplines employees who violate ethical standards	.08	<b>.44</b>	.16
pt19 –Expresses appreciation when a subordinate does a good job	-.31	<b>.42</b>	.42
au13 –Is guided in his/her actions by internal moral standards	-.06	.38	.17
e13 –Conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner	-.32	.37	.37
au9 –Resists pressures on him/her to do things contrary to his/her beliefs	.21	.29	.06

---

*Note.* Factor loadings  $\geq .40$  are bold.

## Appendix S

### Dissertation Proposal

#### The Dimensionality of Destructive Leadership: Toward an Integration of the Bright and Dark Sides

The importance of leadership to organizations cannot be overstated. Many leadership researchers would define leadership as the building and maintaining of cohesive, goal-oriented teams that perform well and achieve goals (e.g., Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Leadership is largely responsible for the ultimate success or failure of organizations (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). For example, one research study showed that high performing executives contributed an additional \$25 million in value to their organizations over the course of their tenure (Barrick, Day, Lord, & Alexander, 1991). In addition, leadership can contribute to the well-being of employees (Tichy & Bennis, 2007). Leaders have the ability to reduce employee stress during times of organizational change (Skagert, Dellve, Eklof, Poussette, & Ahlborg, 2008). However, not all leaders are equally effective at providing such guidance. Leadership *effectiveness* can be assessed in terms of how well a group is able to accomplish its goals (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Organizations spend billions of dollars annually on leadership development in an attempt to help individuals become better leaders (Riggio, 2008).

#### **The Bright Side of Leadership**

The leadership literature has been traditionally dominated by research attempting to identify the ingredients necessary to make leaders good or effective. This literature has been

described as addressing the “bright side” of leadership. The bright side is concerned with factors that contribute to leaders’ effectiveness through the factors’ *presence*, and has tended to emphasize behaviors exhibited by leaders when they are more concerned with how they are perceived and attempting to make a positive impression on others (Kaiser & Hogan, 2010). The most studied leadership theories, such as those of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) and charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987), focus on the positive side of leadership, the implications of it, and how leaders can become more effective by doing *more* of key behaviors. Prior research has shown perceived leader effectiveness, from the followers’ perspective, to be positively associated with perceptions of leaders’ honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness (Den Hartog et al., 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Posner & Schmidt, 1992). Furthermore, in a study across 62 cultures, Den Hartog and colleagues found that leaders’ perception by others as trustworthy was believed to be the most important characteristic for effective leadership.

However, leadership researchers tend to agree that highly effective leadership is far from common in organizations (e.g., DeVries & Kaiser, 2003, Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Historically, 60% to 75% of employed adults reported that the worst part of their jobs was their immediate supervisors (Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990). More recently, a survey conducted by the American Psychological Association (2014) revealed that about 29% of employed adults ( $N = 1,562$ ) stated that problems with their supervisors were significant factors contributing to stress on the job. This percentage of employed adults rose 2% from the previous year’s findings. Additionally, survey results also showed that 32% believe that

their employers are not always honest with them and 24% would not trust their employers. Supervisor issues, such as these, have prompted increasing interest in what has been called the “dark side” of leadership.

### **The Dark Side of Leadership**

Whereas the bright side approach to leadership theory and research focuses on the factors that enhance leadership through their presence, the dark side approach to leadership research focuses on the destructive factors that enhance leadership through their absence (Craig & Kaiser, 2012), and often includes behaviors exhibited by leaders when they are not especially concerned with how they are perceived by others (e.g., a manager who does not self-monitor his behavior due to extreme stress; Kaiser & Hogan, 2010). This is not to imply that leaders are necessarily destructive if they lack positive, bright-side qualities. This idea is illustrated by the concept of supererogation. Supererogatory behaviors are those that are morally commendable but not strictly morally required (Urmson, 1958). In the context of destructive leadership, for instance, a leader who simply does not exhibit charismatic behaviors may not necessarily be a destructive leader. Charismatic behaviors may be desirable, but are not required for effective leadership. Instead, the dark side of leadership implies the presence of negative behaviors that undermine effective leadership (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Dark-side characteristics can sometimes arise as “dysfunctional extensions of bright-side characteristics” (Kaiser & Hogan, 2010, p. 220). For example, self-confidence is a traditional bright side characteristic that effective leaders possess, yet leaders who hold extreme self-confidence may become narcissistic and destructive in the long term.

There has been a surge of research on the dark side of leadership in recent years, as interest in this area has grown significantly. Schyns and Schilling (2013) suggest that there are two main streams of the increasingly popular dark side research: (1) determining its prevalence and costs to organizations and (2) the accumulation of research and evidence relating to the detrimental effects of destructive leader behaviors on followers. Some have also suggested that an additional reason for its rise in research focus is the growing consensus that the dark side of leadership may be a stronger predictor of organizational and employee outcomes than the bright side (e.g., Baumeister, Bratlavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001; Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007; J. Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2010; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2009). As the interest in destructive leadership continues to grow, a thorough understanding of the construct is vital to future research, theory, and application, but has not yet been achieved.

### **What is Destructive Leadership?**

Many terms have been used to refer to factors on the dark side of leadership, such as abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000), negative leadership (Schilling, 2009), petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1987), perceived leader integrity (Craig & Gustafson, 1998), toxic leadership (Lipman-Blumen, 2005), and destructive leadership (Einarsen et al., 2007). Destructive leadership has lately been the most comprehensive and commonly accepted label to describe dysfunctional leaders (Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013). Some researchers have argued that the term destructive leadership should be used to refer to a higher, broader category of leadership which allows more narrowly defined areas of

destructive leadership (e.g., abusive supervision) to be subsumed under it (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Although this study will not examine each of the specific areas of destructive leadership, it is important to provide an overview of what is included in the realm of destructive leadership.

Craig and Kaiser (2012) reviewed literature on six narrower areas of the dark side which are relevant to destructive leadership: abusive supervision, integrity, narcissistic leadership, toxic leadership, negligent or laissez-faire leadership, and the dark side of charisma. Each of these areas is considered to be destructive because research has demonstrated that they are linked to undesirable follower and organizational outcomes. Building upon an earlier definition proposed by Einarsen et al. (2007), Craig and Kaiser defined destructive leadership as “systematic or repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor, or manager that knowingly violates, or inappropriately risks violating, the legitimate interest of the organization, its members, or other legitimate stakeholders by undermining or sabotaging the goals, tasks, resources, well-being, job satisfaction, or effectiveness of such stakeholders” (p. 8). The first, and arguably the most commonly studied area of destructive leadership, is abusive supervision. Abusive supervision is defined as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Tepper emphasizes the idea that abusive supervision is a perception; this means that two followers could have different assessments of the same supervisor’s behavior. One of the most commonly used instruments to assess destructive leadership has been Tepper’s (2000) Abusive Supervision Scale (Schyns

& Schilling, 2013). Abusive supervision is very similar to Ashforth's (1987) construct of petty tyranny, although abusive supervision is specific to leadership settings. Petty tyranny may refer to any instance in which one person exerts power over another (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) were among the first to suggest that an abusive style of leadership is uncharacteristic of effective role models.

Integrity is another area of destructive leadership. Craig and Gustafson (1998) referred to integrity as the *absence* of actively devious, manipulative, and dishonest behavior. Research has demonstrated that instruments which purport to measure integrity, such as the Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS; Craig & Gustafson, 1998), better identify managers who are perceived to have low integrity than instruments that purport to measure ethical leadership (Kaiser & Hogan, 2010). Like many areas of leadership, leader integrity has been typically studied from the observer perspective, and prior research has assessed impressions of a leader's integrity based on the reputation earned by the leader (Craig & Kaiser, 2012).

Narcissism is a personality trait commonly seen in leaders to varying degrees. At times, this trait may be beneficial to leadership, such as providing leaders with the self-confidence to carry out organizational missions and achieve their goals. On the other hand, narcissistic leadership can become an issue in the long-term (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Problems arise with narcissism when leaders become too self-involved, with little concern for their followers, or if they force followers to achieve unrealistic goals with unrealistic expectations. Narcissism is typically characterized by feelings of arrogance, grandiosity, self-absorption, and entitlement (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

Toxic leadership is one of the areas where little to no consensus has been reached with regard to how to define the term in the empirical literature. However, toxic leadership is commonly referred to in popular press articles, where numerous themes have emerged. Common themes in toxic leadership include 1) abuse or neglect of followers' well-being, 2) intense micromanaging of followers, and 3) narcissism (Schmidt, 2008). In his unpublished dissertation, Schmidt added self-promotion and unpredictability to characterize toxic leadership, making this construct somewhat broader than abusive supervision (Craig & Kaiser, 2012).

Negligent or laissez-faire leadership has not been widely considered as falling within the destructive domain because it has been typically regarded as the absence of leadership (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). Yet, some researchers have argued that passive forms of leadership can still be considered destructive when leaders intentionally avoid performing their duties and neglect their followers, therefore resulting in undesirable outcomes (e.g., Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2010). Not unexpectedly, research has found that leaders' laissez-faire behavior was negatively associated with perceived leader effectiveness and satisfaction with supervisor (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Further, Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) found that passivity and lack of rewards from leaders can contribute to poor performance and low job satisfaction among followers. Whether these relations constitute evidence in support of considering a laissez-faire style to be a form a destructive leadership remains a matter of some debate.

Another research area relevant to destructive leadership is the dark side of charisma (i.e., destructive charisma; Hogan et al., 2010). Research on the dark side of charisma examines leaders who seem charming on the outside, but conceal a selfish and manipulative agenda. Destructive charismatic leaders often have excellent social skills which help them come across in a positive light. Leaders who possess destructive charisma tend to have an excessive need for power (O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly, 1995). It must be emphasized that not all charismatic leaders are destructive leaders, yet Padilla, Hogan, and Kaiser (2007) have argued that most destructive leaders are charismatic.

### **Previous Research on Destructive Leadership**

Research has shown that destructive leadership is common in organizations with almost 33% of employees reported experiencing destructive leadership on a frequent basis (Aasland et al., 2010). Aasland and colleagues (2010) sent questionnaires to 4500 employed adults and asked them to indicate how often they experienced or witnessed various forms of destructive leadership behavior. Results indicated that 83.7% of employees had at least some exposure to destructive behavior by superiors, and 33.5% reported experiencing destructive behavior more frequently (Aasland et al., 2010). Due to destructive leadership's effects on employees, Tepper (2007) estimated that abusive supervision costs US organizations almost \$24 billion dollars annually.

Based on these numbers, it is evident that destructive leadership is common and very costly for organizations, but how does destructive leadership come about? Wang, Sinclair, and Deese (2010) noted competing theories attempting to explain why leaders engage in

destructive behavior; one theory suggests that destructive leader behaviors are intentional, whereas the other theory implies these behaviors are unintentional. First, the theory of planned behavior suggests that destructive behavior occurs because the leader has the intention to engage in this type of behavior. The leader's attitude toward the behavior, the subordinate, perceived norms for destructive behavior, and control over the behavior are all taken into account and influence a leader's intention to carry out the behavior. Together, these factors subsequently determine whether or not the leader engages in the behavior. Wang and colleagues (2010) also suggest that self-regulatory processes may cause destructive leadership behavior to occur. Self-regulatory processes suggest that leaders may unintentionally engage in destructive behavior because they have depleted their cognitive resources. Job related stress adds to further exhaustion and makes leaders more likely to engage in destructive behavior.

Research on the dark side, as well as the bright side of leadership, tends to primarily focus on factors inherent in the leader (Kellerman, 2004; Craig & Kaiser, 2012). However, Padilla and colleagues (2007) proposed that destructive leadership is the result of what they have termed the "toxic triangle" (p. 176). The toxic triangle refers to the interplay between leader, follower, and environmental factors that make it possible for destructive leadership to occur. In fact, Schilling (2009) content analyzed 48 interviews finding that the individuals believe that their surrounding environment (e.g., followers, organizational culture) plays a larger role in the generation of negative leadership than individual leader characteristics.

Padilla and colleagues (2007) argued that the characteristics of a destructive leader include charisma, personalized need for power, narcissism, negative life themes, and ideology of hate. While these characteristics may be essential for destructive leadership, Padilla and colleagues also argued that there are specific follower and environmental factors that must also be present for destructive leadership to occur. Two types of followers allow destructive leadership to come to fruition. Conformers are those who comply with their leaders out of fear; they are characterized by low maturity, negative core self-evaluations, and unmet basic needs, therefore making them more susceptible to pressures imposed by their leaders. Colluders are those who help leaders carry out their goals; they tend to be more ambitious and share the same values and belief systems as their leaders. The last factor that supports destructive leadership is a conducive environment. Destructive leaders will thrive in an environment that is unstable, perceived to be threatened, lacking the proper checks and balances of power, and reflecting certain cultural values such as collectivism and uncertainty avoidance. Padilla and colleagues (2007) argue that destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments are all necessary components to support destructive leadership.

**Consequences of destructive leadership.** Not only is it important for research and practice to understand how destructive leadership comes about, but it is necessary to understand the consequences of destructive leadership and how it impacts all affected. The consequences of destructive leadership have been studied quite extensively. Research has shown that destructive leader behavior is associated with negative effects ranging from

micro-level outcomes, such as psychological distress for followers (Tepper, Moss, Lockhart, & Carr, 2007), to more macro-level outcomes, such as lower organizational performance (Hmieleski & Ensley, 2007). Outcomes from the followers' point of view tend to receive much of the attention as to how destructive leadership affects organizations (Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

A number of studies have investigated and found significant relationships between destructive leadership and several outcome variables, including follower turnover intentions (Craig & Gustafson, 1998, Tepper, 2000, Ashforth, 1997), follower counterproductive work behavior (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002), follower job satisfaction (Craig & Gustafson, 1998; Tepper, 2000), satisfaction with supervisor (Schyns & Schilling, 2013), perceptions of leader effectiveness (Tepper, 2000), follower well-being (Burriss, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008; Hobman, Restubog, Bordia, & Tang, 2009), and even work family conflict (Tepper, 2000). Within the realm of destructive leadership, job satisfaction and well-being are two of the most studied outcome variables. Research has consistently shown that destructive leadership is negatively correlated with follower job satisfaction (Tepper, 2000, Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004), as dealing with an abusive or unpleasant leader can contribute to an unpleasant work environment. Hobman and colleagues (2009) found that followers who are frequently exposed to abusive supervisory behaviors also experience lower psychological well-being.

Recently, Schyns and Schilling (2013) conducted a meta-analysis to summarize the impact of destructive leadership on various outcomes. They summarized outcomes of

destructive leadership into four categories: concepts that relate directly to the leader (e.g., attitudes toward leader), concepts that relate directly to the job (e.g., job satisfaction), concepts that relate directly to the organization (e.g., turnover intentions, counterproductive work behavior), and concepts that relate directly to the individual follower (e.g., well-being). Schyns and Schilling coded and analyzed 57 studies. Overall, their findings showed that destructive leadership was negatively related to positive consequences and positively related to negative consequences. Schyns and Schilling found that destructive leadership correlated the highest with follower attitudes toward the leader ( $r = -.57$ ) and counterproductive work behavior ( $r = .37$ ). Additionally, turnover intentions and well-being also exhibited moderately high correlations with destructive leadership ( $r = .31$  and  $r = -.35$  respectively).

### **Definitional Issues in Destructive Leadership**

Despite the popularity of destructive leadership as a topic of research, there is no consensus among researchers regarding how to define this phenomenon. Researchers have argued that one reason this concept suffers from definitional issues is because of its novelty (Padilla et al., 2007; Schmidt, 2008). Differences among definitions arise from researchers studying the same phenomena yet using different terminology, lack of consensus regarding whether destructive leadership should be reserved for acts that are intentional or active in nature, and disagreements about the target(s) that must be harmed for the leadership to be considered destructive (e.g., the organization, followers, the public, and/or external environment; Craig & Kaiser, 2012). This lack of a unified definition of destructive

leadership impedes a shared understanding of where poor job performance stops and destructive leadership begins.

Einarsen and colleagues (2007) first defined destructive leadership as “the systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor, or manager 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 subordinates” (p. 208). Based on this definition, the label *destructive leadership* applies only to behaviors that are systematic and repeated, thereby excluding isolated acts. Their definition emphasized that leadership is only destructive if it harms the in-group (i.e. the organization or its members). Legitimate interests are considered to be within the law and support organizational functioning. Einarsen and colleagues’ (2007) conceptualization of the phenomenon does not require intentionality, and so also includes leader behaviors that may unintentionally cause harm to be destructive (e.g., unwise decision making or general ineffectiveness).

Craig and Kaiser (2012) expanded upon Einarsen and colleagues (2007) conceptualization of destructive leadership. Craig and Kaiser defined destructive leadership as “systematic or repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor, or manager that knowingly violates, or inappropriately risks violating, the legitimate interest of the organization, its members, or other legitimate stakeholders by undermining or sabotaging the goals, tasks, resources, well-being, job satisfaction, or effectiveness of such stakeholders” (p. 8). Furthering Einarsen et al.’s definition, Craig and Kaiser proposed that the targets of

destructive leadership should not be limited to the organization and its members, but extend beyond the organization to include legitimate external stakeholders that may be affected by the actions of leader. This addition to the definition allows behaviors that may cause harm to local communities or society to also be considered destructive leadership. Furthermore, Craig and Kaiser explicitly defined destructive leadership as limited to behaviors that are intentional in risking or causing harm to the targets. Clarifying the aspect of intentionality, Craig and Kaiser argued, allows researchers to draw a boundary between actively destructive leadership and merely ineffective leadership (e.g., incompetence). Additionally, as Craig and Kaiser proposed that destructive leadership is a subset of counterproductive work behavior, requiring intentionality aligns destructive leadership more consistently with other forms of counterproductive work behavior; this classification of behavior is limited to intentional acts (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Krasikova and colleagues (2013) proposed yet another definition of destructive leadership by extending Einarsen and colleagues' (2007) definition. Krasikova and colleagues proposed that "destructive leadership is defined as volitional behavior by a leader that harms or intends to harm a leader's organization and/or followers by a) encouraging followers to pursue goals that contravene the legitimate interests of the organization and/or b) employing a leadership style that involves the use of harmful methods of influence with followers, regardless of justifications of such behavior" (p. 1310). Like Craig and Kaiser's (2012) proposed definition of destructive leadership, Krasikova and colleagues distinguished destructive behavior from general ineffectiveness by clarifying that destructive leadership

behavior should be defined as intentional. Following Craig and Kaiser's contention that direction-setting and interpersonal influence are the two primary means by which leaders influence organizational outcomes, Krasikova et al. also pointed out that destructive leadership behavior may be broken down further into two behavioral domains: behavior that encourages followers to attain destructive goals and behavior that utilizes destructive approaches to influence followers. Krasikova and colleagues noted that leaders may engage in counterproductive work behavior that is not destructive leadership, and that destructive leadership should be viewed as a "harmful behavior imbedded [sic] in the process of leading" (p. 1310). For example, Krasikova and colleagues argued that the act of a leader stealing is not considered to fall under destructive leadership; rather this act is a counterproductive work behavior. If not situated in leadership, destructive leadership behaviors simply become destructive behaviors without the follower component, which is essential to leadership (Schyns & Schilling, 2013).

As is evident by the presentation of the above definitions, destructive leadership is a complex concept that has taken on many forms and continues to be redefined. There are points of agreement and disagreement, such as on defining destructive leadership as volitional behavior and on the target(s) that may be affected by destructive leadership. A unified definition and understanding of this construct would do much to facilitate future research on this topic.

### **The Moral Side of Leadership**

Within the bright side approach to leadership research, ethics are thought to be an important part of leadership. Ciulla (2005) asserted that “a good leader is *ethical* and effective” (p. 333). Yet, Ciulla has also proposed that sometimes a leader can be effective without being ethical. Ethical acts or behaviors are those that are, under the rule-based utilitarian approach, in accordance with a normative set of rules that, if followed by all, would maximize outcomes for the greatest number of people (Bentham, 1970). A behavior is labeled as wrong if it violates such a rule. Ethics are also a key component of Brown and Trevino’s (2006) conception of *ethical leadership*. Research has paid significant attention to ethical behavior in organizations, yet the topic of ethical leadership has only recently begun to receive consideration (e.g., Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005; Brown & Trevino, 2006). In light of several high-profile ethical scandals that have taken place in recent years (e.g., Enron, Tyco), questions have been raised regarding what leaders can do to shape themselves as well as their employees into conducting themselves ethically (Brown et al., 2005).

**Ethical leadership.** Brown and colleagues (2005) defined ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (p.120). This definition of ethical leadership holds that what is and what is not ethical is determined by behavioral norms within the organization. Brown and colleagues delineate ethical leadership from other values-related constructs by requiring that ethical leaders encourage ethical behavior from other

organization members through reward and punishment (Brown, Trevino, & Hartman, 2000). Ethical leadership is a construct with a conceptual relationship to destructive leadership in that leaders who do not demonstrate the required ethical behaviors (e.g., promoting ethics in others) are presumably *unethical*. Ethical leaders not only refrain from immoral and destructive behavior, but also actively demonstrate ethical behaviors and encourage them in others. Prior research has shown that ethical leadership is positively associated with affective trust in the leader and perceived leader effectiveness (Brown et al., 2005). Conversely, ethical leadership has been shown to be negatively associated with abusive supervision (Brown et al., 2005).

In 2000, Trevino, Hartman, and Brown asked individuals to describe the personal characteristics associated with ethical leaders. Two dimensions of ethical leadership emerged within their findings. First, findings showed that traits such as honesty and trustworthiness were most likely used to describe ethical leaders—these perceptions of an ethical leader’s character and personality were characterized as the moral person dimension. The second dimension was labeled the moral manager dimension or how the leader influences followers to engage in ethical behavior (e.g., openly communicating about ethics, keeping followers accountable for actions). According to Brown and colleagues, ethical leadership is a construct that “emerges out of a combination of characteristics and behaviors that include demonstrating integrity and high ethical standards, considerate and fair treatment of employees, and holding employees accountable for ethical conduct” (p. 130). In other words,

as Brown and colleagues argue, honesty and integrity contribute to ethical leadership, yet the moral manager component completes the construct.

**Authentic leadership.** A concept similar to ethical leadership is authentic leadership. Although numerous definitions have been offered for authentic leadership, researchers have worked toward refining the definition of authentic leadership. Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008) recently developed a definition of authentic leadership which captures the following underlying dimensions: self-awareness, relational transparency, moral perspective, and balanced processing. This four-dimensional model has been empirically supported (e.g., Walumbwa et al., 2008; Neider & Schreiesheim, 2011). Walumbwa and colleagues have formally defined authentic leadership as “a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development” (p. 94).

Authentic leadership is considered by its originators to be the “root construct” of other forms of leadership, including ethical leadership (Luthans & Avolio, 2003, p. 4). However, research has argued that authentic leadership is theoretically (e.g., Brown & Trevino, 2006) distinct from ethical leadership. Walumbwa and colleagues (2008) later demonstrated that authentic leadership was indeed empirically distinct from ethical leadership. Authenticity (i.e., being true to one’s self) and self-awareness (i.e., being aware of how one impacts others) are components of authentic leadership, but are not part of the

ethical leadership construct (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Rather, concepts such as other-awareness and moral management are more aligned with ethical leadership than authentic leadership. Ethical leadership and authentic leadership are similar in that both types of leaders consider the moral consequences of their actions, engage in role modeling of appropriate behaviors, and possess high integrity and concern for others (Brown & Trevino, 2006).

**Servant leadership.** Servant leadership is yet another construct overlapping with the ethical leadership domain. Servant leadership has been defined as “an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader, emphasizing leader behaviors that focus on follower development and de-emphasizing glorification of the leader” (Hale & Fields, 2007, p. 397). Spears’ (2004) proposed there to be 10 characteristics of servant leaders: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and building community.

Like ethical and authentic leadership, servant leadership includes a moral component where these types of leaders seek to behave in an ethical manner and exhibit positive role modeling, inspirational communication, and altruistic behaviors (Brown & Trevino, 2006). There are two main aspects of servant leadership that separate servant leadership from ethical and authentic leadership. First, servant leadership is not only concerned about the success of the organization and its members, but the success of all organizational stakeholders. The second aspect that makes distinguishes servant leadership from related constructs is that

servant leaders often engage in self-reflection behaviors to help keep these leaders grounded and humble (Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010).

### **Ineffective Leadership**

Kellerman (2004) has suggested that any negative leader behavior may be placed on a continuum, ranging from ineffective/incompetence to destructive/unethical. Schilling (2009) also acknowledged this polarity and has used the term negative leadership to describe any negative behaviors ranging from ineffective to destructive aspects of leadership. Ineffective leadership may be conceptualized as a leader's natural inability or lack of motivation to lead (e.g., Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Krasikova et al., 2013). More recently, however, it is evident in the destructive leadership literature that two lines of research have begun to develop: one stream of research focusing on destructive leadership and one focusing on ineffective leadership (e.g., Krasikova et al., 2013). Implicit in these two streams of research is that some researchers see destructive leadership as distinct from ineffective leadership; however this distinction has not yet been universally adopted or empirically established. Both types of leadership may have harmful effects, but whether these behaviors are volitional or unintentional appears to help clarify destructive leadership from ineffective leadership (Krasikova et al., 2013). There are many leaders out there who have good intentions, yet still fail. An important question is whether the label of destructive leadership should be reserved for actively counterproductive leader behaviors, or whether it should also include the *absence* of desirable leader behaviors. In addition to

“ineffectiveness,” previous research on ineffective leadership has also used the terminology of “incompetence” and “derailment,” with the latter focusing on managers’ career outcomes.

**Managerial incompetence.** If destructive leadership requires intentionality, as argued by many researchers, then managerial incompetence occurs when leaders are ineffective despite their good intentions (Craig & Kaiser, 2012; Krasikova et al., 2013). It has been estimated that the percentage of incompetent managers is anywhere from 30% to 75% (DeVries & Kaiser, 2003). Historically, some researchers have considered incompetent managers guilty of failing to possess the necessary characteristics that are needed to be successful (Bray & Howard, 1983), while others believed incompetent managers possess undesirable qualities (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). There were even some who believe incompetence is a combination of both. Bentz (1985) pioneered the study of managerial incompetence. In his research, he uncovered seven themes: unable to delegate and prioritize, being reactive rather than proactive, unable to maintain relationships with an extended network of contacts, unable to build a team, having poor judgment, being a slow learner, and having a maladaptive personality trait. Some years later, Leslie and Van Velsor (1996) replicated Bentz’s research and further refined the themes present in managerial incompetence, including problems with interpersonal relationships, failure to meet business objectives, inability to build a team, and inability to adapt to transition.

**Managerial derailment.** Like managerial incompetence, managerial derailment is another term that has been used to describe the failure of managers and is often used interchangeably with managerial incompetence. Managerial derailment occurs when

managers do not meet the level of achievement they were expected to due to being fired, demoted, or simply lacking the ability to progress (Lombardo, Ruderman, & McCauley, 1988). Whatever the specific reason, derailed managers do not plateau voluntarily (McCall & Lombardo, 1983). Researchers have suggested that these managers fail because they prefer to do things their own way (Kovach, 1989) or are unable to adjust their behavior when necessary due to changes in the work environment (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2005). More specifically, there is incongruence between the demands of the job and a manager's preferences or skills (Leslie & Van Velsor, 1996). The effects of derailed managers can severely affect organizations, costing millions of dollars. DeVries and Kaiser (2003) argued that the estimated cost of derailment can amount to anywhere between \$750,000 and \$1,500,000 per senior manager. Smart (1999) estimated that the cost to the organization could be even more at \$2,700,000 for each case of ineffective leadership.

McCall and Lombardo (1983) examined and compared successful executives and derailed executives. Successful executives were skilled at handling stress, getting along with others, and solving problems with the help of their team members. On the other hand, derailed executives, most often failed because of their insensitivity to others, usually becoming "abrasive and intimidating" under pressure (p. 6). McCall and Lombardo found that derailed executives also failed because of specific business problems, arrogance, betrayed trust, failing to delegate, being overly ambitious, failing to staff effectively, failing to think strategically, failing to adapt to a boss with a different style, and being overly dependent on a mentor.

Based on the literature, it is evident that the label “destructive leadership” has been used in connection with many dark side constructs (e.g., perceived leader integrity), bright side constructs (e.g., ethical leadership), and general ineffectiveness. Given the number of constructs used to refer to destructive leadership and the varying measures employed to assess it, researchers need to bring some order to this domain in order to guide future theory and research.

### **The Current Study**

There have been many attempts to define destructive leadership, yet there is still no consensus as to whether destructive leadership and leader (in)effectiveness are distinct from one another. The first goal of this study is to determine the nature of their relationship. Part of the issue stems from the fact that there are a number of constructs within the literature used to refer to destructive leadership (e.g., abusive supervision, petty tyranny, perceived leader integrity). By extension, there are also a number of measures, such as the Destructive Leadership Questionnaire (Shaw, Erickson, & Harvey, 2011), Abusive Supervision Scale (Tepper, 2000), and Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (Craig & Gustafson, 1998), that have been utilized in research in an attempt to assess and identify destructive leadership in organizations.

If we examine the item content of the various measures intended by their authors to assess destructive leadership and related constructs, we might note that there appears to be a mixture of items with an ethical or moral aspect and items that assess more traditional forms of leadership effectiveness or performance. For example, Shaw and colleagues’ (2011)

Destructive Leadership Questionnaire is one such measure containing numerous items that simultaneously assess leadership effectiveness (e.g., “my boss is very poor at solving problems and making decisions,” “my boss deals very ineffectively with complex situations,” “my boss is not very good at inspiring others”) and leadership integrity (e.g., “my boss rarely acts with a high level of integrity,” “my boss often acts in an unethical manner,” and “my boss often takes credit for work that others have done”). Additionally, Brown and colleagues’ (2005) Ethical Leadership Scale contains the item, “listens to what employees have to say.” One could argue that failing to listen is more indicative of poor performance rather than unethical behavior. Furthermore, some authors have explicitly defined destructive leadership as including effectiveness, regardless of ethical or moral considerations. Since Einarsen and colleagues’ (2007) definition of destructive leadership does not limit the term to only those who cause harm deliberately, cases of ineffective leadership, where harm is unintentional, are included in their definition.

This raises the question of whether these more “values-centric” constructs are really distinct from the traditionally studied “performance-centric” constructs, or whether they simply represent different ranges along a single “performance” continuum as proposed by Kellerman (2004). I propose that all of the aforementioned constructs may be categorized as either values-centric constructs or performance-centric constructs. Values-centric constructs refer to the types of values underlying a leader’s goals and the behavior that he or she demonstrates in the process of achieving those goals. For example, ethical leaders may achieve their goals by doing what is considerate and fair for all followers, while destructive

leaders may achieve their goals by doing what is self-serving and not in the best interests of their followers. Performance-centric refers to constructs that represent how effective a leader is at leading the group to goals, irrespective of any values-based judgments about those goals. More specifically, regardless of the means, performance-centric constructs refer to whether the leader was ultimately effective or ineffective.

This categorization scheme may also apply to areas outside of destructive leadership, but for the purposes of this study, I will seek to include constructs and pre-established measures that will aid in defining destructive leadership. Specifically, I argue that values-centric constructs include perceived integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership. This view is consistent with how many scholars view destructive leadership (e.g., Conger, 1990; Hogan et al., 1990; Howell, & Avolio, 1992); destructive leadership is less frequently viewed as an outcome (e.g., performance) and more often a process (i.e., what destructive leaders do). Managerial derailment may be considered a performance-centric construct. This study seeks to investigate whether these constructs and their subfacets are best categorized into these two distinct, overarching factors. Currently, due to the lack of consensus under the destructive leadership umbrella, and leadership in general, these values-centric and performance-centric constructs are often intermixed within measures. If two overarching factors emerge, this will aid in the determining how destructive leadership should be defined. Therefore, the following research question is posed:

**Research Question 1:** Are values-centric leadership constructs distinct from performance-centric leadership constructs in terms of (1A) conceptual definition, (1B) factor structure, and (1C) external correlates?

It is evident that destructive leadership overlaps with many other constructs, therefore I seek to disentangle to these constructs. In addition to the dark side, destructive leadership also relates to positive forms of leadership. Although ethical leadership has been shown to be negatively associated with abusive supervision (Brown et al., 2005), if leaders do not demonstrate actively ethical behavior, does that imply they are destructive? Or, are forms of ethical leadership distinct from destructive leadership? The second goal of this study is to further examine the relationship between the ethical side of leadership and destructive leadership. Moreover, since authentic leadership and servant leadership overlap with ethical leadership, these two constructs will also be examined to determine if they are in fact distinct from ethical leadership. An empirical investigation into the dimensionality of these values-centric constructs is necessary to further refine the definition of destructive leadership and determine where these constructs overlap and where they do not. In an effort to better understand the nature of these values-centric constructs, the current study will address the following research question:

**Research Question 2:** How many distinct dimensions underlie the set of values-centric leadership constructs (i.e., perceived integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership)?

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Sixteen hundred eighty employed adults (i.e., incumbents) will be targeted to participate in this study although fewer may be used. Some researchers suggest a minimum of three respondents per variable for the currently planned analyses (Cattell, 1978). The targeted sample size for this study is set to meet the minimum number of participants needed for data analysis. However, fewer participants may be used if initial data analysis results indicate that communalities are high (mean of at least .7) for each factor and the factors are over-determined.

In order to participate in this study, all participants must be employed full-time. Demographic questions will be included to gain information about participants' current occupational status and to ensure they meet the specified criteria to be used in data analysis (see Appendix A). In order for participant responses to be considered for data analysis, participants must have worked under their current supervisors for at least three months. These criteria are in place to ensure that the incumbents have had enough opportunities to work with and observe their leaders' behaviors. The number of incumbents who do not meet these criteria will be reported.

### **Procedure**

Multiple methods will be used to recruit participants, such as the use of social media websites, fee-based services, and undergraduate college students. Participants will be invited to take part in an online survey through social media websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter). Fee-

based services such as Mechanical Turk, Survey Monkey panels, and Qualtrics panels will also serve as recruitment methods. Mechanical Turk, Survey Monkey, and Qualtrics participants will be compensated for their responses. Undergraduate students will be asked to provide email addresses for at least three full-time employees who may potentially serve as participants. Undergraduate students will receive course credit for their assistance.

Participants will be invited to access a web link containing measures of perceived leader integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, managerial derailment, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, servant leadership, leadership effectiveness and team performance, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, counterproductive work behavior, well-being, and demographic questions. Participants will be instructed to read and accept the terms of informed consent prior to participation. No identifying information will be collected from participants and all will be made aware that their responses are anonymous and participation in this study is voluntary. Given the sensitive nature of some of these measures, guaranteeing anonymity may increase honest responding. Participants will then be instructed to complete the entire survey containing the aforementioned measures.

## **Measures**

**Perceived leader integrity scale.** The Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS; Craig & Gustafson, 1998) measures observers' overall impressions of leaders' integrity, in this case via subordinates' perceptions of the likelihood that their leaders will engage in various destructive behaviors. These destructive behaviors include: hindering follower performance

or development, avoiding responsibility or shifting blame, creating or fueling conflict, lying and manipulation, and acting against the organization (Craig & Kaiser, 2012). A short version of the PLIS will be used in the current study, which highly correlates with the full version ( $r = .95$ , Craig, n.d.). The short version of the PLIS contains eight items (see Appendix B). Sample items include “[my manager] would allow someone else to be blamed for his/her mistake,” and “[my manager] would try to take credit for other people’s ideas.” For each of the eight items, participants will be asked to indicate how well the item describes their leaders on a four-point response format (0 = *not at all* to 3 = *well*). The full version and short version of the PLIS have demonstrated high internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .97$ ,  $\alpha = .93$ ).

**Destructive leadership questionnaire.** The Destructive Leadership Questionnaire (DLQ; Shaw et al., 2011) will be incorporated as an additional measure to assess participants’ perceptions of their leaders exhibiting destructive leadership behaviors. The DLQ contains 104 behavior-focused items (22 *a priori* dimensions), 19 personality-focused items (4 *a priori* dimensions), and four overall judgment items. For this 127-item measure, participants will be asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with various descriptions of their leaders’ behaviors on a six-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 6 = *strongly agree*). This measure includes various behaviors and personality traits, such as making decisions based on inadequate information, lying and other unethical behavior, laziness and incompetence, and inability to develop and motivate subordinates. Sample items include “my boss often takes credit for the work others have done (behavior-focused),” “my

boss is arrogant (personality-focused),” and “my boss is a terrible boss to work for (overall judgment).” The DLQ subscales have demonstrated high internal consistency reliability. Cronbach’s alpha ranges from .72 to .76 for the behavior-focused factors, .74 to .94 for the personality-focused factors, and .96 for the overall judgment items. Items are reported in Appendix C.

**Abusive supervision.** Participants’ perceptions of abusive supervision will be measured using Tepper’s (2000) 15-item Abusive Supervision Scale. Participants will be asked how often they believe their leaders engage in various abusive supervisory behaviors on a five-point response format (1= *I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me* to 5 = *He/she uses this behavior very often with me*). Sample items include “[my manager] ridicules me,” and “[my manager] doesn’t give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort.” This measure has demonstrated high internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .90$ ; Tepper, 2000). Items are reported in Appendix D.

**Petty tyranny.** Participants’ perceptions of their supervisors’ petty tyranny will be measured using Ashforth’s (1987) 47-item Petty Tyranny Scale. Participants will be asked to what extent they believe their leaders engage in each behavior on a seven-point response format (1= *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). This measure utilizes six subscales to assess petty tyranny: arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement, belittles subordinates, lack of consideration, a forcing style of conflict resolution, discouraging initiative, and noncontingent punishment. Sample items include “delegates work that he/she does not want to do (arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement),” and “criticizes subordinates in front of others

(belittles subordinates).” This measure has demonstrated high internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .96$ ; Ashforth, 1997). Items are reported in Appendix E.

**Managerial derailment.** Participants’ perceptions of managerial derailment risk factors will be measured using 36 items from Benchmarks® (Lombardo & McCauley, 1994). Participants will be asked to what extent they believe their leaders display behaviors believed to indicate risk of career derailment on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Benchmarks® utilizes five subscales to measure managerial derailment risk: problems with interpersonal relationships, difficulty in building and leading a team, difficulty in changing or adapting, failure to meet business objectives, and too narrow a functional orientation. Sample items include “[my manager] is reluctant to share decision making with others (problems with interpersonal relationships),” and “[my manager] has difficulty meeting the expectations of his/her current position (failure to meet business objectives).” Previous research has shown that these items are significantly correlated with likelihood of derailment ( $r = .58$ ; Center for Creative Leadership, 2002). This instrument has demonstrated high internal consistency ( $\alpha = .88$  to  $.93$ ) and interrater reliability (.87 to .92; Leslie & Braddy, 2013). Items are reported in Appendix F.

**Ethical leadership.** Participants’ perceptions of their supervisors’ ethical leadership will be measured using the Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS; Brown et al., 2005). The ELS includes ten items (see Appendix G). The ELS measures subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which their leaders engage in ethical behaviors on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include “[my manager] listens to what

employees have to say,” and “[my manager] sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics.” This instrument has demonstrated high internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .91$ ).

**Authentic leadership.** Participant perceptions of authentic leadership will be measured using the Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI; Neider & Schreisheim, 2011). The ALI contains four subscales: self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and internalized moral perspective. Sample items include, “my leader is clearly aware of the impact he/she has on others (self-awareness),” and “my leader openly shares information with others (relational transparency).” This 14-item instrument assesses the extent to which participants agree or disagree with each statement about their leaders’ behavior on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). This instrument has demonstrated adequate internal consistency reliability for all four subscales respectively ( $\alpha = .70, .77, .74, .82$ ). This measure has also demonstrated that it is not unduly affected by social desirability bias. Items are reported in Appendix H.

**Servant leadership.** Participants’ perceptions of servant leadership will be assessed using Ehrhart’s (2004) 14-item Servant Leadership Scale. This measure includes seven dimensions: forming relationships with subordinates, empowering subordinates, helping subordinates grow and succeed, behaving ethically, having conceptual skills, putting subordinates first, and creating value for those outside the organization. Participants will be asked to evaluate their leaders on a five-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include “my manager spends the time to form quality

relationships with employees,” and “my manager’s decisions are influenced by employees’ input.” This measure has exhibited acceptable internal consistency reliabilities in previous research ( $\alpha = .88$  to  $.97$ ; Hunter et al., 2013). Items are reported in Appendix I.

**Leadership effectiveness and team performance.** Participants’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness and team performance will be measured using seven items from the Leadership Versatility Index ® (LVI; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2003). Team performance will be measured using two 3-item team productivity and team vitality subscales. Previous research has found that these team performance scales demonstrate acceptable internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .89, .87$  respectively; Kaiser & Overfield, 2010). One additional item will measure perceived overall leadership effectiveness. Although one item measures are often criticized as unreliable, evidence shows that this single item measure of perceived overall leader effectiveness is reliable and valid (Kaiser, Overfield, & Kaplan, 2010). According to Kaiser and colleagues (2010), this overall leader effectiveness item correlates highly with other leader effectiveness scales, such as Tsui’s (1984) reputational effectiveness measure ( $r = .73$ ) and Quinn, Spreitzer, and Hart’s (1991) managerial effectiveness scale ( $r = .86$ ). The LVI was designed as a 360-degree developmental feedback survey, but for the purposes of this research, only subordinate ratings will be collected. The response format varies by item. Items for this scale are reported in Appendix J.

**Turnover intentions.** Participants’ intentions to leave their current organization will be measured using a 5-item scale from Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997). Sample items include “as soon as I find a better job, I will leave my organization,” and “I often think about

quitting my job at my current organization.” Participants will respond to these items using a seven-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). This measure has demonstrated acceptable internal consistency reliability in previous research ( $\alpha = .89$ ; Wayne et al., 1997). Items are reported in Appendix K.

**Job satisfaction.** Participants’ overall satisfaction with their current jobs will be measured using Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh’s (1979) 3-item scale. Participants will be asked to rate their level of agreement (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) for each of the following statements: “all in all, I am satisfied with my job,” “in general, I don’t like my job (reverse scored),” and “in general, I like working here.” This measure has demonstrated high internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .89, .90$ ) in numerous studies (e.g., Tepper, 2000; Spector et al., 2006).

**Satisfaction with supervisor.** Participants’ satisfaction with their supervisors will be measured using a 2-item supervisory satisfaction scale from Hackman and Oldham’s (1974) Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS). The JDS utilizes three dimensions and several job facets to measure overall job satisfaction, but for this purposes of this study, only the supervisory satisfaction subscale will be used. Participants will be asked to indicate how satisfied they are (1 = *extremely dissatisfied* to 7 = *extremely satisfied*) with the following statements: “the amount of support and guidance I receive from my supervisor” and “the overall quality of the supervision I receive at work.” The original supervisory satisfaction subscale uses three items to measure this construct, but one item will be removed due to its overlap with destructive leadership. The removed item is “the degree of respect and fair treatment I receive from my

boss.” The original 3-item measure has demonstrated acceptable internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .89$ ; Mathieu, Hofmann, & Farr, 1993). Coefficient alpha for the 2-item measure will be reported.

**Counterproductive work behavior.** Participants’ counterproductive work behavior will be assessed using a 12-item organizational deviance measure developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000). Sample items from the organizational deviance measure include “taken property from work without permission” and “taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace.” Previous research has shown that this measure exhibits acceptable internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .81$ ; Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Participants will be asked to indicate how frequently they engage in each behavior on a five-point response format (1 = *never* to 5 = *weekly*). Items are reported in Appendix L.

**Well-being.** Participants’ psychological well-being will be measured using the 8-item Index of Psychological Well-Being developed by Berkman (1971). Participants will be asked to indicate how often they experience a variety of positive and negative feelings. Sample items include “very lonely or remote from other people” and “pleased about having accomplished something” (reverse scored). Participants will respond to these items using a five-point response format (1 = *never* to 5 = *always*). This measure has demonstrated acceptable internal consistency reliability in previous research ( $\alpha = .72$ ) and high test-retest reliability ( $r = .74$ ; Wright & Bonett, 1992). Items are reported in Appendix M.

**Demographic variables.** Several demographic variables will be measured, including type of employment (full-time or part-time), hours worked per week, tenure at current organization (in years), tenure with current supervisor (in years), age, and gender.

### **Proposed Analyses**

**Descriptive statistics.** The means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and intercorrelations among study variables will be calculated and reported (see Table 1).

**Expert ratings.** Research question 1A asked whether performance-centric and values-centric leadership constructs are conceptually distinct. Ratings from subject matter experts will be one source of evidence in discovering if these two sets of constructs are in fact distinct from one another. Following procedures similar to those outlined in Brown and colleagues (2005), approximately 20 individuals with expertise in leadership (e.g., university faculty, leadership researchers, and doctoral students) will serve as subject matter experts. Experts will be recruited from a large southeastern university and from leadership consulting organizations. Response rates and credentials for subject matter experts will be reported.

Subject matter experts will receive a web link via e-mail and will be asked to complete an online survey. Two versions of the survey will be created in an effort to cut down on the length of the survey; experts will only complete one version of the survey. In the surveys, experts will be presented with definitions for each leadership construct as well as the items from each leadership measure described above (i.e., perceived leader integrity, destructive leadership, petty tyranny, abusive supervision, managerial derailment, ethical

leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership). For each item, experts will be instructed to select the construct for which the item best serves as an indicator.

To address research question 1A, (i.e., are values-centric leadership constructs distinct from performance-centric leadership constructs in terms of conceptual definition?), the percent of expert agreement among the constructs will be calculated for each item. If percent agreement meets or exceeds a threshold of 70%, which is considered acceptable agreement (Stemler & Tsai, 2008), for a given construct, I will consider that item to be an indicator of that construct. If subject matter experts agree that values-centric items belong to values-centric constructs and performance-centric items belong to performance-centric constructs, this will provide evidence that these two sets of constructs are distinct from one another. Interrater agreement ( $r_{wg}$ ) for each item will be calculated and reported. Results will be presented in Table X.

**Configural analyses (pattern frequencies).** To provide additional information relevant to research question 1A, frequencies of score patterns across the performance-centric and values-centric constructs will be examined. The sample will be divided into three ranges for each leadership construct, although only the lowest scoring and highest scoring groups will be examined. Scores that are greater than one standard deviation above the mean will be considered “high” and scores that are more than one standard deviation below the mean will be considered “low.”

The relevant question is whether constructs can be considered to lie at different points on a common continuum (e.g., if destructiveness, a values-centric leadership construct, lies at

the extreme low end of effectiveness, a performance-centric leadership construct, as proposed by some authors) or if they lie on different continua. For example, if a nontrivial proportion of managers exist who score high on destructive leadership and also high on effectiveness (a high-high pattern), this would be evidence supporting the proposition that those two constructs represent different continua rather than different points along the same continuum. Conversely, if particular patterns occur with only trivial frequency (or are nonexistent), that finding might indicate constructs that represent different points along a common continuum. As suggested by Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, and Laczó (2006), pattern frequencies containing at least 8% of the sample will be considered as nontrivial. Because the number of possible configurations across constructs is very large in the current study, a subset will be chosen for examination based on preliminary analyses. Frequencies for all examined score patterns will be presented in Table X.

**Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (all leadership constructs).** To address research question 1B (i.e., are values-centric leadership constructs distinct from performance-centric leadership constructs in terms of factor structure?), a combination of exploratory factor analyses (EFA) and confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) will be conducted to examine the factor structure underlying the following leadership measures: perceived leader integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, managerial derailment, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership. The initial sample will be randomly split into a primary sample and a hold-out sample as is recommended when performing exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (Hinkin, 1998).

The primary sample will be used for EFA and the hold-out sample will be used for CFA.

This randomization procedure will be completed in SPSS. If values-centric leadership constructs load onto the different factors than the performance-centric constructs, this will provide evidence that these two types of constructs are distinct from one another.

Following Hinkin's (1998) suggestions for EFA, principal axis factoring will be used to examine the interrelationships among all items. The Kaiser criterion and scree test will be used to determine the number of factors that appear to underlie these items. Factor loadings will be examined to identify which items load onto which factors. There are two ways to determine whether an item loads onto a factor: a) the item has a factor loading greater than .40 and, b) the loading is twice as strong on one factor than the same item's loading on any other factor (Hinkin, 1998). Similar to analyses conducted by Paulhus (1984), scale totals for each measure may also be calculated to identify which measure loads onto which factor. These findings will be presented in Table X.

Using the hold-out sample, I will conduct a series of confirmatory factor analyses. The results from the previous EFAs will inform the models that will be tested in the CFA. A single factor model will be tested, in addition to one model specifying each of the original scales. A model specifying the factor structure that has been hypothesized from the EFA will be tested in the CFA. If these models do not produce a good fitting model, I will then examine what alternative models exhibit the best fit for this combination of leadership constructs. If the best fitting model is one that has values-centric constructs loading onto one

factor, and the performance-centric constructs loading onto another factor, this will provide evidence that these two sets of constructs are distinct from one another.

The best fitting model(s) will be determined by the fit indices. Currently, the most recommended fit indices are Chi-Square, Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMSR), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI). Hu and Bentler (1999) propose the following recommendations and cutoffs for these indices: a chi-square statistic that is close to zero and non-significant, a RMSEA value less than or equal to .06, a SRMSR value less than or equal to .08, a CFI value greater than or equal to .90, and a TLI value greater than or equal to .95. A variety of models will be tested and the results of the confirmatory factor analyses will be presented in Table X.

In the event the targeted number of participants cannot be reached, item parceling may be used to examine associations among constructs. Although there are conflicting views among researchers regarding whether item parceling is appropriate for multidimensional scales, Kishton and Widaman (1994) suggest two procedures for parceling multidimensional scales: internal-consistency approach and domain-representative approach. The internal-consistency approach uses facets within a measure as the grouping criterion, whereas the domain-representative approach groups items together from different facets. While some may recommend grouping similar items (i.e., high intercorrelations, similar content; Hoyle & Smith, 1994), Kishton and Widaman found the domain-representative approach to parceling

yielded more stable and acceptable parameter estimates than the internal-consistency approach.

**Relationships between leadership constructs and outcomes.** To address research question 1C (i.e., are values-centric leadership constructs distinct from performance-centric leadership constructs in terms of external correlates?), the pattern of correlations between all measured outcomes (i.e., leader effectiveness, team performance, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, counterproductive work behavior, and well-being) and all leadership constructs (i.e., perceived integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, managerial derailment, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership) will be examined (see Table 1). If the leadership constructs have different outcomes, that is, if the pattern of correlations varies between values-centric and performance-centric leadership constructs, this will be evidence that these constructs are in fact distinct from one another.

To address research question 1C, the researcher will also conduct hierarchical multiple regression to examine how strongly each leadership construct is related to each outcome variable. Hierarchical multiple regression allows the researcher to provide an index of the unique predictive validity of each leadership construct. Separate hierarchical regressions will be conducted for each outcome variable. Findings will be presented in Table X. If the values-centric constructs provide significant additional variance beyond the performance-centric constructs (or vice versa), this will provide evidence that these two sets of constructs are distinct from one another.

**Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (values-centric leadership constructs).** To address research question 2 (i.e., how many distinct dimensions underlie the set of values-centric leadership constructs?), a combination of EFAs and CFAs will be conducted to examine the factor structure underlying the values-centric leadership constructs of perceived integrity, destructive leadership, abusive supervision, petty tyranny, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, and servant leadership. The same procedures described earlier will be used for examining factor structure and model fit. Findings from the factor analysis will provide evidence as to whether these values-centric constructs are distinct from one another and how many dimensions emerge.

## REFERENCES

- Aasland, M. S., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The prevalence of destructive leadership behavior. *British Journal of Management, 21*, 438-452.
- American Psychological Association. (2014). Employee distrust is pervasive in U.S. workforce [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2014/04/employee-distrust.aspx>.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 1073–1091.
- Ashforth, B. E. (1987). *Organizations and the petty tyrant: An exploratory study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, LA.
- Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*, 126–140.
- Barrick, M. R., Day, D. V., Lord, R. G., & Alexander, R. A. (1991). Assessing the utility of executive leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*, 9–22.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 181-217.

- Baumeister, R., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. Review of general good. *Review of General Psychology, 5*, 323–370.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). The development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 349-360.
- Bentham, J. (1970). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. London: Athlone Press.
- Bentz, V. J. (1985). *A view from the top: A thirty year perspective of research devoted to the discovery of research devoted to the discovery, description, and prediction of executive behavior*. Paper presented at the 93<sup>rd</sup> Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August.
- Berkman, P. L. (1971). Measurements of mental health in a general population survey. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 41*, 105-111.
- Bray, D. W., & Howard, A. (1983). The AT&T longitudinal studies of managers. In K. W. Shaie (Ed.), *Longitudinal studies of adult psychological development* (pp. 266–312). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*, 117-134.
- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 595-616.

- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 912–922.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M, Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Cattell, R. B. (1978). *The scientific use of factor analysis in behavioral and life sciences*. New York: Plenum.
- Center for Creative Leadership. (2002). *Benchmarks® facilitator's manual*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 481-498.
- Ciulla, J. B. (2005). The state of leadership ethics and the work that lies before us. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 14*(4), 323-335.
- Conger, J. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*, 44–55.
- Craig, S. B. (n.d.). A short form of the Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS). Retrieved from <http://www.sbcraig.com/plis/short.htm>
- Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived leader integrity scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. *The Leadership Quarterly, 9*(2), 127-145.

- Craig, S. B., & Kaiser, R. B. (2012). Destructive leadership. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.) *The Oxford handbook of leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., et al. (1999). Culturally specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 219–256.
- DeVries, D. L., & Kaiser, R. B. (2003, November). *Going sour in the suite*. Paper presented at the Maximizing Executive Effectiveness workshop, Miami, FL.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 331–351.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., Shaw, J. D., Johnson, J. L., & Pagon, M. (2006). The social context of undermining behavior at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *101*, 105–126.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *57*, 61-94.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 207 –216.
- Foti, R. J., & Hauenstein, N. A. (2007). Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 347-355.

- Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2010). The battered apple: An application of stressor-emotion-control/support theory to teachers' experience of violence and bullying. *Human Relations, 63*, 927–954.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1974). *The Job Diagnostic Survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects* (Tech. Rep. No. 4). New Haven, CT: Yale University, Department of Administrative Sciences.
- 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.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 104-121.
- Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). An examination of nonleadership: From laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 1234-1248.
- Hmieleski, K. M., & Ensley, M. D. (2007). The effects of entrepreneur abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1-6.
- Hobman, E. V., Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., & Tang, R. L. (2009). Abusive supervision in advising relationships: Investigating the role of social support. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 58*, 233–256.

- Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2010). Management derailment: Personality assessment and mitigation. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *American Psychological Association handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 555-575). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, *49*, 493–504.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, *9*(2), 169-180.
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. Clark, & M. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*(1), 1-55.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, *6*, 43–54.
- Hoyle, R. H., & Smith, G. T. (1994). Formulating clinical research questions as structural equation models: A conceptual overview. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *62*, 158–176.

- Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*, 316-331.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 755-768.
- 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 traits paradigm. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 855-875.
- Kaiser, R. B., & Hogan, R. (2010). How to (and how not to) assess the integrity of managers. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(4), 216-234.
- Kaiser, R. B., & Overfield, D. V. (2010). Assessing flexible leadership as a mastery of opposites. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(2), 105–118.
- Kaiser, R. B., Overfield, D. V., & Kaplan, R. E. (2010). *Leadership versatility index® version 3.0 facilitator's guide*. Greensboro, NC: Kaplan DeVries Inc.
- Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser, R. B. (2003). Developing versatile leadership. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 44*(4), 18-26.
- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

- Kishton, J. M., & Widaman, K. F. (1994). Unidimensional versus domain representative parceling of questionnaire items: An empirical example. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*, 757–765.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kovach, B. E. (1989). Successful derailment: What fast-trackers can learn while they're off the track. *Organizational Dynamics, 18* (2), 33-47.
- Krasikova, D. V., Green, S. G., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda. *Journal of Management, 39*(5), 1308-1388.
- Leslie, J. B., & Braddy, P. W. (2013). *Benchmarks*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Leslie, J. B., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). *A look at derailment today*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians—and how we can survive them*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2005). *Preventing derailment: What to do before it's too late*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership. (Original work published 1989).
- Lombardo, M., & McCauley, C. D. (1994). *Benchmarks®: A manual and trainer's guide*.

- Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lombardo, M. M., Ruderman, M. N., & McCauley, C. D. (1988). Explanations of success and derailment in upper-level management positions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 2, 199-216.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive development approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Mathieu, J. E., Hofmann, D. A., & Farr, J. L. (1993). Job perception-job satisfaction relations: An empirical comparison of three competing theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 56, 370–387.
- 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.
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159-1168.
- Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1146-1164.
- O'Connor, J., Mumford, M., Clifton, T., Gessner, T., & Connelly, M. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 529-555.

- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, vulnerable followers, and conducive environments. *Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 176-194.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*(3), 598-609.
- Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1992). Values and the American manager: An update updated. *California Management Review*, *34*, 80-94
- Quinn, R.E., Spreitzer, G.M., & Hart, S. (1991). Challenging the assumptions of bipolarity: Interpenetration and managerial effectiveness. In S. Srivastva & R. Fry (Eds.), *Executive and organizational continuity* (pp. 222-252). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Riggio, R. E. (2008). Leadership development: The current state and future expectations. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *60*(4), 383-392.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 555-572.
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 617-633.
- Sackett, P. R., Berry, C. M., Wiemann, S. A., & Laczko, R. M. (2006). Citizenship and counterproductive behavior: Clarifying relations between the two domains. *Human Performance*, *19*(4), 441-464.
- Schilling, J. (2009). From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. *Leadership*, *5*(1), 102-128.

- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). *Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland at College Park.
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 138-158.
- Shaw, J. B., Erickson, A., & Harvey, M. (2011). A method for measuring destructive leadership and identifying types of destructive leaders in organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(4), 575-590.
- Skagert, K., Dellve, L., Eklof, M., Poussette, A., & Ahlborg, G. R. (2008). Leaders' strategies for dealing with own and their subordinates' stress in public human service organizations. *Applied Ergonomics*, *39*(6), 803-811.
- Smart, B. D. (1999). *Topgrading*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*, 446-460.
- Stemler, S.E., & Tsai, J. (2008). Best practices in estimating interrater reliability. In J. Osborne (Ed.). *Best Practices in Quantitative Methods* (pp. 29-49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Stouten, J., van Dijke, M., Mayer, D. M., De Cremer, D., & Euwema, M. C. (2013). Can a leader be seen as too ethical? The curvilinear effects of ethical leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 680-695.

- 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.
- Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., Lockhart, D. E., & Carr, J. C. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1169–1180.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 455–465.
- Tichy, N. M., & Bennis, W. G. (2007). Making judgment calls – The ultimate act of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85, 94.
- Treviño, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California Management Review*, 42, 128–142.
- Tsui, A. S. (1984). A role-set analysis of managerial reputation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 64-96.
- Urmson, J. O. (1958). Saints and heroes. In A. I. Melden (Ed.), *Essays in Moral Philosophy* (pp. 198-216). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- Walumba, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure? *Journal of Management*, *34*(89), 89-126.
- Walumba, R. O., Hartnell, C. A., Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(3), 517-529.
- Wang, M., Sinclair, R. R., & Deese, M. N. (2010). Understanding the causes of destructive leadership: A dual process model. In T. Hansbrough & B. Schyns (Eds). *When leadership goes wrong: Destructive leadership, mistakes and ethical failures* (pp. 73-97). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *40*(1), 82-111.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., Lofquist, L. H., & England, G. W. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire (Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation 22)*. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
- Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (1992). The effect of turnover on work satisfaction and mental health: Support for a situational perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*(6), 603-615.

Table 1

*Summary of Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations (Condensed)*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8...
1. PLIS											
2. DLQ											
3. Abusive Supervision											
4. Petty Tyranny											
5. Managerial Derailment											
6. Ethical Leadership											
7. Authentic Leadership											
8. Servant Leadership											
9. Leader Effectiveness											
10. Team Performance											
11. Job Satisfaction											
12. Satisfaction with Supervisor											
13. Turnover Intentions											
14. Counterproductive Work Behavior											
15. Well-being											

*Notes.* Coefficient alphas are located along the diagonal. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ . PLIS= Perceived Leader Integrity Scale. DLQ = Destructive Leadership Questionnaire.

## Demographic Questions for Participants

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
3. Are you currently employed?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
4. Do you work full-time or part-time?
  - a. Full-time
  - b. Part-time
5. How many hours, on average, do you work at your current job per week?
6. How long have you been employed with your current *organization*?
7. Have you been employed with your current supervisor for at least 3 months?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
8. How long have you been employed with your current *supervisor*?
9. Is English your native language?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No [If not, please indicate]
10. In what type of industry do you work?
  - a. Accommodation and Food Services
  - b. Administrative and Support Services
  - c. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting
  - d. Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation
  - e. Construction
  - f. Educational Services
  - g. Finance and Insurance
  - h. Government
  - i. Health Care and Social Assistance
  - j. Information
  - k. Management of Companies and Enterprises
  - l. Manufacturing
  - m. Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction
  - n. Other Services (Except Public Administration)

- o. Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
  - p. Real Estate and Rental Leasing
  - q. Retail Trade
  - r. Self-Employed
  - s. Transportation and Warehousing
  - t. Utilities
11. How well do you know this person you are assessing?
- a. Pretty well
  - b. Somewhat
  - c. Don't know this person well enough to rate
12. What is the gender of your current supervisor?
- a. Male
  - b. Female
13. What of the following best describes your current supervisor's managerial level?
- a. Senior Executive (C-Suite and directly reports to CEO)
  - b. Other Executive (Responsible for multiple businesses)
  - c. General Manager (Head of a division with responsibility for multiple functional units)
  - d. Functional Head (Department head responsible for one functional unit—Sales, HR, IT, etc.)
  - e. Middle-Manager (Within one functional area and has multiple managers reporting)
  - f. Supervisor
  - g. Other