ABSTRACT

Title of Document:	DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE TOXIC LEADERSHIP SCALE
	Andrew A. Schmidt, Master of Science, 2008
Directed By:	Professor Paul J. Hanges, Department of Psychology

While many publications focus on traits and behaviors that make leaders effective, some leaders engage in dysfunctional and destructive behaviors. These "toxic leadership" styles have been largely unexplored. The goals of this study were to empirically derive the dimensions of toxic leadership, to create a reliable and valid survey that measures the construct, to explore convergent and discriminant construct validity, and to perform a preliminary examination of subordinate outcomes that may result from working under a toxic leader. Using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies across military and civilian sectors, this study suggests that toxic leadership is composed of the following five dimensions: abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership, narcissism, self-promotion, and unpredictability. Toxic leadership is differentiable from other leadership constructs (e.g., transformational, LMX) and its dimensions significantly predict employee outcomes such as turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with the supervisor. Implications for future research are discussed.

DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE TOXIC LEADERSHIP SCALE

By

Andrew Alexander Schmidt

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science
2008

Advisory Committee:
Professor Paul J. Hanges, Chair
Associate Professor Paul Tesluk
Associate Professor Cynthia Stevens

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

Leadership has been a focal point of scholarly research for decades, spawning literally thousands of research articles on the topic. While many of these investigations have attempted to discover the specific traits, behaviors, and styles that are associated with successful leadership, few have directly attempted to understand the nature and consequences of dysfunctional leadership (Ashforth, 1994; Kellerman, 2004; Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007; Tierney & Tepper, 2007). We have all experienced bad leaders, and we know the frustration of working under them. However, recent articles in the popular press (Brandel, 2006; Dyck, 2001; Flynn, 1999; Goldman, 2006; Henley, 2003; Korn, 2004; Lester, 2007; Lipman-Blumen, 2005b; Lipman-Blumen, 2005c, Macklem, 2005; Simmons, 2001; Taylor, 2007; West, 2007; Wilson-Starks, 2003) have suggested that there is a unique, more insidious type of dysfunctional leadership. These articles described a unique blend of negative attributes and call it "toxic leadership" because they hypothesized that this leadership style has particularly negative consequences for subordinates and organizations.

Toxic leadership has become a focal interest for many organizations in recent years. For example, the United States military has emphasized the need to define and understand toxic leadership (De Genio, 2002; Reed, 2004; Williams, 2005). Reed writes, "In 2003, Secretary of the Army Thomas E. White asked the U.S. Army War College (AWC) to address how the Army could effectively assess leaders to detect those who might have 'destructive leadership styles.'" (Reed, 2004, p. 67) As an organization in which bad leadership can cost lives, it is sensible that the United

1

States military would attempt to identify toxic leaders and mitigate any harm of these leaders to their subordinates and others. Toxic leadership can have dire consequences in non-military organizations, as well. It has been suggested that toxic leadership can lead to poor employee health and increased benefits costs for the organizations (Dyck, 2001), higher absenteeism and increased employee withdrawal (Macklem, 2005), poor performance and group-think (Wilson-Starks, 2003), and turnover (Flynn, 1999).

Unfortunately, despite increased attention in the popular press, toxic leadership has not been systematically studied (Goldman, 2006; Macklem, 2005). Although the aforementioned lay publications made initial efforts to understand this construct, they lacked empirical support for their claims and every publication had its own definition of toxic leadership. The first step in understanding the construct, therefore, is forming a comprehensive definition of what toxic leadership is and is not. This task is difficult, however, because the term "toxic" has been used to describe a wide variety of dysfunctional leaders. For example, in her list of toxic leaders, Lipman-Blumen (2005a) included a politician who ruled his country and his inner circle by controlling information and instilling fear in his constituents, a CEO who made a series of bad business decisions that left his company bankrupt, and an influential member of the clergy who sexually assaulted young boys. Obviously, the leadership and personal characteristics of these examples vary greatly, and yet they all fell under Lipman-Blumen's definition of "toxic." Another example is Whicker's (1996) taxonomy of toxic leaders. This taxonomy shows similar confusion. Although Whicker made a finer distinction by breaking dysfunctional leadership into

"toxic" and "transitional" categories, even the toxic leader types showed great variability in their displays and degrees of toxicity. Some authors used the term "toxic leadership" to describe people in leadership positions who had clinically-diagnosable mental health disorders (Goldman, 2006). Therefore, little differentiation was made between destructive leaders that were truly toxic, bad leaders that were not toxic but lacked managerial skills, good leaders that were evil people, and leaders with mental health problems.

In this thesis, I hypothesized that toxic leadership is a distinct, specific construct that does not include simple mismanagement, evil intentions, or impaired mental health. Great leaders make bad decisions, and some of the most ill-intentioned people have superior leadership abilities. Leaders suffering from anxiety and/or personality disorders can seek treatment from licensed professionals. But toxic leadership can and should be universally recognized as a unique set of leadership behaviors that negatively impact the subordinate group in predictable ways. These distinctions are critical because they create boundaries around the construct of toxic leadership and enable the development of valid measurement tools to empirically investigate it. The present paper aimed to increase parsimony and promote further scientific investigation by empirically deriving a precise definition of toxic leadership and developing a reliable scale for its measurement.

Defining "Toxic Leadership"

I started my scale development effort by reviewing the current toxic leadership literature to better understand the content and boundaries of this construct. Table 1 shows the definitions of toxic leadership in five of the most frequently cited

publications on this topic. This table also contains the common themes that run

across these definitions. It is apparent from reading the definitions in Table 1 that

each definition covers unique aspects of this construct. This illustrates how the

current state of the toxic leadership construct is amorphous. Although not fully

comprehensive of all toxic leadership publications, my review of this literature

revealed that most authors not included in Table 1 have used one or more of these

definitions for their discussions. Therefore, this list appears to represent the current

understanding of the toxic leadership construct. By examining these key

publications, then, I have identified the most frequently cited elements of toxic

leadership.

From the various definitions presented in Table 1, several common themes

can be identified. First, toxic leaders exhibit an underlying neglect for the well-being

of their subordinates, and may even be harmful or abusive (Flynn, 1999; Lipman-

Blumen, 2005a; Wilson-Starks, 2003). Many toxic leadership articles include stories

of leaders who berate, belittle, and bully their subordinates, who hold subordinates

responsible for things beyond their control or tasks beyond their job descriptions, and

who cause their subordinates to work harder and sacrifice more than is reasonable

(for examples, see: Ambrose, 1992; Frost, 2004; Wilson-Starks, 2003). A second

theme is exemplified by micromanaging to the point where subordinates are cowered

and stifled. Lipman-Blumen (2005a) described this as "stifling constructive criticism

and teaching supporters (sometimes by threats and authoritarianism) to comply with,

rather than to question, the leader's judgment and actions" (p. 20) and Wilson-Starks

(2003) wrote "in a toxic leadership environment, 'yes' people are rewarded and

promoted to leadership roles, while people who more fully engage their mental resources, critical thinking, and questioning skills are shut out from decision-making and positions of influence" (p. 2). Other anecdotes included leaders who demand obedience and who are commandeering. A third common theme indicates that toxic leaders are narcissistic. They have a need to be viewed in a positive light by others coupled with a desire to enhance their own self-image. Toxic leaders were often described as being self-interested, lacking empathy or sensitivity for others, and having inflated opinions of their own importance.

Given this starting point, the remainder of this study describes my attempt to refine the toxic leadership construct. Specifically, I describe a two-part investigation that involved both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. The goals of this study were to empirically derive the dimensions of toxic leadership, to create a reliable and valid survey to measure the construct, to show that the construct converges to other negative leadership styles but is distinct and differentiable from pre-existing leadership constructs, and to perform a preliminary examination of outcomes that may result from working under a toxic leader. I will begin by reviewing relevant constructs of destructive leadership that exist in the academic literature.

Destructive Leadership Styles

Although the academic literature on "toxic leadership" is virtually nonexistent, certain types of destructive leadership styles have been recognized and addressed by scholarly researchers. I will briefly review these negative leadership styles and discuss how they relate to the lay literature on toxic leadership.

The 'Dark Side" of Charisma: Researchers first started investigating negative leadership when they recognized the "dark side" of charismatic leadership (Conger, 1990; Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Conger cited examples of business leaders (i.e. Steve Jobs, Lee Iaccoca) that personify charismatic leadership, and showed that elements of this leadership style have both positive and negative influences on followers and the organization. For example, charismatic leaders are often less formal and more approachable, but these traits can mean that they circumvent appropriate channels of communication and hierarchy, and thus undermine the power structure within the organization (Conger, 1990). Although Conger hinted at the possible negative effects of charismatic leaders, he considered the destructive impact these leaders have on their followers to be unintentional. Leaders were still encouraged to aspire toward charismatic leadership, but with the cautionary note that there can be negative drawbacks in utilizing this style. The "dark side" of charisma opened the academic discussion about negative effects of leaders on their followers and organizations, but did not include leaders who are either intentionally destructive or, at the very least, unrepentant about their destructive behaviors. Therefore, while not fitting well into the construct space of toxic leadership, publications on the 'dark side' of charisma suggested that researchers needed to investigate the negative side of leadership.

Petty Tyranny: Ashforth (1994; 1997) made an initial attempt to study negative leadership styles when he introduced the concept of "petty tyranny," defined as "the tendency to lord one's power over others," (Ashforth, 1997, p. 126). Petty tyranny includes such behaviors as "arbitrariness, self-aggrandizement, belittling

6

others, lack of consideration, a forcing style of conflict resolution, discouraging initiative, and noncontingent punishment." (Ashforth, 1994, p. 755) While often cited in reviews on negative, dysfunctional, and destructive leadership, there are only a handful of articles on petty tyranny and the construct remains undeveloped. Petty tyranny overlaps with some aspects described in the toxic leadership definitions in Table 1, but as Tepper (2000; 2007) describes, it does not necessitate the implication of hostility. Therefore, petty tyranny falls into the same trap as 'dark side' charisma in that it does not necessarily involve hostile actions. The concept of toxic leadership must include the deliberate malice that these leaders display towards others in the workplace. Therefore, the petty tyranny construct overlapped with toxic leadership to a greater extent than the 'dark side' of charisma, but still lacked many of the elements of toxic leadership that are described in Table 1.

Abusive Supervision: Tepper 2000 improved upon the deficiencies in the petty tyranny construct and came even closer to toxic leadership when he introduced the concept of "abusive supervision," defined as "sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact," (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). Abusive supervision is more closely related to toxic leadership because it includes nonverbal and intentional destructive behaviors. Tepper developed his abusive supervision scale by translating a scale of non-physical abuse in romantic relationships to a work context, replacing the reference to a significant other with the words "my boss." Participants responded in the first-person about their interactions with their boss (e.g. "My boss ridicules me.")

Abusive supervision has captured the attention of many researchers in recent years and has spawned serious scholarly discussion. Tepper (2000) found that abusive supervision is associated with higher incidence of turnover, poorer attitudes towards work, greater work/life conflict, poorer perceptions of organizational justice, and increased psychological distress. Other articles have shown that subordinates of abusive supervisors perform fewer organizational citizenship behaviors (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002), experienced decreased job satisfaction (Tepper, Hoobler, Duffy, & Ensley, 2004), and had decreased perceptions of interactional justice and affective commitment to the organization (Aryee, Sun, Chen, & Debrah, 2007). For a comprehensive review of the state of research on abusive supervision, please see Tepper (2007).

Despite a strong series of investigations on abusive supervision, there remain several problems with this construct. Because the scale is worded in a first-person response format, it requires participants to report on behaviors that were directed at them. Many of the toxic leaders discussed in prior publications (e.g. Lipman-Blumen, 2004; Whicker, 1996) and described during the qualitative data collection for this project, however, only chose a small subset of subordinates to victimize. Therefore, while the whole subordinate group might witness toxic leadership behaviors, only a small portion would report positively on Tepper's (2000) abusive supervision scale. In my focus groups, I recorded many stories told by subordinates who did not directly experience abusive behaviors in the way that the abusive supervision scale measures it, but who still reported feeling distressed and being affected by their leaders' toxicity. These "lucky" subordinates were not directly

victimized but still felt the effects of toxic leadership because they were imbedded in the negative climate created by such behaviors and because they felt sympathy for their victimized coworkers. Therefore, a more nuanced way of collecting information about abusive supervision is necessary. A revised scale should not limit respondents to reporting on individual dyadic interactions with their supervisors (i.e. "My boss ridicule me"), but should allow subordinates to report on abusive behaviors that are happening to anyone in the group (i.e. "My boss ridicules subordinates). This is consistent with Chan's (1998) discussion on referent-shift measurement.

Also, there are many non-hostile but abusive work behaviors that are not captured by this scale. Because the scale was adapted from a scale designed to measure romantic relationships, it does not capture important elements that are unique to work situations. Later, I will describe how my revised scale of abusive supervision ameliorates this limitation by empirically deriving items with the intention of applying them to the workplace.

Finally, while abusive supervision certainly qualifies as a toxic leadership style, there is more to the construct domain of toxic leadership than the behaviors measured by the abusive supervision scale. Referring once again to the definitions of toxic leadership in Table 1, it is apparent that abuse is a central component in these definitions, but certainly is not the only one. Abusive supervision does not cover concepts of narcissism or authoritarianism. To include the other factors described as key elements of toxic leadership, a broader, multi-dimensional scale is needed. There are two other nascent literatures on narcissistic and authoritarian leadership that seem to relate to the toxic leadership.

Narcissistic Leadership: "The real disease of many executives, CEOs in particular, is narcissism." (Manfred Kets de Vries quoted in Dearlove, 2003, p. 26) There has been a growing yet fractured literature on the role of narcissism in leadership. Researchers have disagreed about what narcissistic leadership is and how it should be measured. Many of the existing articles on narcissistic leaders consisted of simple case studies (Dreijmanis, 2005; Klass & Hutch, 1986; Post, 1994; 1997; Sheng, 2001; Wasylyshyn, 2005). The theoretical publications on this topic were divided between those that saw narcissistic leadership as a potential positive (Deluga, 1997; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1985) and those viewed it as harmful (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006; Kets de Vries, 1999a). Some authors considered narcissistic leadership to be a distinct leadership style (Kets de Vries, 1999a, Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006) yet others conceptualized narcissistic leadership as overlapping with well-established leadership constructs, such as charismatic leadership (Deluga, 1997; Sankowsky, 1995). A major problem in this literature is distinguishing between narcissistic leaders (people who are high in narcissism and happen to be in leadership positions) and narcissistic leader*ship* (a specific leadership style characteristic of narcissistic traits) (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

Despite the many unresolved issues surrounding the relationship between narcissism and leadership, it seems clear that narcissism is an important component of toxic leadership. Table 1 shows that many definitions include key words indicting narcissism (e.g. "personal inadequacy," "selfish," "enhance the self," motivated primarily by self interest." Other narcissistic personality components, and indeed the term "narcissistic leader" itself, have been included in previously published literature

describing types of toxic leaders. The first publication on toxic leaders described how they suffer from grandiose self-importance and display narcissistic traits (Whicker, 1996). In her more comprehensive set of case studies, Lipman-Blumen (2005) described how narcissism becomes apparent in toxic leaders across industries. In a publication describing toxic leadership in a military setting, Williams (2005) included narcissism as a toxic leader trait.   Finally, in his recent book on toxic managers and subordinates, Lubit (2004) included eight chapters on narcissism and its links to toxic behavior. Specifically, he wrote about the distinction between positive and destructive narcissism, and showed how narcissistic tendencies in managers can have negative effects on subordinates and workplace climate. He then created an eight-part taxonomy of types of destructive narcissism and dedicated a chapter to each type, making links between these particular aspects of narcissism and toxic leadership behaviors. I concur that narcissism is a component of toxic leadership and should be measured as part of this larger construct.

Even with this addition, Table 1 still shows some elements that have not been explained by abusive supervision or narcissistic leadership. These elements of "over-control" and micromanagement might be captured by another nascent leadership construct: authoritarian leadership.

Authoritarian Leadership: Defined as "leader's behavior that asserts absolute authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestionable obedience from subordinates" (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh, 2004, p. 91), "Authoritarian Leadership" is another underdeveloped construct that seems to relate to toxic leadership. The authoritarian leadership construct and the scale to measure it

11

were both created in China as part of a larger examination of paternalistic leadership, so the authors of this scale did not conceptualize authoritarianism as being necessarily toxic or destructive. Authoritarian leadership does, however, capture some important elements of toxic leadership, such as task micromanagement and acting in a commandeering fashion. Although this construct is beginning to capture the attention by some theorists (Aryee, et al., 2007), it has largely been ignored by Western researchers. In fact, Kets de Vries (1999b) specifically noted that he was investigating authoritative, not authoritarian, leadership. One explanation for this oversight might involve the questionable English translation of the scale. The English translation of the items involves multiple grammatical errors and some the items are ambiguously worded and double-barreled, creating methodological issues for use with native English speakers.

In summary, several existing constructs in the leadership literature that may have a connection with toxic leadership have been reviewed. Several conclusions were reached by this review. First, toxic leadership must capture the intentionally destructive behaviors that leaders enact upon their subordinates. Second, toxic leadership is likely a multidimensional construct that includes elements of abusive supervision, narcissism, and authoritarianism. Finally, the destructive behaviors of toxic leaders may affect more people that the specific targets of those behaviors. In other words, even if leaders victimize a small subset of subordinates, others who witness these behaviors may feel the effects of the toxic leader. Therefore, the scale to measure toxic leadership should be written in a third-person response format.

In the next section of this thesis, I describe a two-phase investigation designed to refine the toxic leadership construct. The first phase of this project involved qualitative data collection and analysis. I believed that in-depth interviews would help clarify the boundaries around this construct and refine the dimensions within it. This phase was designed to inform item construction for a quantitative survey. Phase 2 involved administering this survey and quantitatively analyzing the data to create final scales of toxic leadership dimensions.

Although the primary purpose of this study was to develop these dimensional scales, I included several outcome variables (turnover intention, job satisfaction, satisfaction with job, satisfaction with supervisor, and satisfaction with pay) in the Phase 2 survey to test if my scales explained more variance than previously published scales. I will test whether my scales account for more variance than either the Multiphasic Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 1995) or the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) scale (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). I will now discuss Phase 1 of the project and describe the new dimensions of toxic leadership that were discovered using this methodology.

Phase 1: Specification of the content domain of toxic leadership

As stated above, the purpose of Phase 1 was to systematically study the concept of toxic leadership by conducting focus groups. The focus groups were used to identify the dimensions of toxic leadership and clarify the boundaries of this construct. All information obtained from this phase of the project was used to construct items and develop a quantitative scale that will be tested in Phase 2.

For this first phase of the project, I focused on a military population. There were several reasons for choosing this specific sector. First, the initial call for more research on this emerging construct came from military publications (e.g., Reed, 2004; Williams, 2005). Therefore, this is a sector that is open to these types of investigations and is in need to data-driven results. Second, many aspects of military jobs translate to the civilian workplace, the reverse is not true. Military units have heavy workloads, tight deadlines, strict bureaucratic hierarchies, and other elements that are shared by many civilian workers. But military job include the possibility of receiving or intentionally inflicting fatal injuries. Therefore, mistakes in a military context can be fatal, so there are few other industries with the same necessity for excellence-oriented leader behaviors. Third, military leadership is often stereotyped as being somewhat toxic. The yelling, name-calling drill instructor at boot camp is a common archetype. Therefore, leadership that is considered "toxic" in a military context, where expectations (and presumably tolerance) for abusive comments are high, should be considered even more toxic in the civilian sector where people do not expect to be berated by their supervisors. Essentially, I believed that toxic behaviors found in a military context would be generalizable to other civilian sectors because they would have to be extreme to exist beyond the toxic threshold of military personnel and would therefore be very extreme for civilians. By focusing on this population, I hypothesized that a more comprehensive perspective about the nature and effects of toxic leadership might be obtained.

Method for Phase 1

Participants

Participants in the qualitative phase of this investigation were U.S. military personnel. Two officers, 19 officers-in-training, and two ROTC midshipmen provided data during focus groups and interviews. These participants represent three very distinct subgroups within the military hierarchy. In order to explicate the significance of these subgroups, I will briefly review the structure of the U.S. military.

The military rank structure is broken into two tiers. The officers (ranging from Ensign to Admiral in the Navy and from 2nd Lieutenant to General in the Marine Corps) are people who have completed officer training, earned a Bachelor's degree at an accredited 4-year university, and have had experience as leaders of military units. The enlisted (ranging from Seamen Recruit to Master Chief Petty Officer in the Navy and from Private to Sergeant Major in the Marine Corps) personnel are all below the lowest ranking officer, do not necessary have 4-year degrees, but have completed basic training (at a minimum) and serve on active duty. The participants in my study represent a cross-section of these two tiers. The two officers had an average of 24 years of military leadership experience. The officers-in-training were people enrolled in the Officer Candidate School (U.S. Navy) or the Marine Enlisted Commissioning Education Program (U.S. Marine Corps). People enrolled in these two programs, called "OCs" and "MECEPs" respectively, were active duty military personnel that were formally in the enlisted tier and were being trained to cross into the officer tier and receive officer commissions. The Midshipmen were college undergraduates who were participating in ROTC, and had therefore undergone basic and advanced

training, but who had not completed their Bachelor's degree or performed any active duty service in the military. Therefore, the Midshipmen were technically not part of either tier because they were still considered to be in training, but upon receiving their commissions they will graduate directly into the officer tier.

The majority of participants were male (82.6%) and participants' age ranged from 20 to 47 years old with an average age of 27.8 years-old and a median age of 27 years-old. Various levels of military ranks were included ranging from midshipmen to a full Captain and two-time company commanding officer. In addition, the participants varied in terms of their specialization within the U.S. Navy (e.g., Surface Warfare, Naval Intelligence, Cryptology, Aviation). This sample therefore represents a broad cross-section of military leadership.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through a personal contact that served in their military unit. My contact explained the purpose of this investigation to the unit's commanding officers and requested to use time during the unit's weekly meeting for me to conduct focus groups. Access to the commanding officers was restricted, so my contact was an intermediary who secured permission from the officers for me to run the groups. The commanding officers allowed me to conduct a 15-minute presentation to the entire company and then conduct two focus group sessions with smaller groups. I arrived at the site of their weekly meeting and was introduced to the entire group of more than 150 officers, OCs and MECEPs, and ROTC Midshipmen. I gave a short description of the history of destructive leadership in the military, the lack of empirical research on the topic, the military's call for further investigation,

and my plans for conducting the present investigation. At no time during the presentation did I use the word "toxic" or the phrase "toxic leadership." Rather, I used the terms "destructive" and "dysfunctional." After completing the introductory presentation, I asked for volunteers to participate in focus groups. Nine OCs (67% male, 33% female) and ten MECEPs (100% male) volunteered to participate.

I decided to only include OCs and MECEPs in the initial focus groups for several reasons. First, these individuals had served in the Navy or the Marine Corps as enlisted personnel for several years. Therefore, all of them entered the military at the very bottom of the rank structure (as Seamen Recruits or Privates), and had experienced followership. Second, after their initial status at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy, they had all been promoted to the upper ranks of the enlisted tier and served as non-commissioned officers (e.g. chiefs and sergeants), so they also had leadership experience. Third, they were selected to go through officer training programs, so they had been identified by their organizations as having high leadership potential and had shown individual interest in leadership issues. Therefore, they offered a perfect blend of leadership, followership, and the desire to improve both.

After my initial presentation, the group was told that OCs and MECEPs could participate in the focus groups if they were interested. Therefore, participation was completely voluntary, but many were eager to participate, yielding a focus group sample of 19. I decided to split this sample into two separate focus groups. The U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps, despite being under the umbrella organization of the Department of the Navy, represent two very distinct cultures. I was forewarned by my military contact that I would receive very different critical incidents from these

two groups. Thus, before arriving at the unit meeting, I planned to conduct separate

focus groups for people in each branch of the military. I believed that people would

feel more comfortable sharing stories with others in their own branch. I also foresaw

that merging the groups would foster examination of the differences between military

branches rather than commonalities of all toxic leaders. Separating the focus groups

in this manner permitted more effective sessions because the other members of the

focus groups understood the culture, context, and acronyms of their fellow focus

group participants. Incidentally, the large number of volunteers also necessitated

splitting them into separate rooms because focus group methodology relies on small

group (4-12 members) discussion (Seal, Bogart, & Ehrhardt, 1998).

Realizing that I would need to organize two focus groups concomitantly, I

recruited another graduate student to facilitate one of the discussions. This student

has several years of applied work experience at an industrial/organizational

consulting firm located in Washington D.C., and during her tenure she had run focus

groups with the military. Therefore, she had perfectly relevant experience for this

project. I developed a semi-structured focus group interview guide for this project

(see Appendix A) and trained her using this document. We conducted a practice

focus group with graduate students using the questions in the interview guide, and she

led the discussion to understand what types of answers to expect and where to set

parameters around the construct of interest.

Once at the military unit, my research assistant and I split the participants into

two separate rooms based on their military branch. I conducted the MECEP (Marine)

focus group and she conducted the OC (Navy) focus group. Participants were asked

to complete an informed consent form and a demographics questionnaire. The informed consent form included a check-box indicating that participants knew the focus groups would be audio recorded. They were assured that the recordings would remain confidential and that only the researchers would have access to the tapes. There were initial concerns about being recorded, but participants were assured that the recordings would not be given to or played in front of their supervisors. After answering questions and concerns, the recorders were started and the focus groups began.

Focus groups were conducted following the critical incident technique (Andersson & Nilsson, 1964). My research assistant and I used a semi-structured question guide to help lead the discussion. Participants were asked to think of a time when they witnessed or heard about a destructive leader. They were then asked what the leader did (behaviors), how the subordinates reacted (effects), and the circumstances leading up to the incident (context). Facilitators asked probing questions to elicit further information when necessary, and helped spur conversation among participants. Both focus groups filled the allotted time and collected more than 30 stories with toxic leadership elements.

Officers were not included in these initial focus groups. I decided to exclude officers from the group sessions because I wanted the OCs and MECEPs to freely report on any critical incidents pertinent to toxic leadership, even if those incidents involved their current officers. Clearly I could not expect them to report toxic behaviors if the perpetrators of those behaviors were present. Despite my attempts to segregate the officers, however, one Marine officer was skeptical about the purpose

of the research and installed himself in the MECEP focus group. Although there was palpable discomfort at his presence, he left the room after 30 minutes and the MECEPs began to report their experiences more freely. While the initial 30 minutes of that focus group were affected by his presence, the climate change within the group after his exit provided anecdotal support for my decision to separate the officers from the officers-in-training.

Undergraduate ROTC members (Midshipmen) were not included in the focus groups because they were scheduled for a different activity during that meeting. They were told they could volunteer to be interviewed if they were interested in participating and providing information. This change to the research protocol was a compromise reached my military contact and the unit officers without which the undergraduate ROTC members could not participate in the study. Specifically, the unit officers argued that most midshipmen, having recently graduated from high school and gone directly into the military without opportunity for summer jobs, had little experience with leaders in the workplace, let alone toxic leaders. The unit officers also expressed concern that many ROTC students would be eager to participate but carried heavy workloads, and the officers did not want to distract the Midshipmen from their other obligations. The compromise specified that I would provide contact information to all Midshipmen with an offer to schedule individual interviews at a later date should they desire to participate. I composed an email that my contact sent through the unit's email system with my contact information and an offer of participation. Two Midshipmen, one male and one female, both 20 years-old, responded and were interviewed.

After the focus groups were complete, the commanding officer (CO) and executive officer (XO) requested that I meet them in their conference room for a debriefing. This was the first time we met. I told them about the goals of my study, the procedures their subordinates had just undergone, and some of the general themes that were mentioned during the focus groups. The two officers then volunteered to be interviewed, so we scheduled appointments and I returned to their offices to conduct individual interviews with each of them. I conducted these interviews individually. I followed the procedure used for the focus groups for these individual interviews. Specifically, I introduced the topic, the officers completed a demographics questionnaire and an informed consent form, an audio recorder was started, and the interview commenced. In total, two focus groups and four individual interviews were conducted, providing information from 23 participants.

Results of Phase 1

After the focus groups and interviews were completed, transcripts of all qualitative data were written (transcripts available upon request). These transcripts were checked against the original recordings for accuracy. The transcripts were as close to the original verbal information as possible; the only intentional changes involved converting names of real people and ships to pseudonyms to prevent any identifying information in the written interview transcripts. Using these transcripts, I performed a preliminary content analysis to attempt to identify the various themes inherent in the destructive leader descriptions. To perform this content analysis, I highlighted all actions and verbs that were attributed to the toxic leaders. Actions that mirrored the behavioral items in the abusive supervision scale and the Authoritarian

Leadership scale were coded as being part of those dimensions. Actions that mirrored

the definition of narcissism were coded as being part of that dimension. All the

actions and verbs that did not fall into these three dimensions were then qualitatively

assessed to determine the other dimensions that seemed to be thematic in the data. In

the next two sections I will discuss the six dimensions that appeared to arise from the

qualitative data. To support these dimensions, I will include quotes from the

transcripts. It is important to note that some quotes involve elements of more than

one dimension.

Themes from preliminary content validity
On the basis of my review of the transcripts, there appeared to be evidence for three

of the prior negative leadership traits: abusive supervision, authoritarianism, and

narcissism. More specifically, abusive supervision was defined by Tepper (2000) as

"sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical

contact," (p. 178). The following quotes from the interviews appear to be instances

of abusive supervision.[1]

> "…a senior flag officer, who was … overbearing and demanding of his
>
> people, unreasonable demanding of his people, did not respect their free
>
> time…*would berate people*"

> "I had a buddy [who] always had problems with his … staff sergeant
>
> … [*the sergeant was punishing him* through] incentive training, pushups and
>
> stuff. It was to the point where it's like *he never saw anything positive from*
>
> *[his sergeant] and all [the sergeant] did was hate on him* … So I mean he

---

[1] Each quote refers to a different toxic leader. Phrases in italics represent the leadership behavior in question.

may have thought that he was, you know, being a good leader and disciplining, you know, stuff that he felt was wrong, but I think *he took it to the level where it was too much and actually broke down his Marines.*"

"…your subordinates aren't draft animals, you know, that pretty much, that sums it up. You need to know, your people need to know you care about them even on a basic a basic human level."

"[*this officer] was famous for being a screaming, maniacal, jackass….* But he was also one of those guys who *took great delight in seeing, you know, pain, discomfort, awkwardness amongst those he was leading by putting them in bad spots or embarrassing them in front of their peers ..* [He would] see if he can get [his subordinates] ratting each other out, for lack of a better phrase. And *it was brutal, and literally we nicknamed [staff meetings with him] the 'Friday night fights.'*"

In summary, the focus group interviews did produce critical incidents containing behavior that can be categorized as abusive supervision. This suggests that abusive supervision might be an aspect of toxic leadership.

Other critical incidents appeared to suggest the theme of authoritarianism. Authoritarianism has been defined as "behavior that asserts absolute authority and control over subordinates and demands unquestionable obedience from subordinates." (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh, 2004, p. 91). I found many critical incidents appeared to describe this type of leadership. For example,

"Often these guys [are] prestigious … they get to a point where '*You can't tell me I'm wrong, I know how it is, this is the way to do it.*'

And when you try to interject and *tell them they are wrong, they … completely ignore you…*"

"I [was observing a] situation [that] was getting out of hand … I'm junior to [the leader], *trying to tell him it's not going our way and trying to interject, and he's like 'SHUT UP! I've got it*!' At that point, okay fine, I'll shut up. I'll let this fail … *With authoritarian command, there is a point where people [are] beat down. [The leader] said this is what he wants to do, we'll let him do it,* and … he fails ... No one wants to fail, but there is a point they will let the commander fail just because [he] deserves it...."

"…there are some [leaders] that *are so by the book that they can't make a reasonable judgment* and go, 'Yeah, I know that's what the book says but anybody with half a mind would throw the book out because this is the right thing to do here.' Guys who lead from their own fear are worried about what someone else might say and might get in trouble…"

In addition to these negative leadership critical incidents, there was one incident of non-authoritarian leadership:

"Some of the best leaders I've ever had were guys who thought that was the last command they'd ever have…. And its so liberating because a guy by the name of [deleted], ahead of me, was going to retire after the job and knew it and he did things that maybe could have gotten him fired and prevented him from moving up [the chain of command] but he didn't care because he had the freedom to do whatever he thought would help the squadron without worrying about his career. They were gutsy but the

24

troops respected him for it, they LOVED that type of leadership and it's

so liberating."

In summary, my initial evaluation of the transcripts suggested that authoritarianism

was also a theme of toxic leadership.

Finally, the Navy personnel also seemed to be describing narcissistic

leadership. As indicated earlier, "narcissistic leadership occurs when leaders' actions

are principally motivated by their own egomaniacal needs and beliefs, superseding

the needs and interests of the constituents and institutions they lead." (Rosenthal &

Pittinsky, 2007, p. 631) There are several incidents of narcissistic leadership in the

transcripts.

"….*because they're so good, and they think they can disregard the*

rules and procedures and skills and they think the rules don't apply"

"*He craved approval. He couldn't move without getting that "atta*

boy" or a pat on the back…"

"*I think a pretty common characteristic these people are forming their*

own personal ideas in a complete vacuum without the input of others on how

to make that vision better, how to make that vision achievable…"

In summary, the focus groups appeared to suggest that some of the previous

literature on toxic leadership might have identified aspects of this construct. Namely,

my review of the transcripts appears to suggest themes of abusive supervision,

authoritarianism, and narcissism.

However, I also found that there were other quotes that suggested additional

behaviors that could not be captured by these three aforementioned themes.   After

reviewing the transcripts and attempting to make sense of the commonalities in the examples, I hypothesized that there might be three additional themes contained in the transcripts. Specifically, I believe that these three factors are self-promotion, unpredictability, and unprofessional behaviors.

Self-Promotion: As discussed above, there appeared to be evidence for narcissism in the transcripts. However, this theme did not appear to fully capture the focus group data. Narcissism focuses on self-oriented actions designed to primarily enhance the self to itself. In contrast to this focus, many of the quotes from the focus groups appear to center around a theme of enhancing the impression of the self to others. For example:

> "…*when [leaders] try and make themselves look better* there is a huge loss of respect."

> "[The leaders did] not worry about troop welfare; *they're just worried about themselves getting their good. They're worried about, 'I want to get promoted to captain, I want to make major one day.'*"

> "…if that individual is *concerned with the process of advancement and personal accolade it generally leads to a toxic environment*."

> "[When] these *guys are trying to make flag [admiral] and that's all they're ever driven for*, that comes through, their true colors show through. '*He's just chasing that star*,' and there's a loss of respect. *He's not in it for us; he's in it for him*."

> "…he *presented an image of himself that was untouchable* and he would go out of his way constantly to help you if it wouldn't put a bad spin on

his name…but if someone got in a shady situation that he needed help out of it, he would be like, 'I don't want anything to do with this, *I don't want to have anything to do with any situation that has the possibility of bringing me down with you*.'"

"*…they tended to take a lot of credit upon themselves in really obvious and blatant manners for achievements of their subordinates*."

"There was an issue … and I thought it was my fault or our fault or shop's fault … I said 'hey this is our fault I'll take responsibility for that.' But I went down there and told [my Master Sergeant] and *he says 'No you should never do that you should always, you know, deny responsibility pass the buck, pass it up.*' … if his method of putting out the fires is to deny responsibility, that's not bringing me up to be an effective leader at some point. If other Marines are seeing you deny responsibility and passing it up that's - it sort of breaks you down and breaks down your shop and breaks everything down … I thought it was weak of him to say that."

"…the *platoon sergeant started to play politics. He would do things and then he would blame it on the officer and it was his own choice* … he was saying stuff to the officer that we were doing things [incorrectly] and then he would come out and tell us that the officer wanted us to do something. And so basically *he was lying to both sides just so he could get his end* … and it ended up just destroying the platoon."

These quotes appear to center around a theme of self-promoting behaviors designed to influence or flatter others, usually those in authority. It should be noted that while these quotes includes sycophantic behaviors, many of the critical incidents

did not involve the presence of senior leaders. It is for that reason that this theme

seems more appropriately labeled "self-promotion," indicating that these behaviors

could be present even if senior leaders are not.

This self-promoting theme is a related but still conceptually distinct element

of toxic leadership that has not been covered by previous theories. Indeed, many of

the abusive, authoritarian, and narcissistic behaviors used by toxic leaders are

performed with the intention of promoting and maintaining the image of the leaders

to senior level supervisors. One of the items in the abusive supervision scale is "My

boss blames me to save himself/herself from embarrassment," which clearly includes

a self-promoting explanation for a toxic leadership behavior. Although this one item

implies an element of self-promotion in abusive supervision, this aspect is

overwhelmed by the other items in the abusive supervision scale. Thus, self-

promotion dimension has never been explored independently in the existing literature.

Based on this assessment, I hypothesized that the theme of self-promotion

could be a dimension of toxic leadership. These quotes suggest that some leaders act

in ways that promote their own interests above and beyond the interest of the units

they are leading, usually with the intention of maintaining a positive image to upper

levels of the leadership hierarchy.

Unpredictability: The majority of the toxic leadership literature focuses on

providing support or suggestions about how to handle a toxic leader (e.g. Dyck, 2001;

Taylor, 2007). Implicit in this literature is that toxicity is a stable trait. That is, the

leader always is toxic. Similarly, the academic leadership literature also implicitly

assumes that the negative traits of leaders, such as abusive, petty tyranny, and

authoritarianism, are consistent aspects of a leader's behavior. In fact, the very definition of abusive supervision is that the leader hostility be sustained (Tepper, 2007). More specifically:

> "Abusive supervision involves continuing exposure to hierarchical mistreatment – a boss who has a bad day and takes it out on his or her subordinates by exploding at them would not be considered an abusive supervisor *unless such behavior because a regular feature of his or her repertoire*." (Tepper, 2007, p. 265)

While I agree that leaders who engage in these destructive behaviors relatively frequently would be considered "toxic," many of the quotes from the focus groups identified a different dimension of toxicity. For example:

> "I would *rather have a consistent asshole rather than an inconsistent civil [leader]*."

> "*….the inconsistent guy …if he had his file cap on, and it was pushed back like this, it was a good day, you could talk to him. If it wasn't, you knew he was in a bad mood*. You would look at him and say, '*what is the weather today? Is he going to be an asshole today or what?'* And that wasn't even always the barometer. [Sometimes he would change the angle of his cap in the middle of a conversation]. It was just miserable. You were more worried about how he was going to receive this [new information]. And you're more worried about that than doing the actual job."

> "… there was one lieutenant who had gotten into trouble for something minor but enough to constitute a [review with the commanding

officer]. [*His leader] told him to his face, 'You're a great worker. I'm going to take care of you.' And in front of the captain he sold him up the river.* I saw it and this guy was dumbfounded and he came up to me after and was like, 'I can't believe that just happened.'"

"I've been in [a situation] where your [*mid-level manager] will come in and talk to you and then the next thing comes in and all of sudden you're hearing something totally different than you just heard five minutes ago.* And you're standing there like, 'I'm not retarded, I'm not deaf.' …there is no trust, you'll never know what to believe that comes out of their mouth."

These quotes suggest that while negative behavior has negative effects, unpredictable negative behavior might exasperate the negative results. Therefore, I hypothesized that unpredictability would be a dimension of toxic leadership.

Unprofessional Behaviors: Finally, the last category of critical incidents seemed to center around unprofessional acts committed by leaders that resulted in subordinate disapproval and disenchantment. For example:

"…guys who were *terrific pilots but cheated on their wives … that's immoral*…And the other real challenge is the followers who think that this guy is the greatest guy and the other stuff doesn't matter, but then there are those who see that morals are important and they don't respect him, so then you have a divided command which is certainly unhealthy."

"*Character and integrity [are crucial]. Quickest way to lose respect, particularly in the military, particularly in aviation [is to lack integrity].* I gotta trust you with my life; I gotta fly your weight and go into combat with

you. If I can't trust you, I don't want you here. And it's interesting too because there are the stereotypes of the fighter pilot, womanizer and all that, but you know that while that's the 'living the dream' type thing, it can also be very damaging…if you got a life partner or a wife and you are doing that to her [committing adultery], how can I expect to trust you with me?"

"I saw some of my staff sergeants coming down on subordinate Marines for being overweight when they couldn't run a first-class [personal fitness test] themselves … But even the *drinking and the way they would carry themselves out in town would directly conflict with how they were expecting the marines to present themselves. So that was a big thing, it's you know, one of our main leaderships, 'lead by example.'"*

These critical incidents indicate that subordinates expect their leaders to set personal examples of professional conduct. Subordinates assess their leader actions both on- and off-duty. Thus, this theme was labeled "unprofessionalism."

In summary, my review of the transcripts suggests that there might be six dimensions of toxic leadership. Three of these dimensions (i.e., abusive supervision, authoritarianism, narcissism) were discussed in the leadership previously. However, the critical incidents also suggested three new dimensions (i.e., self-promotion, unpredictability, unprofessionalism) of toxic leadership. While this prior analysis was promising, any conclusions can only be viewed as tentative. The next step in Phase 1 is to more systematically gather Q-Sort information from others.   This more formal Q-Sort procedure will provide a more solid framework for the hypothesized toxic leadership dimensions.

Q-sort Coding

I categorized the critical incidents into the six aforementioned toxic leadership dimensions. I began the task of creating a survey for the Phase 2 quantitative analysis. For all critical incidents, I identified four components. The first component focused on the actual leader behavior described in the critical incident. Actions and verbs in the critical incidents relating to leaders were coded as "behaviors." The second component focused on the antecedents that lead up to the leader behavior. Adjectives and personality dimensions contained in the critical incidents were coded as "antecedents." The third component focused on subordinate reactions to the leader's behavior. Subordinate actions and verbs described in the critical incident were coded as "subordinate reactions." The final component focused on the context surrounding each leader behavior. Any descriptions of situations contained in the critical incidents were coded as "context." This coding scheme mirrors the pieces of a critical incident statement and the parallels the probes that were used by focus group facilitators to elicit these critical incidents. While the primary focus of the qualitative phase of this project was to collect toxic leader behavior, the other three components might prove useful for future theory development and model building.

After completing this coding of the critical incidents, I wrote items that captured the highlighted behaviors in each incident. For example, one participant said, "But he was also one of those guys who took great delight in seeing, you know, pain, discomfort, awkwardness, amongst those he was leading by putting them in bad spots or embarrassing them in front of their peers." I generated two items (i.e., "Sets subordinates up for failure"; "Publicly embarrasses subordinates") from this critical incident. After coding all the responses, 157 items were created (for complete list of

items, see Appendix B). These items were subjected to a Q-Sort to determine

whether raters unfamiliar with the toxic leadership literature or the original

transcripts.

Q-Sort Method

Seven PhD students at a large mid-Atlantic university who had all been

trained in psychometric theory but who were unfamiliar with toxic leadership

literature were asked to perform a Q-Sort. Each student was given a list of the 189

items including those I derived from the focus groups and the previously published

items on abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership[2], and narcissism[3]. They were

also given brief definitions of the six hypothesized dimensions along with the three

previously published dimensions (i.e., Abusive Supervision, Authoritarian

Leadership, and Narcissism). For these previous dimensions, the Q-Sorters were

given the definitions published in the original journal articles. Specifically, I used the

definition for abusive supervision found in Tepper (2000). The definition for

Authoritarian Leadership came from Cheng et al. (2004) and the definition for

Narcissism came from Rosenthal and Pittinsky (2006). The Q-Sorters were asked to

categorize each item. These raters were asked to take notes for any items that they

felt fit into more than one dimension or did not fit into any dimension. A complete

---

[2] Items from the Authoritarian Leadership Scale (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh, 2004) had to be edited because their original format contained numerous grammatical errors, double-barreled, and ambiguous items. These problems were probably due to a poor translation of the scale from its original Mandarin version into English. I revised the items, splitting the double-barreled item into two separate pieces, and fixing grammatical errors to create a cleaner 10-item version of the scale. Edits were made to keep the items as close to the original format as possible.

[3] To date there is no scale of narcissistic leadership, therefore items of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1979) were adapted to pertain to leaders (more details in the 'Measures' section).

table of the Q-Sort items, dimensional definitions, and Q-Sorter responses can be found in Appendix B.

Once Q-Sorters completed their responses, I created a table of the Q-Sorter responses for each item. A meeting was held with all Q-Sorters to discuss their responses. At this meeting, we assessed the agreement among Q-Sorters. If an item was placed in the same category by five of the seven Q-Sorters, it was determined that there was agreement about the dimensional category for this item. When less than 5 raters categorized an item into the same dimension, a discussion ensued to determine how to remove the ambiguity of the item. As a result of these discussions, items were reworded or eliminated.

Q-Sorters also discussed the dimensional structure of the data. From this discussion, several conclusions were drawn. First, five of the dimensions received widespread support: Abusive Supervision, Authoritarian Leadership, Self-Promotion, Narcissism, and Unpredictability. The sixth dimension, Unprofessional Behaviors, proved to be very controversial. There was very little agreement about what was considered "unprofessional." The Q-Sort participants debated the definition of the term, the behaviors that would qualify, and believed that behaviors can be considered professional or unprofessional based on the contextual factors surrounding the actions. Ultimately, it was decided that all toxic leadership behaviors are unprofessional, including those that are clearly in other dimensions (e.g. "Ridicules subordinates" is an item in the Abusive supervision scale but is clearly not what should happen in a professional environment). The nuances of the unprofessional items were behaviors such as spousal adultery, illicit fraternization, dishonorable

actions, etc. My Q-Sort participants noted that many of these behaviors are not conducted in the workplace and the likelihood that subordinates would directly witness such behavior is fairly unlikely.

Upon reflection, I suggested to the Q-Sort participants that perhaps unprofessionalism was an artifact of my sample. The officer corps of the U.S. military prides itself on honor, integrity, and professionalism. Therefore, behaviors that erode perceptions of these values, even when the officers are off-duty, are not only discouraged but are actively prosecuted. There are legal consequences for off-duty unprofessionalism. Indeed, as indicated in one of the quoted incidents above, professionalism is implicitly translated as the target's ability to save a life in battle. Therefore, people in the military are particularly sensitive to the level of professional behaviors of their coworkers. Further, military lifestyle involves a unique blend of personal and professional life because sailors and soldiers live in close quarters, even away from "the office," so they know when illicit behaviors are occurring away from the workplace. Ultimately, the Q-Sort participants decided that all toxic leader behaviors are unprofessional. Further, they concluded that unprofessional behaviors are less likely to generalize to the civilian workplace. After some discussion of these points, we decided that it would be best to drop this dimension in Phase 2.

The other major discussion in the Q-Sort meeting involved the bi-dimensionality of the abusive supervision scale. The Q-Sort participants believed that this dimension included two factors: abuse of subordinates and abuse of power. After some discussion and debate about which items would fit into each factor, we decided to maintain the single factor structure of the Abusive supervision dimension. To

verify this decision, I asked an eighth graduate student to undergo the same Q-Sort procedure as the prior Q-Sorters except for one change. While this eighth rater saw all of the items that the original Q-Sorters saw, I removed the unprofessionalism dimension and split the Abusive supervision dimension into the two factors suggested by the original Q-Sort participants. This final Q-Sort participant reported that he had a hard time distinguishing between the two Abusive dimensions and also said that the items in the unprofessionalism dimension were difficult to categorize because *all* of the items were "unprofessional." Further, he suggested that these items had more to do with ethics or morality than professionalism. Indeed, the larger discussion with the original seven Q-Sorters had also diverted into one of morality and ethics when the unprofessional behaviors category was discussed. Therefore, I realized that this dimension might be capturing a morality component of leadership that is much more salient in military contexts. As a result of this additional information, and with the goal of making my final scales generalizable across leadership contexts, I removed the unprofessionalism dimension from my survey. However, I decided that the dimensionality of the abusive supervision dimension would be examined in a more formal manner by analyzing the quantitative Phase 2 data.

In summary, at the conclusion of the Q-Sort process, 105 items remained. The Q-Sort results provided more support for five toxic leadership dimensions (Abusive Supervision, Authoritarianism, Narcissism, Self-Promotion, and Unpredictability). In the next section of this study, I discuss the quantitative phase of this study. The purpose of the quantitative analysis was to assess the psychometric properties and dimensionality of the items derived from Phase 1. Specifically, this

phase sort to determine whether the there are five separable dimensions of toxic leadership.

Phase 2: Quantitative Assessment of Toxic Leadership Scales

The goal of Phase 2 was to more systematically assess the dimensionality of toxic leadership as well as demonstrate that toxic leadership provides unique information not captured by previous constructs discussed in the leadership literature. From the Phase 1 analysis, several hypotheses regarding the factor structure were derived:

> *Hypothesis 1: Factor analyses will support a five factor toxic leadership model.*

Following the results of the Phase 1 Q-Sort, this hypothesis indicates that an unprofessionalism dimension will not materialize and abusive supervision items will not separate into the two factors.

In addition to the goal of specifying the content domain of toxic leadership and creating scales measuring this construct, I also had the goal of demonstrating the unique contribution of this construct over more traditional leadership constructs. Toward this goal, I incorporated five outcome variables into the Phase 2 survey: turnover intention and four satisfaction items (i.e. satisfaction with job, coworkers, supervisor, and pay). I was primarily interested in the unique predictive utility of toxic leadership on job satisfaction and satisfaction with the supervisor. The other satisfaction constructs were included to obscure the blatancy of responding to the outcome measures after responding to 157 items about positive and destruction leadership. The Phase 2 survey also included pre-existing measures of positive

leadership (Leader-Member Exchange and transformational leadership) and pre-existing measures of negative leadership (abusive supervision and authoritarian leadership).

Transformational leadership, as measured by the Multiphasic Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 1995), has been thoroughly researched and conceptualized as a positive, ideal leadership style. Since the transformational component of the MLQ is rated in a positive direction and includes subscales that measure the quality of the relationship between leaders and subordinates (e.g. Individual Consideration, Inspirational Motivation), I expected to find a significant negative correlation between toxic leadership dimensions and transformational leadership.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant negative correlation between ratings on the toxic leadership dimensions and the rating of transformational leadership.

Similarly, the LMX scale (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975) is a measure of the positive aspects of the relationship between subordinate and supervisor, and I expected that the strength of this relationship would be negatively related to a leader's level of toxicity. I therefore expected strong negative correlations between leader toxicity and LMX.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a significant negative correlation between ratings on the toxic leadership dimensions and the rating of Leader-Member Exchange.

In terms of outcome variables, I was interested primarily in how toxic leadership would correlate with job satisfaction and satisfaction with the supervisor. I hypothesized that since toxic leader behaviors have harmful impacts on subordinates, ratings of toxic leadership would be negatively correlated with ratings of satisfaction with the supervisor.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a significant negative correlation between ratings on the toxic leadership dimensions and the rating of satisfaction with the supervisor.

Further, I expected that reporting to a toxic leader would negatively impact job satisfaction because experiencing these toxic behaviors would mar the subordinate's perceptions of the job as a whole.

Hypothesis 5: There will be a significant negative correlation between ratings on the toxic leadership dimensions and the rating of job satisfaction.

Although support for these hypotheses would provide initial construct validity for the toxic leadership scales, it is critical to demonstrate that toxic leadership uniquely predicts these outcome variables.

The Phase 1 critical incidents were useful for developing hypotheses regarding toxic leadership and these outcome measures. Some critical incidents collected during my focus group and interview sessions described coworkers that bonded together as a result of their shared negative experiences with a toxic leader. Thus, this implies that toxic leadership should not be related to turnover intentions. Further, the critical incidents also described some subordinate teams devolving into physically assaulting each other because of their leader's toxic influence. Because I

collected evidence to show that toxic leaders could both facilitate and impair

coworker relations, I expected these effects to counteract each other and show no

significant relationships. Although coworkers might be implicated in toxic leadership

(either as victims or as toxic cronies), I did not expect toxic leader behavior to

significantly predict satisfaction with coworkers. Similarly, I expected satisfaction

with pay to be orthogonal to toxic leadership. Many toxic leaders are found in senior

management, so the upper-level and middle managers who report directly to them

might be well-compensated, but still suffer from their leaders' toxicity. These

individuals may be happy with the pay but unhappy with their supervisors, and

therefore leader toxicity would not predict this particular satisfaction outcome.

Conversely, I did expect to find that ratings of toxic leadership to predict job

satisfaction and satisfaction with supervisor. These outcome variables are more

directly impacted by toxic leadership behaviors, and thus should show significant

relationships.

> *Hypothesis 6: Ratings on the Toxic Leadership Scale will significantly predict*
> *ratings of job satisfaction.*
>
> *Hypothesis 7: Ratings on the Toxic Leadership Scale will significantly predict*
> *ratings of satisfaction with the supervisor.*

One of the critiques of studying destructive leadership is that these negative

behaviors can be measured as the opposite of more traditional constructs of positive

leadership such as transformational leadership and LMX. I believe that toxic

leadership is not merely the opposite of these constructs, nor is it a lack of these

transformational and relationship-building behaviors, but is instead a separate

construct. Thus, I expect that toxic leadership will predict ratings on the five outcome variables of turnover and satisfaction over and beyond the variance accounted for by either transformational leadership or LMX.

Hypothesis 8: The toxic leadership scales will explain more variance in the turnover and satisfaction variables than the transformational leadership scale.

Hypothesis 9: The toxic leadership scales will explain more variance in the turnover and satisfaction variables than the LMX scale.

Hypothesis 10: The toxic leadership scales will explain more variance in the turnover and satisfaction variables, even when controlling for both the LMX scale and the transformational leadership scale.

One of the goals of this study is to show that the empirically derived scales of toxic leadership improve upon pre-existing scales of destructive leadership. Therefore, I expect my dimensions of toxic leadership to explain a significant amount of variance in the outcome variables, even when controlling for the previously published abusive supervision scale.

Hypothesis 11: The toxic leadership scales will explain more variance in the turnover and satisfaction variables than the abusive supervision scale.

Method for Phase 2

Participants

A total of 218 people participated in this phase of the project. Participants were recruited using the snowball sampling method (Goodman, 1961). More specifically, undergraduate students at a large mid-Atlantic University were told they

would receive extra credit in upper-level psychology courses if they obtained two surveys from adults over the age of 18 who worked at least 20 hours per week. As a result, the participant pool is extremely broad. Of the 218 total participants, 105 indicated that they were male and 110 indicated that they were female. The participants ranged in age from 19 to 72 with the average age being 45.5 years-old (s.d. = 12.6). Participants worked in a variety of industries including retail, finance, healthcare, telecommunications, and government, among many others. For a complete table of job titles and industries of the participants, refer to Appendix C. Their levels of employment vary between entry-level workers such as cashiers and baristas, and corporate executives such as CEOs and CFOs.

Measures

A copy of the survey distributed to participants is contained in Appendix D. As can be seen in this appendix, the first page of the survey included demographic questions designed to gather information regarding participants' age, sex, occupation, tenure at their current workplace, intention to turnover, reasons for turnover, and military service. The military service component of the demographics sheet asked about their military status, branch (Army, Navy, etc.), warfare community (Aviation, Surface Warfare, etc.), length of service, and pay grade.

The survey included an informed consent form, a demographics questionnaire, and four sections of items. The first section consisted of the 105 items vetted through the Phase 1 Q-Sort procedure. These 105 items consisted of 80 items that I wrote and that survived the Q-Sort method, the 15-item Abusive Supervision Scale (Tepper, 2000), and a revised version of the 10-item Authoritarian Leadership Scale (Cheng,

Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh, 2004). The items were randomly distributed in the final survey. All items used a 6-point Likert scale response format, with answers ranging between "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." I decided to make the Likert scale include 6 points without a neutral point because the nature of the questions makes a neutral point hard to interpret. Kulas, Stachowski, and Haynes (in press) show that neutral points on Likert response scales are often used as "dumping grounds" for unsure responses even when participants are instructed to skip the questions if they are unsure of the answers. Also, Kulas et al. found that a neutral point is often used a proxy for "Not Applicable (N/A)." Given these two tendencies, I followed Kulas et al.'s recommendation against using neutral points in Likert response scales and formatted my scales to create a forced choice for participants.

I designed my scales with an Agree-Disagree response format. Although Tepper (2007) discusses the frequency of abusive behaviors as an important aspect of the construct, and Avolio and Bass (1995) use frequency in the MLQ, Kline (2005) discussed the difficulties of using this type of response format. Kline acknowledged the utility of frequency-based response scales in certain circumstances, but warned that their interpretation could differ between participants. Each participant's conceptualization of "often" could be different. Further, these conceptualizations could differ between participants and researchers as well, causing researchers to interpret results based on their own perceptions of what "often" means. Kline also wrote that the utility of frequency-based response scales is founded on a solid understanding of the proper anchors for each point of the scale. Therefore, in order to be meaningful, a frequency-based response scale must specify temporal categories for

43

each response point, and these categories must be relevant to the construct being studied. For example, researchers investigating team processes must know how often the team interacts if they are to construct an appropriate scale. Maybe the team members only communicate every few weeks, making an anchoring point of "Every few minutes" meaningless and another anchoring point of "Once each month" useful. But a team that works together every day might not need the "Once each month" anchoring point because they communicate much more frequently than that. Ultimately, frequency-based response scales must be appropriate for the construct of interest. Finally, the assumption with these scales is that frequency is a good indicator of impact. Research on the techniques used in job analysis shows that job tasks must be weighted by both frequency and importance (Gatewood, Field, & Barrick, 2008) because frequency alone is not always a good indicator of impact.

Based on these criticisms, I decided not to use a frequency-based scale and opted to use an Agree/Disagree scale instead. I could not create specific temporal anchoring points for toxic leadership because I did not know what timeframes would be appropriate, and those points would probably differ across toxic leaders. Further, frequency is not a good indicator of impact when referring to critical incidents of toxic leadership. A toxic leader may not engage in toxic behaviors often, but this does not necessarily minimize their impact on subordinates. A violent outburst of belittling behavior could be impactful and painfully remembered for a long period of time, allowing the toxic effects to permeate the subordinate group despite the low frequency of the initial toxic behaviors. Finally, given that the Phase 1 data suggested that unpredictability might be a key component of toxic leadership, this negates the

utility of a frequency-based response scale because unpredictability necessitates that toxic leaders do not maintain consistent patterns of behavior. Therefore, I believe the response scale I chose best captures the subordinate perceptions of leader behavior.

The next two sections of the survey were included to show discriminant validity, and included the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) scale (Dansereau et al., 1975) and the Multiphasic Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 1995). The full MLQ was included and measured on a 5-point Likert scale response format ('Not at All' to 'Frequently, if not Always') The original 7-point Likert scale response format ('Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree') was maintained for the LMX scale.

The final section of the survey consisted of four items measuring satisfaction. These variables were included to provide a very preliminary look at outcomes of toxic leadership. The responses to these items were measured using the Kunin (1955) Faces Scale. This is single-item measure asks participants to rate their satisfaction according to a string of six faces with different expressions. The happiest face is coded as a "1" while the least happy/angry face is coded as a "6." A meta-analysis of single-item satisfaction measures, including the Kunin (1955) Faces Scale, shows that the minimum reliability is estimated to be close to .70 (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997), making this scale a reasonable measure of satisfaction. Participants rated satisfaction with their jobs, their coworkers, their supervisors, and their pay. Of the four satisfaction variables, I was particularly interested in satisfaction with the supervisor, which should be highly related to toxic leadership behaviors.

Finally, two different versions of the survey were distributed. The first version asked participants to respond to all items in reference to "My Current Supervisor." The second version asked participants to respond to all items in reference to the "The Most Destructive Supervisor I have Experienced." This manipulation was included to provide further evidence of discriminant validity by showing that the items can distinguish between a toxic and non-toxic boss. It is important to note that some respondents' current supervisors are toxic, so although they received the first version of the survey they were still reporting on destructive leaders.

Procedures

Students were given three copies of the survey before a major national holiday and asked to give surveys to their family members, then to return two completed copies after the holiday. I received 110 of the "Current Supervisor" and 108 of the "Most Destructive Supervisor I have Experienced" surveys.

Analyses

To refine the final scales for each of the five dimensions, the data were subjected to a Maximum Likelihood factor analysis with a Varimax rotation. The factor analysis was conducted in the following manner. First, the data were separated according to the type of supervisor being rated by respondents (i.e., 'Current Supervisor' vs. 'Most Destructive Supervisor I have Experienced'). This was done so that mean differences between type of supervisor being rated would not influence the factor solution and thus, the final scale would exhibit measurement equivalence across these two groups. Second, the factor analyses were initially conducted

46

separately for each dimension. The number of factors that were extracted from each Q-sort dimension set of items was determined by keeping factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 (i.e., Kaiser rule). If more than a single factor emerged, the items were examined to determine if they should be retained. Items that dual-loaded on multiple factors, items that did not load on any factors, and items that covered similar territory in the construct domain as other items, were generally eliminated. However, all of the items were qualitatively assessed to determine whether they covered an important domain of the initial construct. Items that were evaluated as tapping an important aspect of the construct that would have been lost if the item was dropped were retained. In this way, the scales for each of the five dimensions were trimmed until all items loaded on one factor and the breadth of the original construct domains was covered. After conducting these separate factor analyses, one final factor analysis was performed in which items from all five dimensions were entered into a single Maximum likelihood factor analysis with an Oblimin rotation. This rotation was more appropriate at this stage because the five separate factors should be correlated with one another. A five-factor solution was forced upon the items. At this point, the few dual-loading items were eliminated and the five scales were finalized.

After the factor analyses were completed, a series of regressions and hierarchical regressions were conducted to assess the degree to which toxic leadership predicted the five outcome variables. The next section describes the results of these analyses.

Results of Phase 2

As indicated above, I first conducted a five factor analyses in which each analysis focused on only those items for a particular dimension. The purpose of these analyses was to test the unidimensionality of each of the proposed toxic leadership scales. Table 2 shows the factor loadings obtained for these five separate factor analyses.

After conducting these separate factor analyses, one final factor analysis was performed in which items from all five dimensions were entered into a single Maximum likelihood factor analysis with an Oblimin rotation. Table 3 shows the item loadings for the five-factor solution. These results show that the factor analysis supported a five-factor solution, lending full support to Hypothesis 1. The items for each dimension of toxic leadership can be seen in Appendix E. Note that each of the five scales has high reliability (Abusive Supervision: $\alpha = 0.93$, Authoritarian Leadership: $\alpha = 0.89$, Narcissism: $\alpha = 0.88$, Self-Promotion: $\alpha = 0.91$, Unpredictable Leadership: $\alpha = 0.92$).

Finally, I created an overall composite score of toxic leadership. Specifically, I created this composite score by standardizing all the dimensional scales separately and then adding the z-scores together for each individual item. This transformation ensured that each of the original dimensional scales had equal influence on the final composite score.

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics and correlations among the scales for each of the five toxic leadership dimensions, the Toxic Leadership Scale composite, transformational leadership, LMX, the original abusive supervision and authoritarian leadership scales, laissez-faire leadership, contingent reward, and management by

48

exception. All correlations among these scales are significant at the $p < .01$ level. I

asserted that the five dimensions of toxic leadership would be related to one another,

so finding strong positive correlations among them is not surprising. Further, the

Toxic Leadership Scale composite and its five dimensional scales all show significant

negative correlations with transformational leadership and LMX. Therefore,

Hypotheses 2 and 3 were fully supported. The next section describes a more rigorous

analysis I performed to establish convergent and discriminant validity.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity

It is clear from the high correlations in Table 4 that there is convergence

between the toxic leadership subscales and previously published scales of negative

leadership. Although convergent validity has been established, it is important to

show that toxic leadership also has discriminant validity from these other measures.

To test for discriminant validity, all correlations were z-transformed following

Formula 1:

$$z = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{1 + r_{xy}}{1 - r_{xy}} \right) \qquad (1)$$

The z scores associated with the convergent validity relationships (i.e., average

among the toxic leadership scales) were averaged. The same were done for the z

scores associated with the discriminant validity relationships (i.e., correlations

between the toxic leadership scales and the transformational leadership and LMX

scales). I included the LMX scale in the discriminant validity correlations despite the

fact that LMX measured the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship and

that leader toxicity describes a negative relationship. Specifically, I decided to

examine discriminant validity both with and without LMX. After averaging the z

scores, I converted the averages back into correlations using Formula 2:

$$r = \frac{\left(e^{2z} - 1\right)}{\left(e^{2z} + 1\right)} \qquad (2)$$

The average convergent correlation was 0.75 (which corresponds to an average z-

score = 1.003). The average correlation for the discriminant validity, including the

LMX scales, was -.65 (average z-score = -.77). Excluding the LMX scale, the

average discriminant validity was -.61 (average z-score = -.71). The difference

between these two convergent and discriminant validities can be determined by using

the following formula:

$$z = \frac{\left(\bar{z}_{convergent} - \bar{z}_{divergent}\right)}{\sqrt{\dfrac{2}{n-3}}} \qquad (3)$$

In this formula, $\bar{z}_{convergent}$, $\bar{z}_{divergent}$, and n represent the average z score for the

convergent validities, the average z-score for the divergent validities, and sample size,

respectively. To create a fair comparison of these two types of validities, I took the

absolute value of the discriminant validities so that any significant difference between

convergent and discriminant validity was not attributable to the direction of the scale

but rather to the difference in magnitude between the convergent and discriminant

validities. The z-difference between the convergent and divergent validities,

including both transformational leadership and LMX, was 2.39 ($p < .01$). This z-

difference increased to 3.03 ($p < .01$) when LMX was removed. These scores show

that there is a significant difference at the $p < .01$ level between convergent and

discriminant validity of the Toxic Leadership Scale with other leadership scales.

Thus, even though the LMX and MLQ scales were related to the toxic leadership

scales, the degree of convergence among the toxic leadership scales was greater than

the relationship between the toxic leadership scales and the other constructs. This

evidence provides support for the unique contribution of the Toxic Leadership Scale.

Predictive Power of the Toxic Leadership Scale

To verify that toxic leadership is a useful construct, I tested whether ratings of

toxic leadership significantly predicted ratings of turnover intention and satisfaction.

Table 5 shows the correlations between the leadership scales and the five outcome

variables. As expected, there were significant negative correlations between ratings

of toxic leadership and ratings of turnover intentions (low levels of endorsement

means the person plans to leave the organization) and satisfaction. Hypotheses 4 and

5 predicted these relationships, and were therefore supported. I did not expect to find

significant correlations between toxic leadership, satisfaction with coworkers, and

satisfaction with pay, but actually found significant negative correlations for almost

all toxic leadership dimensions.

Table 6 shows the results of regressing the five outcome variables on the z-

scored composite Toxic Leadership Scale and its component dimensions. As

expected, the composite Toxic Leadership Scale did not significantly predict turnover

intentions. Indeed, many of the qualitative responses following an endorsement of

the intent to turnover variable include reasons such as "Retirement," "Better Pay,"

"More Interesting Opportunities," and "Starting Graduate School." Although some

participants reported "Toxic Work Environment" and "Unfair Promotions" as reasons

for leaving, turnover is a behavior that occurs for many reasons and is not a good indicator of toxic leadership. Hypotheses 6 and 7 stated that toxic leadership would predict ratings of job satisfaction and satisfaction with the supervisor. Both of these hypotheses were supported. Further, toxic leadership also significantly predicted satisfaction with coworkers and with pay. I did not expect to find these relationships, but they, along with the many unexpected by significant correlations in Table 5, suggest that toxic leadership has a greater impact on subordinate outcomes than originally expected. In summary, toxic leadership significantly predicted participants' ratings of job satisfaction ($\beta = -.49$, t(214) = -8.14, $p < .01$), satisfaction with coworkers ($\beta = -.27$, t(214) = -4.11, $p < .01$), satisfaction with supervisor ($\beta = -.69$, t(212) = -13.96, $p < .01$), and satisfaction with pay ($\beta = -.19$, t(214) = -2.84, $p < .01$). Examination of the R^2 showed that toxic leadership accounted for 25% of the variance in job satisfaction and 49% of the variance in satisfaction with supervisor.

Interestingly, breaking the composite Toxic Leadership Scale into its component dimensions showed that each dimension differentially predicted the outcome variables. Abusive supervision ($\beta = -.32$, t(207) = -2.17, $p < .05$) and authoritarian leadership ($\beta = -.45$, t(207) = -3.44, $p < .01$) significantly predicted participants' endorsement of an intention to leave their organizations. Strangely, the unpredictability dimension significantly predicted subordinates' willingness to stay in their organizations ($\beta = .25$, t(207) = 2.10, $p < .05$). Therefore, while the toxic leadership construct as a whole did not predict turnover intentions, some dimensions of the construct appeared to be refined enough to do so. Table 6 also shows that the two toxic leadership dimensions significantly predicted satisfaction with the

supervisor: self promotion ($\beta = -.22$, t(208) = -2.20, $p < .05$) and unpredictability ($\beta =$

-.21, t(208) = -2.26, $p < .05$). This finding supports the inclusion of these dimensions

within the domain of toxic leadership. The dimension of abusive supervision

significantly predicted job satisfaction ($\beta = -.31$, t(210) = -2.35, $p < .05$).

Another component of assessing the utility of a new scale is to show that it

has greater predictive power than other scales of related constructs. To test whether

toxic leadership adds explanatory variance above and beyond previously existing

leadership scales, a series of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. Table

7 shows the results of including the transformational leadership in Step 1 of the

analysis and then including the five toxic leadership dimensions in Step 2.

Transformational leadership significantly predicted job satisfaction ($\beta = .48$, t(214) =

7.94, $p < .01$), satisfaction with coworkers ($\beta = .23$, t(214) = 3.42, $p < .01$),

satisfaction with supervisor ($\beta = .67$, t(212) = 13.27, $p < .01$) and satisfaction with

pay ($\beta = .15$, t(214) = 2.28, $p < .05$), but did not significantly predict turnover

intentions. More importantly, Table 7 also shows that for four of the outcome

variables, toxic leadership predicted a significant amount of additional variance above

and beyond that predicted by transformational leadership. Toxic leadership showed

unique predictive power for turnover ($\Delta R^2 = .10$, $F(5,206) = 4.52$, $p < .01$), job

satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $F(5,209) = 3.52$, $p < .01$), satisfaction with coworkers ($\Delta R^2 =$

.05, $F(5,209) = 2.44$, $p < .05$), and satisfaction with supervisor ($\Delta R^2 = .11$, $F(5,207) =$

10.05, $p < .01$). The only variable for which the toxic leadership did not provide

additional predictive power was satisfaction with pay, showing almost complete

support for Hypothesis 8. Further, when controlling for transformational leadership,

the abusive supervision dimension significantly predicted job satisfaction ($\beta = -.29$, t(209) = -2.22, $p < .05$) and the unpredictability dimension predicted satisfaction with supervisor ($\beta = -.18$, t(212) = -2.09, $p < .05$). These results show that toxic leadership accounted for significantly more variance than the transformational leadership scale. Therefore, it cannot be said that toxic leadership is just the opposite or absence of transformational leadership, and the results support my assertion that toxic leadership is a unique construct.

Table 8 repeats the same analyses but controls for LMX instead of transformational leadership. I expected that because LMX measures the quality of the relationship between subordinate and supervisor, that it would account for some of the relational aspects of toxic leadership. Indeed, LMX significantly predicted all five outcome variables on its own, but the toxic leadership dimensions explained significantly more variance for turnover intentions ($\Delta R^2 = .09$, $F(5,206) = 3.96$, $p < .01$), satisfaction with coworkers ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $F(5,209) = 3.05$, $p < .05$), and satisfaction with supervisor ($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $F(5,207) = 5.78$, $p < .01$). These results show partial support for Hypothesis 9, and indicate once again that toxic leadership is more than a poor subordinate-supervisor relationship; it is instead a separate construct.

Table 9 displays the results hierarchical regressions that control for both transformational leadership and LMX. Examination of Table 9 shows that adding LMX into step 1 reduced the number of outcome variables that are significantly predicted by transformational leadership. Job satisfaction and satisfaction with supervisor were still predicted by both transformational leadership and LMX at the *p* < .01 level. But even when controlling for both of these scales, turnover was

predicted by the toxic leadership dimensions of abusive supervision ($\beta = -.29$, t(205) = -2.02, $p < .05$), unpredictability ($\beta = .25$, t(205) = -2.07, $p < .05$), and authoritarian leadership ($\beta = -.44$, t(205) = -3.39, $p < .01$). Further, the unpredictability dimension significantly predicted satisfaction with supervisor ($\beta = -.17$, t(206) = -2.09, $p < .05$). Finally, the toxic leadership dimensional scales added significant predictive power over and above both the transformational leadership and the LMX scale for turnover ($\Delta R^2 = .09$, $F(5,205)=4.09$, $p < .01$), satisfaction with coworkers ($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $F(5,208)=2.58$, $p < .05$), and satisfaction with supervisor ($\Delta R^2 = .05$, $F(5,206)=4.63$, $p < .01$). These results show that for some outcomes variables, toxic leadership accounted for significantly more variance than the transformational leadership scale and LMX combined. Thus, Hypothesis 10 was also partially supported.

It is clear from these results that the toxic leadership scales are measuring different constructs than the MLQ and the LMX scales, but are they an improvement over the Abusive Supervision scale published by Tepper (2000)? Table 10 displays the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which the variance attributable to abusive supervision was controlled before entering Toxic Leadership into the equation. Although Tepper's Abusive Supervision scale significantly predicted the four satisfaction outcomes on its own, it did not significantly predict turnover. More importantly, even when abusive supervision was controlled for, toxic leadership dimensions added significant predictive power for turnover intentions ($\Delta R^2 = .10$, $F(5,206)=4.83$, $p < .01$). Turnover was predicted by the toxic leadership abusive supervision dimension ($\beta = -.57$, t(206) = -2.71, $p < .01$), narcissism ($\beta = -.22$, t(206) = -2.08, $p < .05$), and authoritarian leadership ($\beta = -.49$, t(206) = -3.73, $p < .01$).

These results partially support Hypothesis 11. More importantly, they indicate that

the abusive supervision scale within the toxic leadership scale is a more powerful

scale than the one previously published by Tepper for predicting turnover intentions.

Also, the unpredictability dimension of the toxic leadership significantly predicted

satisfaction with coworkers (β = -.28, t(209) = -2.04, p < .05) even when controlling

for Tepper's Abusive Supervision scale. These results represent several key findings

which I will explicate in the next section.

Discussion

The primary objective of this project was to perform a systematic

specification of the domain of toxic leadership and to develop measures of all aspects

of this domain. Although this construct has been mentioned in previous literature

(both scientific and lay publications), my review of this literature revealed wide

variability and disagreement regarding which leader behaviors are considered "toxic."

The present investigation began by reviewing the existing literature and summarizing

the current domain specification of toxic leadership (see in Table 1). I followed this

review of the toxic leadership literature by exploring the broader leadership literature

to find discussion of destructive leaders. This extended review revealed discussions

of the "dark" side of charisma, petty tyranny, abusive supervision, narcissistic

leadership, and authoritarianism. All of these negative aspects of leadership were

believed to lead to negative and/or destructive organizational consequences. While

this review of the existing literature was useful, these negative aspects of leadership

did not appear to adequately capture the full conceptual space of the toxic leader

discussed in the lay literature. Thus, my thesis was designed to systematically study this construct.

I first conducted a qualitative study in which focus groups provided critical incidents of toxic leadership. This qualitative analysis found support for some of the leadership dimensions already discussed in the scientific literature. Indeed, aspects of abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership, and narcissism were contained in the critical incidents obtained from my focus groups. However, consistent with my original belief, I found that these three dimensions did not completely cover the entire domain of this construct. Based on the focus group results and the Q-Sort analysis, I proposed that two additional dimensions were needed to complete the coverage of the toxic leadership domain: self-promotion and unpredictability. This investigation marks the first instance in which these dimensions have been included in discussions of toxic leadership. Using transcripts of the focus groups and interviews, I developed a bank of survey questions to measure these five dimensions.

I followed the qualitative study with a quantitative one in which a series of factor analyses were conducted to refine the content pool of questions and to verify the separability of the five proposed toxic leadership dimensions. The factor analyses were supportive of a five-factor solution for the toxic leadership construct. Based on these results, I believe that a more rigorous definition of toxic leaders can be proposed. Specifically, toxic leaders are "narcissistic, self-promoters who engage in an unpredictable pattern of abusive and authoritarian supervision." This definition marks an important step for future research on toxic leadership because it is the first time that the construct has been empirically defined and operationalized. Further, this

definition is based on discernable leader behaviors rather than on retrospective analysis of leader effects on subordinates. Therefore, this definition allows future researchers to categorize toxic leaders for further investigation. Finally, this standardized definition of toxic leadership enables organizations to detect toxic tendencies in its leaders before they have destructive effects on other organizational members. Early detection of toxic tendencies may enable organizations to retrain leaders that are potentially toxic before they severely impact their subordinate groups.

The quantitative study also found that the newly defined toxic leadership construct and scales add to the existing literature. My toxic leadership scales significantly contributed to the prediction of turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with the supervisor even after controlling for more traditional leadership measures. Specifically, I found that results revealed that toxic leadership significantly contributed to the prediction of turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with the supervisor even after controlling for transformational leadership or the quality of the leader-follower relationship (i.e., LMX measure). Even when I simultaneously controlled for transformational leadership and LMX, toxic leadership still significantly contributed to the prediction of these variables. Thus, my results indicate that toxic leadership is separate construct and does not substantially overlap with existing leadership constructs (i.e., transformational leadership; good supervisor-subordinate relations).

Despite the fact that the toxic leadership composite score added significant amounts of variance for all four satisfaction variables, more detailed examination revealed that the five dimensions comprising toxic leadership were not equally

important when predicting these outcome variables. Specifically, the authoritarian leadership aspect of toxic leadership did not predict any of the satisfaction outcomes. Rather, authoritarian leadership consistently predicted turnover intention. This finding makes sense in that the authoritarian leadership scale primarily measured the extent to which leaders micromanage their employees. Thus, it seems reasonable that subordinates would report that they were more likely to leave organizations if they felt that their leader was removing autonomy (by micro-managing) from their jobs.

The narcissism and self-promotion dimensions of the toxic leadership scale did not show much predictive power for any of the outcomes. Although narcissism predicted turnover when Tepper's Abusive Supervision scale was included in the regression analysis, and despite the fact that self-promotion predicted satisfaction with supervisor by itself, neither of these toxic leadership dimensions showed consistent patterns of strong predictive relationships with the dependent variables. I was surprised to find such small effects for these two dimensions. Many of the critical incidents appeared to reflect these two dimensions.

There might be several explanations for the apparent inconsistency between the qualitative and quantitative results for self-promotion and narcissism. One possibility is that these dimensions were more antecedents of toxic leadership and not components of this construct by themselves. While the technique for gathering critical incidents tries to separate antecedents, behaviors, and consequences, it is possible that the qualitative data was vague enough for some slippage to have occurred. For example, self-promotion was mentioned in many critical incidents. Comments such as "he was just chasing his star," referring to achieving the rank of

admiral or master chief initially appeared to be an example of leader behavior.

However, it is possible that this incident does not necessarily reflect self-promotion

leadership behavior. Perhaps this incident was the focus group member's

interpretation of the leader's motivation for the behavior. If this is true, self-

promotion should not be included as a component of toxic leadership, but rather,

should be considered an antecedent of toxic behaviors.

Review of the qualitative transcripts with regard to narcissism suggests a

similar explanation. Narcissism was usually mentioned as an attribute of the leaders

that participants had deemed "toxic." Phrases such as "she only had her own interests

in mind," might be subordinates' attributions regarding toxic leader behaviors. Given

the problematic state of narcissistic leadership research, perhaps this concept should

also be considered a broader attribute or summary trait of the leader across situations,

rather than specific behaviors that can be classified as toxic leadership.

Another possible explanation for the obtained minimal predictive power of the

self-promotion and narcissism dimensions is that these dimensions may simply be

more difficult for a third party to assess. Narcissism is often conceptualized as a

personality characteristic that is reflected in overt behaviors, but is not really overt

behavior in and of itself. It is usually rated by in the first-person. Similarly, self-

promotion is a motivational construct that exists within an individual. Therefore,

third party ratings of these constructs may be problematic because these

characteristics reside within the leader and therefore may be difficult for subordinates

to properly evaluate.

In contrast to these problematic dimensions, the abusive supervision scale that I developed explained a significant portion of the variance even after controlling for the previously published Abusive Supervision scale (Tepper, 2000). This appears to suggest that my scale might be tapping a different aspect of abusive supervision. Tepper's original measure was derived from the literature on non-physical relationship abuse. Specifically, he revised the reference point of the items from the original "my significant other" to "my boss." While the original measure captures some important elements of abusive supervision, romantic relationships most likely fundamentally differ from supervisor-subordinate relationships. For example, Tepper's scale involved behaviors that might not be applicable in work situations, such as giving others the "silent treatment." Thus, the scale might have some construct contamination. Further, this scale fails to capture common dysfunctional workplace behaviors such as holding subordinates responsible for tasks outside their job descriptions, being inconsiderate of subordinates' commitments outside of work, and gossiping about subordinates to other people in the workplace. Thus, the scale might be somewhat construct deficient. While the literature on non-physical relationship abuse is informative for many kinds of interpersonal interactions, people choose their romantic partners, but not their bosses. Further, people can choose to end their romantic attachments, but disobedience or insubordination can result in severe and long-lasting career and legal repercussions (e.g. a "Dishonorable Discharge" from the military or a bad recommendation from a former supervisor could prevent future career achievement).

The abusive supervision scale developed as part of this investigation recognizes the importance of distinguishing between romantic relationships and subordinate-supervisor relationships, and was designed to be appropriate for the latter. Because it includes behaviors that are more salient in work situations and omits less applicable behaviors, it is not surprising that this refined abusive supervision scale adds explanatory power over and above the original.

Finally, the unpredictability dimension of toxic leadership seems to be the most powerful of the five. Even when controlling for other leadership scales and Tepper's Abusive Supervision scale, the unpredictability dimension significantly predicted a number of outcome variables. Further review of my qualitative data supports the notion that unpredictability adds a dimension to negative leadership. Unpredictability makes a bad leader even worse. Comments recorded during my focus group sessions such as "I'd rather work for a consistent asshole than an unpredictable civil [leader]" indicate that subordinates are able to handle abusive and authoritarian leader behaviors if they know what to expect. Although an abusive leader's behavior might be unpleasant, when subordinates know what to expect, they can brace themselves for this negativity. But when subordinates are unsure of how their leaders will act and react, the work climate is less stable and employees must focus on preventing negative outbursts. Tables 3 to 6 show that when toxic leadership explains a significant portion of the variance in satisfaction with the supervisor, unpredictability is the only toxic leadership dimension that was significantly related to the dependent variable. Further, in each of these examples, unpredictability is significant while abusive supervision is not. Therefore, it seems

that abusive and authoritarian supervision are bad, but unpredictability is what turns a bad leader toxic.

Although unpredictability in leadership has rarely been studied explicitly, there are many examples of research that shows how unpredictable "leadership" has a negative impact on "followers." For example, Piper, Doan, Edwards, and Jones (1979) showed that patients undergoing psychotherapy from consistent co-therapy teams produced significantly higher levels of documented work and reported significantly better improvement for social and psychosomatic problems than patients undergoing therapy from inconsistent therapy teams. Graves and Robinson (1976) found that inconsistent messages during therapy were associated with greater interpersonal distances between therapists and patients. Inconsistent messages also resulted in subordinates giving lower ratings of counselor genuineness. In other words, therapists ("leaders") who were less consistent, or more unpredictable, facilitated fewer positive results for patients ("subordinates") than those who were more predictable. Therapists are not the only type of "leaders" that have been inadvertently studied. Investigations from the developmental psychology literature and the educational literature on permissive parenting and teaching styles also suggests that permissive, or unpredictable, styles of leading children result in decreased outcomes (Walker, 2008). Future investigations could draw from a number of literatures that discuss inconsistency or unpredictability in leader-like roles to show that unpredictable leadership has been implicitly shown to have negative effects on many types of subordinates.

The results of this investigation clarified the current confusion in the sparse existing literature on toxic leadership by specifying the content domain and developing behavioral scales that measure toxic leadership. The results of this study contradict some of the claims of toxic leadership made in the lay literature. For example, Kellerman (2004) argues that Mother Theresa was a toxic leader because she may have accepted monetary donations from people that were later implicated in financial scandal. Despite this peripheral involvement with unscrupulous individuals, Mother Theresa did not exhibit any of the behaviors measured in my Toxic Leaders Scale, so I would disagree with Kellerman's categorization.

Other authors have labeled many leaders as "toxic" based on the outcomes of their efforts rather than their actual behaviors. I argue that this retrospective labeling is inappropriate. Toxic leaders can scare their employees into working harder, and non-toxic leaders might lack the management skills necessary for success. The present research advances the understanding of toxic leadership because it moves the literature beyond defining toxic leadership by its effects on subordinates, and begins defining toxicity as a function of the behaviors of the leader. Based on my definition, incompetent or unethical leaders will not necessarily be labeled toxic. Leaders that effectively push their subordinates to high levels of productivity might be toxic based on the leader behaviors used to motivate their employees. This separation of behavior from outcomes for classification of toxicity allows for a more refined assessment of current leaders and enables organizations to detect toxic leaders and retrain them rather than suffer the ill effects of their destructive influence.

Limitations and Future Research

There were several limitations with this project. Participants were allowed to choose a destructive leader to rate, so some participants likely chose leaders from their past and were thus relying on retrospective interpretation of events to complete my questionnaire. This could have caused participants to give more prototypical responses to my questions as opposed to more accurate responses. The information processing literature repeatedly has shown that over time, individuals process information about others by relying on cognitive schemas (Dorfman, 1998; Erez & Earley, 1993; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997; Shaw, 1990). Over time, they are more likely to forget leader behavior that were inconsistent with their schemas as well as falsely report schema-consistent behaviors even though these behaviors did not occur. Thus, future research should investigate toxic leaders in real-time and not rely on retrospective interpretations or recollections of behavior.

Another limitation of the present study is that there are many reasons for turnover intentions and satisfaction. Qualitative reviews of the reasons given for turnover intentions during the survey phase of this investigation include reasons that are both directly linked and completely orthogonal to the type of leader that participants rated. Future research should examine whether turnover intentions are directly related to leader behavior.

Another limitation of this study is that all indicators of leader behaviors and outcomes come from the same people, creating single-source bias. Future investigations should collect data from multiple sources. Perhaps collecting performance, turnover, and counterproductive work behavior data from supervisors

while collecting leader behavior and satisfaction data from subordinates would help allay the effects of single-source bias.

The present study has many other implications for future investigations. As an initial attempt to operationalize toxic leadership, this study has gone a long way in creating empirically valid and reliable scales of toxic leader dimensions. However, validity is not established with only one study (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2001). A continued evaluation of these scales in future studies is critical for firmly establishing their validity and utility.

Also, I failed to find utility for the self-promotion and narcissism scales. Clearly, future studies are needed to determine if this lack of findings replicates. Perhaps self-promotion and narcissism really are antecedents of toxic leadership, as I suggested earlier. Perhaps these two dimensions would be predictive of different follower or team outcomes. Future research is necessary to clarify these issues. Perhaps leaders could self-report regarding these measures and their responses are combined with followers' evaluations of the leaders on the other three toxic leadership dimensions. This approach would also eliminate the single-source bias that is a limitation of the present study, and will enable first-person assessment of the motivational factors driving the leader along with the third-person assessment for the observable toxic leader behaviors.

Future research also needs to replicate these findings in different populations. It is possible that some behaviors are more toxic in certain industries than in others. Perhaps leader unpredictability in the financial services industry would be less tolerable because people in this industry are trying to predict future trends.

Conversely, these subordinates might be more tolerant of unpredictable leader behaviors because their work involves unpredictable financial markets. Similarly, societal culture may affect the dimensions of toxic leadership. It is possible that societal culture such as collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and tightness/looseness could affect toxicity in leaders. It is reasonable to expect that the influence of unpredictability in toxic leaders would be stronger in high uncertainty avoidance countries. Also, citizens of high power distant societies expect their leaders to act in privileged ways. Thus, it could be possible that the tolerance level for toxic leader behaviors such as self-promotion and authoritarianism may be greater in high power distant societies. Cross-cultural research on this topic is clearly needed.

Another avenue of research is to explore follower differences in reactions to toxic leaders. Subordinate perceptions of toxic leader behavior might be affected by follower self-esteem. Followers low in self-esteem may be more tolerant of toxic leaders because such negative behavior might reinforce their low opinion of themselves. Further, need for closure and need for assessment are two personality characteristics of followers that might moderate the follower's reaction to toxic leaders.

There are many other outcome variables that could be examined. It would be interesting to see how toxic leadership affects perceptions of unit and organizational climate. Perhaps toxic leadership negatively impacts climate for service because employees are so concerned about completing their job tasks correctly that they do not correctly prioritize customer concerns. Conversely, they may be more concerned

about quality customer service because they want to avoid complaints that might incite a toxic leader's destructive reprisals. I would predict that toxic leadership would be negatively associated with the number of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) that subordinates perform because they would be less concerned with helping each other and more concerned about protecting themselves by completing their own job tasks. Other related outcomes might include group-level factors such as group cohesion and group viability. Subordinates may rally together in mutual dread and dislike of the toxic leader, or they may isolate themselves to avoid the possibility of being connected to a peer's mistakes. Finally, it would be interesting to examine the social networks that exist within a group with a toxic leader. Perhaps toxic leaders constrain the networks of those they supervise to ensure that they are central to every aspect of group functioning. Toxic leaders' authoritarianism would suggest that want to control how tasks are completed, narcissism would suggest that they believe they *should* be at the center of the networks, and self-promotion would suggest that they want to protect their image by controlling what information flows into and out of the network. Therefore, many other individual and group-level outcome variables await further investigation.

This study found that some toxic leadership dimensions might be more potent than others. Thus, future research is needed to explore the robustness of this finding. A limitation of my study is that I only explored the main predictive effects of each toxic leadership dimension. It is quite possible that toxic behaviors interact with one another. As discussed earlier, the qualitative transcripts suggest that the unpredictability toxic leader dimension might play a moderating role. People may

tolerate an abusive supervisor provided that the supervisor is consistent. It could be that unpredictability elevates an abusive supervisor into the toxic leader realm. Future investigations might profit by studying the relationship between authoritarian leadership and turnover intentions. Also, the toxic leadership scale of abusive supervision was more powerful than the previously published scale of the same construct, so future researchers might endeavor to understand the differences between these two scales and refine them further.

It is clear that leader unpredictability is particularly toxic. This notion opens the door for a completely new theory in the leadership literature. Recent theoretical additions such as authentic leadership (May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003), spiritual leadership (Townsend & Wichern, 1984), and servant leadership (Graham, 1991) show that leadership literature is searching for moderating mechanisms that make good leadership better. In this vein, I propose that unpredictable leadership fits as a moderating mechanism that makes bad leadership worse.

Although the Q-Sort for this study discarded the unprofessionalism dimension that was proposed by the focus groups, it may be important to re-examine this dimension. Recent developments in the leadership literature include ethical components, and the toxic leadership construct might be bolstered by including an unprofessional or unethical component. Although in this study, many of the critical incidents related to this dimension were very specific to the military, there are other industries and contexts in which ethical behavior and professional standards are considered central to the quality of a person's ability to lead. Therefore, future

research should re-examine this dimension and the ways in which it fits with toxic leadership.

It will be important to continue differentiating toxic leadership from other leadership constructs. In this study, I showed that toxic leadership was not merely the opposite of transformational leadership or Leader-Member Exchange, but future investigations should compare toxic leadership with other leadership constructs. For example, there may be some overlap between toxic leadership and authentic leadership (May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003). Although this latter construct is new and largely unexplored, it seems to cover some of the professionalism and ethical components discussed above. These are probably distinct constructs, however, because authentic leadership proposes that leaders must be true to themselves to be effective, but there are leaders who might be genuinely toxic individuals, and therefore act "authentically" even while being toxic.

Finally, leadership researchers should begin to consider the role of intentionality in leader behaviors. The introduction of this paper discussed how some destructive leader styles failed to include the leaders' intentions as part of their definitions. I asserted that intentionality is an important component of behavior, and suggested that the dimensions of narcissism and self-promotion might be attributions that followers make in an attempt to understand leader behaviors. Leadership researchers should ask themselves, "Does intention matter?" Maybe intention is irrelevant and only subordinate and supervisor perceptions are important. Some might say that intention to lead is not leadership, and therefore is trivial. But intention might also be critical for contextualizing leader behavior. If a military

70

leader yells at a subordinate on the battlefield to convey the urgency of her message, she may be intending to save her subordinate's life. Few observers would likely find this behavior toxic. Back at the barracks, however, the same leader yelling at the same subordinate with the intention of "making an example of him," might appear to be a toxic leader. Therefore, I conceptualized toxic leadership as intentionally destructive behavior, but future research should explore this issue further.

Conclusion

Reed creates an apt description when he writes "Toxic leadership, like leadership in general, is more easily described than defined, but terms like self-aggrandizing, petty, abusive, indifferent to unit climate, and interpersonally malicious seem to capture the concept. A toxic leader is poison to the unit – an insidious, slow-acting poison that complicates diagnosis and the application of an anecdote." (Reed, 2004, p. 71) The adjectives in Reed's description fit well with the dimensions of toxic leadership explored in this investigation. This study aimed to reduce the ambiguities in defining and detecting toxic leadership. Although more research is needed, the results of this investigation are tantalizing. This is the first empirical attempt to study toxic leadership, and therefore marks an important step toward understanding this ambiguous yet harmful construct. By refining the definition of toxic leadership and creating a valid scale for measuring it, this investigation significantly adds to the leadership and management literatures. Further, it opens the door for continued examination of toxic leadership. The results from this study will have broad implications for ways to detect and deter toxic leadership within

organizations, and will lead to practical recommendations for how to effectively

select, train, and coach leaders in the workplace.

Results Tables

Table 1: *Various Definitions of Toxic Leadership in the Literature.*

Author:	Whicker (1996)	Lipman-Blumen (2005a)	Wilson-Starks (2003)	Reed (2004)	Flynn (1999)
Definition:	"… maladjusted, malcontent, and often malevolent, even malicious. They succeed by tearing others down….With a deep-seated but well-disguised sense of personal inadequacy, a focus on selfish values, and a cleverness at deception, these leaders are very toxic, indeed." (p. 12)	"... leaders who engage in numerous destructive behavior and who exhibit certain dysfunctional personal characteristics. To count as toxic, these behaviors and qualities of character must inflict some reasonably serious and enduring harm on their followers and their organizations. The intent to harm others or to enhance the self at the expense of others distinguishes seriously toxic leaders from the careless or unintentional toxic leaders, who also cause negative effects." (p. 18)	"… an approach that harms people – and, eventually, the company as well – through the poisoning of enthusiasm, creativity, autonomy, and innovative expression. Toxic leaders disseminate their poison through over-control. [Toxic leaders] define leadership as being in control." (p. 2)	"…it is not one specific behavior that deems one toxic; it is the cumulative effect of demotivational behavior on unit morale and climate over time that tells the tale…. Three key elements of the toxic leader syndrome are: 1. An apparent lack of concern for the well-being of subordinates 2. A personality or interpersonal technique that negatively affects organizational climate 3. A conviction by subordinates that the leader is motivated primarily by self interest." (p. 67)	"The manager who bullies, threatens, yells. The manager whose mood swings determines the climate of the office on any given workday. Who forces employees to whisper in sympathy in cubicles and hallways. The backbiting, belittling boss from hell." (p. 1)
Dimensions:					
Abusive to Subordinates	X	X	X	X	X
Controlling / Stifling		X	X		X
Narcissistic	X	X		X	
Effects:					
Destroy Morale	X	X	X	X	X
Create Negative Climate	X	X	X	X	X

Table 2: *Factor loadings for Toxic Leadership Dimensions*

Self-Promotion

Drastically changes his/her demeanor when his/her supervisor is present	.74
Denies responsibility for mistakes made in his/her unit	.80
Will only offer assistance to people who can help him/her get ahead	.84
Accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her	.85
Acts only in the best interest of his/her next promotion	.87

Abusive Supervision

Ridicules subordinates	.87
Holds subordinates responsible for things outside their job descriptions	.72
Is not considerate about subordinates' commitments outside of work	.74
Speaks poorly about subordinates to other people in the workplace	.82
Publicly belittles subordinates	.91
Reminds subordinates of their past mistakes and failures	.84
Tells subordinates they are incompetent	.79

Unpredictability

Has explosive outbursts	.83
Allows his/her current mood to define the climate of the workplace	.86
Allows his/her mood to affect his/her vocal tone and volume	.86
Expresses anger at subordinates for unknown reasons	.81
Causes subordinates to try to "read" his/her mood	.78
Affects the emotions of subordinates when impassioned	.69
Varies in his/her degree of approachability	.67

Narcissism

Has a sense of personal entitlement	.71
Assumes that he/she is destined to enter the highest ranks of my organization	.76
Thinks that he/she is more capable than others	.85
Believes that he/she is an extraordinary person	.82
Thrives on compliments and personal accolades	.75

Authoritarian Leadership

Controls how subordinates complete their tasks	.72
Invades the privacy of subordinates	.70
Does not permit subordinates to approach goals in new ways	.84
Will ignore ideas that are contrary to his/her own	.81
Is inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special circumstances	.73
Determines all decisions in the unit whether they are important or not	.74

Table 3: *Factor loadings for the Toxic Leadership Scale (TLS)*

Items	1	2	3	4	5
			Factor		
Drastically changes his/her demeanor when his/her supervisor is present	.68	-.65	.57	-.49	.59
Denies responsibility for mistakes made in his/her unit	.69	-.66	.61	-.57	.65
Will only offer assistance to people who can help him/her get ahead	.74	-.67	.59	-.54	.58
Accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her	.77	-.66	.64	-.59	.57
Acts only in the best interest of his/her next promotion	.74	-.66	.61	-.66	.66
Ridicules subordinates	.57	-.84	.76	-.44	.70
Holds subordinates responsible for things outside their job descriptions	.50	-.68	.61	-.53	.57
Is not considerate about subordinates' commitments outside of work	.55	-.72	.58	-.49	.56
Speaks poorly about subordinates to other people in the workplace	.59	-.80	.61	-.59	.63
Publicly belittles subordinates	.45	-.96	.73	-.46	.56
Reminds subordinates of their past mistakes and failures	.57	-.81	.65	-.40	.62
Tells subordinates they are incompetent	.47	-.77	.63	-.51	.61
Has explosive outbursts	.30	-.66	.83	-.49	.57
Allows his/her current mood to define the climate of the workplace	.55	-.68	.86	-.55	.54
Expresses anger at subordinates for unknown reasons	.54	-.72	.79	-.41	.69
Allows his/her mood to affect his/her vocal tone and volume	.36	-.62	.86	-.55	.52
Varies in his/her degree of approachability	.36	-.54	.63	-.37	.44
Causes subordinates to try to "read" his/her mood	.46	-.61	.74	-.43	.62
Affects the emotions of subordinates when impassioned	.25	-.56	.69	-.46	.52
Has a sense of personal entitlement	.42	-.50	.51	-.64	.60
Assumes that he/she is destined to enter the highest ranks of my organization	.38	-.52	.54	-.72	.52
Thinks that he/she is more capable than others	.40	-.62	.69	-.80	.70
Believes that he/she is an extraordinary person	.37	-.45	.48	-.83	.49
Thrives on compliments and personal accolades	.41	-.46	.50	-.75	.47
Controls how subordinates complete their tasks	.36	-.50	.52	-.46	.75
Invades the privacy of subordinates	.58	-.64	.54	-.46	.66
Does not permit subordinates to approach goals in new ways	.50	-.60	.56	-.53	.79
Will ignore ideas that are contrary to his/her own	.56	-.65	.63	-.61	.75
Is inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special circumstances	.50	-.60	.54	-.40	.72
Determines all decisions in the unit whether they are important or not	.32	-.54	.55	-.56	.75

Table 4: *Descriptive Statistics and Correlations, Old and New Scales*

	Variable	Mean	s.d.	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	11.00	12.00	13.00
1.	Self-promotion Scale	3.21	1.39	(.91)												
2.	Abusive Supervision Scale	3.28	1.38	.83**	(.93)											
3.	Unpredictability Scale	3.51	1.32	.73**	.81**	(.92)										
4.	Narcissism Scale	3.77	1.28	.75**	.70**	.69**	(.88)									
5.	Authoritarian Scale	3.35	1.25	.79**	.80**	.76**	.73**	(.89)								
6.	Toxic Leadership Scale (composite)	3.42	1.20	.91**	.93**	.90**	.84**	.91**	(.97)							
7.	LMX Scale	4.18	1.65	-.74**	-.72**	-.64**	-.58**	-.71**	-.76**	(.93)						
8.	Transformational Leadership Scale (MLQ)	2.70	0.87	-.67**	-.63**	-.58**	-.49**	-.66**	-.68**	.77**	(.94)					
9.	Original Abusive Supervision Scale	3.19	1.35	.88**	.95**	.86**	.72**	.84**	.95**	-.74**	-.67**	(.96)				
10.	Original Authoritarian Leadership Scale	3.70	1.16	.74**	.78**	.79**	.77**	.83**	.87**	-.64**	-.50**	.78**	(.91)			
11.	Laissez-Faire Leadership Scale	2.32	0.91	.56**	.49**	.37**	.34**	.42**	.49**	-.53**	-.50**	.52**	.27**	(.76)		
12.	Contingent Reward Scale	2.85	0.66	.47**	.51**	.41**	.37**	.43**	.49**	-.48**	-.36**	.50**	.40**	.52**	(.78)	
13.	Management by Exception Scale	2.80	0.98	-.64**	-.60**	-.49**	-.50**	-.59**	-.62**	.74**	.83**	-.62**	-.49**	-.51**	-.37**	(.64)

$N = 216$. Internal reliability coefficients (alphas) appear in parentheses along the main diagonal.

$*\ p < .05$

$**\ p < .01$

Table 5: *Correlations Between Old and New Scales and Outcome Variables*

	Turnover Intention	Satisfaction with Job	Satisfaction with Coworkers	Satisfaction with Supervisor	Satisfaction with Pay
Self-promotion Scale	-.090	-.438 **	-.279 **	-.645 **	-.137 *
Abusive Supervision Scale	-.172 *	-.488 **	-.282 **	-.655 **	-.210 **
Unpredictability Scale	-.060	-.423 **	-.189 **	-.630 **	-.193 **
Narcissism Scale	-.030	-.362 **	-.185 **	-.558 **	-.120
Authoritarian Scale	-.210 **	-.457 **	-.277 **	-.623 **	-.169 *
Toxic Leadership Scale (composite)	-.130	-.486 **	-.271 **	-.692 **	-.190 **
LMX Scale	.144 *	.504 **	.201 **	.702 **	.145 *
Transformational Leadership Scale (MLQ)	.100	.477 **	.228 **	.674 **	.154 *
Original Abusive Supervision Scale	-.120	-.488 **	-.299 **	-.688 **	-.219 **
Original Authoritarian Leadership Scale	-.141 *	-.410 **	-.179 **	-.592 **	-.110
Laissez-Faire Leadership Scale	-.150 *	-.270 **	-.170 *	-.400 **	-.180 **
Contingent Reward Scale	-.200 **	-.270 **	-.120	-.420 **	-.110
Management by Exception Scale	.030	.420 **	.190 **	.630 **	.140 *

$N = 216$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 6: *Regression of Outcomes on Standardized (Z-scored) Toxic Leadership Scales*

Variables	Turnover		Job Satisfaction		Satisfaction with Coworkers		Satisfaction with Supervisor		Satisfaction with Pay	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Toxic Leadership Scale (composite)	-.13	.07	-.49 **	.06	-.27 **	.07	-.69 **	.05	-.19 **	.07
R^2	.02		.24 **		.07 **		.48 **		.04 **	
Dimensions:										
TLS – Self-promotion	.18	.13	-.05	.12	-.16	.13	-.22 *	.10	.134	.14
TLS – Abusive Supervision	-.31 *	.14	-.31 *	.13	-.21	.14	-.19	.11	-.25	.15
TLS – Unpredictability	.25 *	.12	-.03	.11	.17	.12	-.21 *	.09	-.09	.12
TLS – Narcissism	.20	.11	.05	.01	.10	.11	-.20	.08	.05	.11
TLS – Authoritarian Leadership	-.43 **	.13	-.18	.12	-.19	.13	-.13	.10	-.04	.13
R^2	.11 **		.25 **		.10 **		.49 **		.05 *	

$** p < .01, * p < .05$

Table 7: *Regression of Outcomes on Standardized Toxic Leadership Dimensions Controlling for Transformational Leadership*

Variables	Turnover		Job Satisfaction		Satisfaction with Coworkers		Satisfaction with Supervisor		Satisfaction with Pay	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Step 1										
Transformational Leadership	.10	.03	.48 **	.06	.23 **	.07	.67 **	.05	.15 *	.07
Step 2										
Transformational Leadership	-.05	.04	.27 **	.08	.03	.09	.39 **	.07	.06	.10
TLS – Self-promotion	.16	.06	.06	.12	-.14	.14	-.06	.10	.16	.14
TLS – Abusive Supervision	-.32 *	.06	-.29 *	.13	-.21	.14	-.16	.10	-.24	.15
TLS – Unpredictability	.25 *	.05	-.01	.11	.17	.12	-.18 *	.08	-.09	.12
TLS – Narcissism	.21	.04	.00	.10	.09	.11	-.08	.08	.04	.11
TLS – Authoritarian Leadership	-.45 **	.05	-.09	.12	-.18	.13	.01	.09	-.02	.13
R^2 Step 1	.01		.23 **		.05 **		.45 **		.02 *	
ΔR^2	.10 **		.06 **		.05 *		.11 **		.03	

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 8: *Regression of Outcomes on Standardized Toxic Leadership Dimensions Controlling for LMX*

Variables	Turnover		Job Satisfaction		Satisfaction with Coworkers		Satisfaction with Supervisor		Satisfaction with Pay	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Step 1										
Leader-Member Exchange	.14 *	.03	.50 **	.06	.20 **	.07	.70 **	.05	.15 *	.07
Step 2										
Leader-Member Exchange	.05	.04	.31 **	.09	-.08	.10	.42 **	.07	.01	.11
TLS – Self-promotion	.20	.06	.07	.12	-.18	.14	-.07	.10	.14	.14
TLS – Abusive Supervision	-.30 *	.06	-.24	.13	-.23	.15	-.09	.10	-.24	.15
TLS – Unpredictability	.25 *	.05	-.02	.11	.16	.12	-.19 *	.08	-.09	.12
TLS – Narcissism	.20	.04	.03	.10	.10	.11	-.05	.08	.05	.11
TLS – Authoritarian Leadership	-.42 **	.05	-.10	.11	-.21	.13	-.02	.09	-.04	.13
R^2 Step 1	.02 *		.25 **		.04 **		.49 **		.02 *	
ΔR^2	.09 **		.04		.07 *		.06 **		.03	

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

80

Table 9: *Regression of Outcomes on Standardized Toxic Leadership Dimensions Controlling for Transformational Leadership and LMX*

Variables	Turnover		Job Satisfaction		Satisfaction with Coworkers		Satisfaction with Supervisor		Satisfaction with Pay	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Step 1										
Transformational Leadership	-.04	.04	.22 *	.09	.18	.11	.32 **	.08	.10	.11
Leader-Member Exchange	.18	.04	.34 **	.09	.06	.11	.45 **	.08	.06	.11
Step 2										
Transformational Leadership	-.01	.04	.18	.01	.09	.11	.27 **	.08	.08	.11
Leader-Member Exchange	.10	.05	.21	.11	-.13	.12	.27 **	.08	-.03	.13
TLS – Self-promotion	.18	.06	.10	.13	-.17	.14	-.01	.10	.15	.15
TLS – Abusive Supervision	-.29 *	.06	-.25	.13	-.23	.15	-.10	.10	-.25	.15
TLS – Unpredictability	.25 *	.05	-.01	.11	.17	.12	-.17 *	.08	-.09	.12
TLS – Narcissism	.21	.04	.01	.01	.09	.11	-.08	.08	.03	.11
TLS – Authoritarian Leadership	-.44 **	.05	-.07	.12	-.19	.13	.03	.09	-.02	.13
R^2 Step 1	.02		.27 **		.05 **		.53 **		.03	
ΔR^2	.09 **		.03		.06 *		.05 **		.03	

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

81

Table 10: *Regression of Outcomes on Standardized Toxic Leadership Dimensions Controlling for Abusive Supervision*

Variables	Turnover		Job Satisfaction		Satisfaction with Coworkers		Satisfaction with Supervisor		Satisfaction with Pay	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Step 1										
Original Abusive Supervision Scale	-.12	.03	-.49 **	.06	-.30 **	.07	-.69 **	.05	-.22 **	.07
Step 2										
Original Abusive Supervision Scale	.48	.12	-.12	.26	-.48	.29	-.32	.22	-.41	.30
TLS – Self-promotion	.07	.06	-.02	.14	-.04	.15	-.15	.11	.23	.15
TLS – Abusive Supervision	-.57 **	.09	-.25	.19	.05	.21	-.02	.16	-.03	.22
TLS – Unpredictability	.14	.06	-.01	.12	.28 *	.14	-.13	.10	.00	.14
TLS – Narcissism	.22 *	.04	.04	.10	.07	.11	-.04	.08	.02	.11
TLS – Authoritarian Leadership	-.48 **	.05	-.17	.12	-.14	.13	-.10	.10	.00	.13
R^2 Step 1	.01		.24 **		.09 **		.47 **		.05 **	
ΔR^2	.10 **		.01		.03		.02		.01	

*** p < .01, * p <.05*

Appendices

Appendix A – Focus Group Discussion Guide

Topics of Focus Group Questions:

Definition of "Destructive Leadership"

Common behaviors of destructive leaders

Personality traits of destructive leaders

Common effects on subordinates of destructive leaders

Leaders' effects on work climate

Organizational factors that facilitate destructive leadership

Definition of "Toxic Leadership"

       I have some questions to direct the conversation, but we may diverge off my list of questions and discuss other things as well. These questions are meant to give us some starting points for our conversation. To begin, think of some supervisors you have worked for or heard about that you would consider "destructive leaders."

1. Is the person you are thinking of someone that you worked for or someone that you heard about?

2. Please describe this supervisor. What specifically would this supervisor do that caused a negative reaction among the subordinates? (after they have described the supervisor, probe with the following questions):

    a. Behaviors:

        i. Why do you think the supervisor acted in this way?

        ii. What led up to these behaviors?

b. Personality:

    i. What were some of the personality characteristics of the leader you are describing?

c. Context:

    i. Did the leader always act this way? What factors tended to cause the leader to behave as you have described?

3. What were the consequences of the supervisor behaving in this manner?

a. Effects on subordinates?

    i. Morale among the subordinates?

    ii. Please describe how subordinates felt after the incident. To what extent did subordinates feel abused or victimized by this supervisor?

    iii. To what extent were subordinates considering leaving their positions or asking for a transfer? If they had a choice, would they be likely to remain in their positions? What factors would cause them to stay or leave?

b. Effects on work climate?

    i. Can you provide a label that captures your description of the work climate?

    ii. Healthy? Fearful?

    iii. Consistency?

    iv. Differences if leader was present or absent?

4. To what extent would this supervisor allow subordinates to work autonomously? Describe…

5. Please describe how this supervisor's subordinates treated each other. (again, get **behaviors**)

    c. To what extent was there conflict where this supervisor worked?

6. Sometimes toxic leadership behaviors can produce positive results. (talk more about this)

7. Can you give me a good summary label for the management style of this supervisor?

    d. For example, would you describe the supervisor as charismatic? As a bully?

8. Were these destructive leaders worried about their actions?

9. Were you able to give feedback? How would they have reacted/changed were you to give them feedback? Would training help?

10. Many leadership researchers are starting to use the term "toxic leadership" in their writings. What do you think is meant by the term "toxic leader?"

11. To what extent would you classify this supervisor as "toxic"?

Working Definition of Toxic Leadership:

It is important to understand that toxic leadership does *not* include simple mismanagement or leaders with evil intentions. Sometimes great leaders make bad management decisions, and sometimes evil people have superior leadership skills. Instead, toxic leadership is a distinct combination of negative leadership behaviors.

My working definition defines toxic leaders as those who:
- display a wide range of extreme emotions in an unpredictable pattern
- lack emotional intelligence
- act in ways that are culturally and/or interpersonally insensitive
- are primarily motivated by self-interest
- influence others by employing negative managerial techniques (for example: micromanagement, ridicule, etc.)

Question 1: How would you define toxic leadership? What behaviors do leaders display that make them toxic? What are the outcomes of these behaviors?

The following questions will ask you to think of a particular incident during which you experienced and/or witnessed toxic leadership. Please try to remember the incident in as much detail as possible.

Question 2: Please describe the incident, and be as specific as possible.

Question 3: What factors led up to this toxic leadership incident?

Question 4: Please specify the exact toxic behaviors displayed by the leader.

Question 5: How did the subordinates react to this incident? How did this incident affect subordinate morale and quality of life? How did this incident change their future behaviors?

The purpose of this study is to explore toxic leadership. In 2003, the Secretary of the Army emphatically called for the systematic study of "destructive leadership styles." As an organization in which destructive leadership can cost lives, the military is keenly interested in identifying "toxic leaders" before they harm (or are harmed by) their subordinates and others.

To date, there are no scientific studies of toxic leadership, so little is known about how toxic leaders impact the subordinate group. My goal is to create the first empirically-based definition of toxic leadership and study its destructive effects. In

order to accomplish these goals, I am relying on your personal insight and broad experiences with a variety of leaders. Your frank and honest responses will greatly improve the understanding of this concept. Results from my studies will have implications for detecting and deterring toxic leadership within organizations, and will lead to practical recommendations for effectively training leaders in the workplace.

Now that you understand specifically what I am studying, would you like to add to your stories or tell me anything else about toxic leaders?

Appendix B – Q-Sort Responses

1. Abusive Supervision: involves leaders' hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors to their subordinates. Examples of such behaviors include public demonstrations of anger, personal ridicule, and destructive feedback. This does not include physical abuse.

2. Authoritarian Leadership: involves leader behaviors that restrict subordinate autonomy and initiative. Authoritarian leaders demand total compliance with their own agendas and operating procedures.

3. Self-Promotion: involves behaviors that promote leaders' own interests (especially to higher level superiors) and that decrease threats from rivals and/or talented subordinates.

4. Unpredictability: involves enacting a wide range of behaviors that reflect dramatic shifts in mood states.

5. Unprofessional Behaviors: show that leaders lack task competence, personal and professional integrity, and collegial respect for peers and subordinates.

6. Narcissism: involves having a grandiose self-image, an inability to empathize with others, and contempt for the abilities and efforts of others.

The following items will be rated on a Strongly Agree-Strongly Disagree scale.

Please read each item, decide which category it fits into the best, and enter the number of the category beside it.

My supervisor…	Originally Proposed Category	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Final Category
				Raters					
Puts subordinates down in front of others	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Makes subordinates feel afraid to approach him/her with problems	4	1	1	6	1	1	1	6	1
Enjoys embarrassing or belittling subordinates	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1
Can be overly harsh toward subordinates	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Ridicules subordinates	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Reminds subordinates of their past mistakes and failures	1	1	1	6	1	1	6	1	1
Gives subordinates the "silent treatment"	1	1	1	4	1	5	1	1	1
Tells subordinates they are incompetent	1	1	1	6,1,4	1	1	1	1	1
Punishes subordinates severely	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Acts like a bully	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Scolds subordinates when they can't accomplish their tasks	2	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1
Demonstrates hostility toward subordinates	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Delivers punishments that exceed the severity of the crimes	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Tells subordinates that their thoughts or feelings are stupid	1	1	1	6,5	1	1	1	1	1
Publicly belittles subordinates	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Communicates with subordinates in an aggressive manner	1	1	1	1,5	1	1	1	1	1
Is rude to subordinates	1	1	1	5,1	1	1	1	1	1
Is inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special circumstances	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Does not permit subordinates to approach goals in new ways	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Asks subordinates to obey his/her instructions completely	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Forces subordinates to follow his/her rules to get things done	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

My supervisor…	Originally Proposed Category	Raters							Final Category
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
Determines all decisions in the unit whether they are important or not	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Always has the last say in meetings	2	2	2	2,6	2	2	2	2	2
Discourages subordinates from sharing ideas	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
Allows subordinates lots of freedom in their work ®	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
Makes it clear that everything must be done his/her way	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Encourages subordinates to be autonomous with respect to their job tasks ®	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
Controls how subordinates complete their tasks	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
Is best described as a micromanager	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	2
Exercises strict discipline over subordinates	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Restricts subordinates' ability to make decisions for themselves	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Sabotages ideas that contradict his/her policies	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
Behaves in a commanding fashion in front of employees	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Does everything exactly "by the book"	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
Stifles subordinates' creativity and innovative ideas	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2
Attempts to impair subordinate productivity for personal gain	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Exploits subordinates for personal ends	6	3	3	4	3	3	5	3	3
Is principally concerned with the process of personal advancement	3	3	3	3	3	3	6	3	3
Tries to make connections to people with high positions in the organization	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sends one message to his/her superior and a different message to his/her subordinates	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	5	3
Blames subordinates to save him/herself from embarrassment	1	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3
Reports all of his/her accomplishments to supervisors	3	3	3	6	3	3	3	3	3
Seems threatened by other peoples' talents	3	3	3	3	3	3	6	6	3

My supervisor…	Originally Proposed Category	Raters							Final Category
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
Takes credit for work his/her subordinates completed	3	3	3	3,5	3	3	3	3	3
Drastically changes his/her demeanor when a senior supervisor is present	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3
"Sucks up" to his/her supervisor	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Avoids decisions that may impair his/her reputation	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Plays organizational politics	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Stands up to his/her superior for his/her subordinates ®	3	5	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
Creates factions among subordinates	1	3	3	3,5	3	3	3	3	3
Accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her	1	3	3	6	3	3	3	3	3
Acts only in the best interest of his/her next promotion	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Seeks constant signs of approval from his/her supervisor	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Believes that "the backs of peers and subordinates are the rungs up the ladder of success"	3	3	3	3,6	3	3	3	6	3
Will offer assistance to anyone who might help him/her get ahead	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Is a "yes-man" to his/her supervisor	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Keeps the atmosphere of the workplace consistent ®	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	5	4
Is unpredictable in how he/she reacts to new information	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
Causes subordinates to try to "read" his/her mood	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
Affects the emotions of subordinates when impassioned	4	4	1	1	4	4	4	4	4
Keeps subordinates vigilant about his/her mood	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
Varies in his/her degree of approachability	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Allows his/her mood to affect his/her vocal tone and volume	4	4	1	4	5	4	4	4	4
Creates a consistent climate within the workplace ®	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4
Allows his/her current mood define the climate of the workplace	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4

My supervisor…	Originally Proposed Category	Raters A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Final Category
Implements company practices and policies in a consistent manner ®	4	5	4	2,3	4	4	4	5	4
Frequently changes the way he/she wants subordinates to complete tasks	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Has frequent, erratic mood swings	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
Volunteers subordinates for extra duties outside their job descriptions	1	5	5	2	2	5	5	5	5
Invades the privacy of subordinates	1	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Does not compensate subordinates for working overtime	1	5	5	2	1	5	5	5	5
Lies to subordinates	1	5	3	5	3	5	5	5	5
Does not comply with professional standards of conduct	5	5	5	5,1	6	5	5	5	5
Allows his/her personal issues to affect interactions with subordinates	1	5	5	4,5	5	4	5	5	5
Shares information told to him/her in confidence	3	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5
Makes subordinates complete personal tasks for him/her	5	2	5	5	5	5	1	5	5
Gossips about other people in the organization	3	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5
Is competent at doing the tasks that are assigned to the unit ®	5	5	5	2	3	5	5	5	5
Holds subordinates responsible for things outside their job descriptions	1	5	5	2,5	5	5	5	5	5
Always acts in a way that exemplifies the values of the organization ®	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5
Does not know how to perform the jobs of each of his/her subordinates	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5
Maintains a productive work/life balance for his/herself ®	1	5	5	3	5	4	5	5	5
Believes he/she can make others believe anything he/she wants them to	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Thrives on compliments and personal accolades	6	6	6	6	3	6	6	6	6
Has a sense of personal entitlement	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Thinks that he/she is more capable than others	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6

My supervisor…	Originally Proposed Category	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Final Category
Believes that he/she is above the rules	6	6	5	6	2	6	6	6	6
Believes that he/she is more competent than anybody else	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Believes that he/she can easily manipulate people	6	2	3	6	6	6	6	6	6
Assumes that he/she is destined to enter the highest ranks of my organization	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Believes him/herself to be special	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Behaves in ways that show he/she is self-centered	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Believes that he/she is an extraordinary person	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Tries to be the center of attention	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Makes inappropriate comments about subordinates	1	1	5	1,5	1	5	5	5	
Breaks promises he/she makes	1	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	
Incites conflict among his/her subordinates	1	1	3	5	3	3	1	3	
Allows subordinates to achieve a positive work/life balance ®	1	2	2	3	1	5	2	2	
Mentors subordinates to improve their performance ®	1	1	5	2	2	3	6	1	
Punishes the entire unit for mistakes made by one member	1	5	1	2	2	1	1	1	
Doesn't give subordinates credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort	1	3	5	6	3	6	3	3	
Gives subordinates feedback that is constructive ®	1	5	5	2	1	1	3	1	
Blames others for mistakes that he/she made	1	3,5	3	5	3	3	6	5	
Makes subordinates feel respected at all times ®	1	1	5	3	1	1	3	1	
Maintains a positive working relationship with subordinates ®	1	1	5	3	5	1	1	4	
Clearly communicates expectations ®	1	5	4	2	4	5	3	5	
Ensures that subordinates are recognized for their individual efforts ®	1	1	3	3	1	3	3	6	
Supports hazing members of the organization	1	1	5	5	1	1	5	5	
Expresses anger at subordinates when he/she is mad for another reason	1	4	5	5	5	1	4	5	

My supervisor…	Originally Proposed Category	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Final Category
Invests time and energy developing the skills of his/her subordinates ®	1	1	5	2,3	1	3	3	6	
Penalizes subordinates for taking sick leave and vacation time	1	1	5	2,5	1	5	5	5	
Denies responsibility for mistakes made in his/her unit	1	3	3	6	3	6	3	5	
Makes subordinates come in to work even when they are sick	1	2	5	2,5	1	5	5	5	
Is not considerate about subordinates' commitments outside of work	1	4	5	5	1	5	1	5	
Effectively communicates task significance to subordinates ®	2	5	5	2	2	5	2	5	
Puts pressure on subordinates	2	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	
Emphasizes that his/her unit must have the best performance of all the units in the organization	2	2	6	2	2	6	6	6	
Effectively transfers his/her knowledge to subordinates ®	2	5	5	2	2	5	3	6	
Focuses only on unit productivity, to the exclusion of subordinate welfare	2	1	5	2	2	5	1	5	
Does not allow subordinates to interact with their coworkers	2	2	2	?	3	5	1	2	
Lies to people in the workplace to advance his/her own position	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	
Distances him/herself from people that might tarnish his/her reputation	3	3	3	6	3	2	3	3	
Speaks poorly about subordinates to other people in the workplace	3	1	3	5	1	5	1	5	
Deliberately destroys or misplaces subordinates' work	3	1	3	3	3	1	5	3	
Protects subordinates from negativity of higher level supervisors ®	3	5	3	2	1	3	3	1	
Has a group of "cronies" or dedicated followers who implement his/her orders	3	3	3	3	2	2	6	3	
Picks "favorites" from among his/her subordinate group	3	5	3	5	3	5	1	5	
Maintains confidentiality when subordinates express concern about his/her superior ®	3	5	3	2	4	3	5	5	
Treats some subordinates differently than others	3	5	4	3,4,5	4	5	1	5	
Reports subordinates who complain about senior management	3	1	3	5	3	2	5	3	

My supervisor…	Originally Proposed Category	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Final Category
Gives preferential treatment to some subordinates but not others	3	5	3	4,5	5	5	1	5	
Amplifies constructive criticism from higher level supervisors into destructive	3	1	1	6	3	3	3	1	
Makes negative comments about subordinates to others	3	3	3	5	1	5	1	5	
Manipulates data so that it pleases superiors	3	3	3	3,5	3	3	5	5	
Is good at controlling his/her temper ®	4	5	1	3	4	4	4	4	
Has explosive outbursts	4	4	1	5,4	5	1	4	1	
Keeps subordinates "on their toes"	4	4	1	2	4	4	1	1	
Causes subordinates to worry about speaking to him/her	4	4	1	1	4	4	1	4	
Is an expert in his/her field	5	?	6	2	5	6	5	5	
Does not embody the values and ethics professed by the organization	5	5	5	1	6	5	5	5	
Exhibits strong personal character ®	5	4	6	2	6	2	5	4	
Respects his/her subordinates as professionals and as people ®	5	6	5	2,3,4	1	1	1	5	
Has a "do as I say, not as I do" mentality	5	5	4	4	2	5	2	5	
Leads by example ®	5	5	5	2	2	5	2	5	
Lies about receiving important paperwork from subordinates	5	3	3	5	3	3	5	5	
Treats his/her subordinates like they are simply raw resources	5	1	3	6	1	3	1	5	
Expresses care and concern for subordinates as people ®	5	1	5	3	1	3	5	5	
Does not trust anyone else to complete tasks effectively	6	2	2	6	6	2	6	6	
Does not listen to ideas or advice that contradicts his/her viewpoints	6	2	2	2,6	6	6	2	6	
Does not like acting on the ideas of others	6	2,6	2	2	6	6	6	6	
Has very high expectations for other people	6	5	5	2	6	2	2	5	
Strives to be seen as an authority figure	6	2	2	2	2	2	6	6	
Shows off when the opportunity arises	6	3	3	6	3	6	6	3	

My supervisor…	Originally Proposed Category	Raters							Final Category
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
Is open to constructive criticism about him/herself	6	5	2	3	6	6	2	6	
Acts as though the rules do not apply to him/her	6	6	5	6,5	2	6	6	5	
Will contradict or ignore ideas that are contrary to his/her own	6	2	2	6,2	2	6	6	6	
Insists that others show him/her respect	6	2,6	6	6	2	2	6	5	

Appendix C – Participants' Job Titles and Industries

Job Titles

Current Work Title	Frequency	Current Work Title	Frequency	Current Work Title	Frequency
(Black)	6	Financial Advisor	1	Principal Engineer	1
2nd Grade Teacher	1	Financial Intern	1	Product Supply Engineer	1
Account Executive	1	Fitness Instructor	1	Professor	1
Accountant	1	General Manager	1	Project Manager	3
Adjunct Professor	1	Graduate Teaching Assistant	2	Project Professional	1
Administrative Assistant	2	Graphic Designer	1	Psychologist	1
Administrative Clerk	1	Group Manager IT	1	Purchasing Manager	1
Administrator, Training and Employee Development	1	Hairdresser	1	Real Estate Agent/Office manager	1
Administrative Officer	1	Head of Pennsylvania Center for Periodontics	1	Real Estate Title Processor	1
Application Consulting/Director	1	Head Salesman	1	Realtor	1
Assistant Manager	1	Head Tutor Counselor	1	Receptionist	2
Assistant Vice President Environment (Hazmat?)	1	Independent Contractor Sales	1	Recording Clerk	1
Associate Professor	1	Instructional Math Coach	1	Recruitment Specialist	1
Associate Trainer	1	Insurance Agent	2	Regional Supervisor	1
Attorney	4	Interpreter	1	Registered Dental Hygienist	1
Barista	1	Inventory Control, Insurance Clerk	1	Registered Nurse	3
Bartender	1	IT Specialist	3	Regulatory Officer	1
Bookkeeper	1	Kindergarten Teacher	1	Regulatory Project Manager/Primary Reviewer	1
Branch Chief	1	Lab Technician	1	Research Analyst	1
Broker	1	Lactation Nurse, RN, IBCLC	1	Research Assistant	2
Building Service Manager	1	Language Analyst	1	Research Scientist	1
Carpenter Helper/Laborer	1	law Clerk	1	Researcher	1
Case Manager	1	Lead Accountant	1	Retired (Medical)	1
Cashier	2	Literacy Coach	1	Sales Associate	3
CEO	2	Loading Dock Supervisor	1	Sales Person	1

Current Work Title	Frequency	Current Work Title	Frequency	Current Work Title	Frequency
CFO	1	Local Guard Branch Chief	1	Sales Representative	1
Challenge Course Manager	1	Logistics Representative	1	School Administrator	1
Chief; Dam Bridge and Seismic Safety Branch	1	LSE Meeting Planner	1	School Social Worker	1
Circulation Supervisor	1	Maintenance Supervisor	1	Section Chief, Interventional Radiology	1
Civil Engineer	1	Male Model Calvin Klein	1	Senior Chemical Engineer	1
Client Services Specialist	1	Management and Program Analyst	1	Senior Director	1
Clinical Research Manager	1	Manager	2	Senior Military Analyst	1
Computer Technician	1	Manager at Kohl's	1	Senior President for Business Finance	1
Consultant	1	Manager at Washington Mutual Bank	1	Senior Property? Administrator	1
Contractor	1	Manager of LaMi Products	1	Senior Victim Advocate	1
Controller	1	Market Research Associate/Intern	1	Software Engineer	1
Coordinator of Fitness staff	1	Marketing	1	Special Education Teacher	1
Correctional Officer/Shift Commander	1	Mary Kay Consultant	1	Specialist in ARNG as a Blackhawk Helicopter Mechanic	1
Courier	1	MD-Rheumatology	1	SR Up Finance CFO	1
Curator	1	Mechanist Tech	1	Staff	1
Customer Service	1	Med. Tech	1	Steamfitter	1
Designer	1	Nurse	2	Store Manager	1
Director	1	Occupational Therapist	1	Student-Worker	1
Director of Accreditation	1	Office Automation Assistant	1	Student	1
Director of Admissions	1	Office Management	1	Student Classroom Support Technician	1
Director of Child Care Program	1	Office Secretary	1	Student Records Evaluator	1
Director of Counseling Services	1	Office/Senior Personal B	1	Student/Mutual Fund Accountant	1
Director of Facilities and Engineering	1	Operation Assistant	1	Student/Part-time Teaching Assistant Pre-school	1
Director of Operations	1	Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeon	1	Teacher's Aide	1
Director of Software Development	1	Owner	1	Teacher/Department Chair/Mentor	1
Director/Psychiatry?	1	Paralegal	1	Teaching Assistant	2
Education Program Assistant	1	Park Planner	1	Team Lead Animal Care Specialist	1

Current Work Title	Frequency	Current Work Title	Frequency	Current Work Title	Frequency
Educator	1	Partner (Attorney)	4	Title Clerk	1
Employee	1	Patient representative II	1	Trade Marketing Manager	1
Engineer	2	Physical Therapist Assistant	1	Tutor	1
Executive	1	Physician	1	Vice President	2
Executive Assistant II	1	Police Officer	1	Vice President of Consulting	1
Executive Director	2	Preschool Music Specialist (Teacher)	1	Vice President of Operations	1
Executive Manager	1	President	4	Vice President/Operations	1
Exhibition Management Assistant	1	President of MAFI Associates	1	Volunteer Assistant Coach	1
Faculty Research Assistant	1	Press Attaché	1	VP/GM Retired	1

Industries

Industry	Frequency	Industry	Frequency	Industry	Frequency
(Blank)	8	Fova Mtg.?	1	Not sure	1
Academia	11	General Merchandise Sales	1	Nuclear Utility	1
Accounting	2	Geotechnical Engineering and Construction Inspection	1	Oil Company	1
Advertising	1	Government/Federal	14	Optical Store	1
Aerospace	1	Government/State	2	Pharmaceutical	3
Arts Management	1	Hospitals/Healthcare	24	Physical Therapy	1
Ballet Instruction	1	High Tech	1	Public Diplomacy	1
Banking	1	Hospitality-Special Events	1	Public Health	1
Basketball Coaching	1	Housing/Maintenance	1	Public Library	1
Bio-Medical	1	HVAC	1	Public or Private Industries (Business)	1
Biotechnology	1	I-O Psychology	1	Public Relations	1
Car Rental	1	Industry Sanitation	1	Public Transit	1
Chemical Manufacturing	2	Insurance	2	Railroad	1
Commercial (Lockwork)	1	IT	6	Real Estate	7
Computer Software	1	Labor Rights	1	Recreation-Child Care	1
Computers/Shanghai Operations	1	Landscaping	1	Relocation	1
Construction	1	Law Enforcement	2	Repossession	1
Consulting	2	Legal	12	Research	3
Cosmetics	2	Lottery and Books	1	Retail	8
Dentistry	3	Manufacturing	2	Sales	2
Education	17	Marine Service	1	Salt Lake City Government	1
Energy: HVAC, power generation	1	Military	3	Social service/advocacy	1
Engineering	4	Mining and Fabrication	1	Telecommunications	4
Enterprise Communication	1	Modeling	1	Trade Shows	1
Finance	4	Music, Performing Rights	1	University	2
Fitness	2	Natural Stone Industry	1	Veterinary	2
FOA/Office of Vaccines	1	Newspapers	1	Wholesale	1
Food/Beverage Service	7	Nonprofit	1	Workforce and Education Development	1
Foreign Services (U.S. Dept of State)	1				

Appendix D – Quantitative Survey

(Most Destructive Supervisor I have ever Experienced)

Initials _____ Date _____

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Project Title: Leadership in Organizations

Why is this research being done?
This is a research project being conducted by graduate students under the direction of Dr. Paul J. Hanges at the University of Maryland, College Park. The purpose of this project is to understand various leadership styles and their effects on subordinates and the workplace environment. We hope that through this project, we will gain a better understanding of the different types of leaders that operate in the modern workplace.

What will I be asked to do?
You will be asked to answer a series of questions about your experiences with supervisors you have had at work. Please read each question and write the number that corresponds with your response in the blank next to the question.

What about confidentiality?
We will do our best to keep your personal information confidential. Although your supervisor may know that you are completing this survey, any information you provide will not be shared with your supervisor. To help protect your confidentiality, a code will be used to store your leadership judgments. Your name will not be included on surveys and other collected data and your name will NOT be stored in any electronic data file. All information will be stored in locked file cabinets in locked rooms in the Biology/Psychology Building, or will be on private, password protected electronic files accessible to the researchers only. While information collected from these surveys may be published, all results will be presented in the aggregate and no personal identifying information will published. When we write our report/research article about this research project, your identity will be protected to the maximum extent possible. Please note, your information may be shared with representatives of the University of Maryland, College Park or governmental authorities if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.

What are the risks of this research?
There are no known risks associated with participating in this research project.

What are the benefits of this research?
The results of this study will help the investigator learn more about leadership. We hope that this study will be helpful in the future to understand various leadership styles and benefit others through improved understanding of certain characteristics that promote effective leadership.

Do I have to be in this research? May I stop participating at any time?

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in this research, you may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized or lose any benefits to which you otherwise qualify.

What if I have questions?

This research is being conducted by Dr. Paul Hanges, Psychology Department, at the University of Maryland, College Park. If you have any questions about the research study itself, please contact Dr. Hanges at:

1147 Biology/Psychology Building,
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742.
Email: phanges@umd.edu
Telephone: 301-405-5930

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact:

Institutional Review Board Office, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742;
(e-mail) irb@deans.umd.edu;
(telephone) 301-405-0678.

This research has been reviewed according to the University of Maryland, College Park IRB procedures for research involving human participants.

Statement of Age of Subject and Consent

Your signature indicates that: you are at least 18 years of age; the research has been explained to you; your questions have been fully answered; and you freely and voluntarily choose to participate in this research project.

Signature and Date

NAME OF PARTICIPANT:

SIGNATURE OF
PARTICIPANT:

DATE:

<u>Demographics</u>

1.   Please indicate your current age: _____ years-old

2.   Are you: Male   Female

3.   What is your current work title?

        _____

4.   Is this a management position?   Yes   No

             If yes, is it: Mid-level Management   Senior
Management

5.   Please indicate how long you have been with your current company:
        _____ years

6.   Are you planning to change companies within the next 12 months?
        Yes   No

             If yes, please list two reasons for leaving:

_____

_____

7.   Please indicate the industry in which you work:

        _____

If you are not <u>military personnel</u>, please skip to the next page. If you are a member of the Armed Services, please answer the following questions before proceeding to the next page.

8.   What is your status?   Active   Reserve   Retired
        Midshipman / Cadet

9.   Please indicate your branch of service:

        _____

10.   Please indicate your Community/Warfare Specialty:

        _____

11.   Please indicate your years of service: _____ years

If less than 5 years, do you plan to serve for 10 years or more?   Yes

No

                                    20 years or more?   Yes

No

12.   Please indicate your pay grade:

       _____

13.   If you are an officer, are you prior-enlisted?   Yes   No

<u>Instructions</u>

Thank you for completing our survey. There are four sections to the survey, and note that response options vary from one section to the next. Please be sure to review the response options at the beginning of each section.

The purpose of this study is to develop a scale of leadership. This survey is a preliminary step in the scale construction process. Therefore, **<u>some of the following questions will seem repetitive</u>**. This is intentional because statistical analysis may show that even though questions seem similar, the particular wording of one question may be better than the wording of a similar question. It is important that you answer each question even if it seems to repeat other items in the survey.

Section 1

To begin, think of the **most destructive supervisor you have experienced** and answer each question with regard to this individual. If you are no longer working with this person, answer as you would have when you were working with him/her. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

The **most destructive supervisor I have experienced…**

1. _____ Communicates with subordinates in an aggressive manner
2. _____ Behaves in a commanding fashion in front of his/her subordinates
3. _____ Frequently changes the way he/she wants subordinates to complete tasks
4. _____ Exploits subordinates for personal ends
5. _____ Insists that others show him/her respect
6. _____ Has explosive outbursts
7. _____ Blames subordinates to save him/herself from embarrassment
8. _____ Is hostile toward subordinates
9. _____ Forces subordinates to follow his/her rules to get things done
10. _____ Lies to subordinates
11. _____ Does not like acting on the ideas of others
12. _____ Likes having authority over people
13. _____ Shares information told to him/her in confidence
14. _____ Puts subordinates down in front of others
15. _____ Scolds subordinates when they cannot accomplish their tasks
16. _____ Allows his/her current mood to define the climate of the workplace
17. _____ Keeps subordinates vigilant about his/her mood
18. _____ Allows his/her personal issues to affect interactions with subordinates
19. _____ Controls how subordinates complete their tasks
20. _____ Ridicules subordinates
21. _____ Keeps the atmosphere of the workplace consistent
22. _____ Expresses anger at subordinates for unknown reasons
23. _____ Sends one message to his/her superior and a different message to his/her subordinates
24. _____ Emphasizes that his/her unit must have the best performance of all the units in the organization

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

The **most destructive supervisor I have experienced…**

25. _____ Asks subordinates to obey his/her instructions completely

26. _____ Allows his/her mood to affect his/her vocal tone and volume

27. _____ Stifles subordinates' creativity and innovative ideas

28. _____ Maintains a positive working relationship with subordinates

29. _____ Lies to people in the workplace to advance his/her own position

30. _____ Has a sense of personal entitlement

31. _____ Refuses to allow subordinates to take earned vacation time

32. _____ Varies in his/her degree of approachability

33. _____ Acts as though the rules do not apply to him/her

34. _____ Has a group of "cronies" or dedicated followers who implement his/her orders

35. _____ Exercises strict discipline over subordinates

36. _____ Drastically changes his/her demeanor when his/her supervisor is present

37. _____ Seeks constant signs of approval from his/her supervisor

38. _____ Reports subordinates who complain about senior management

39. _____ Does not trust anyone else to complete tasks effectively

40. _____ Assumes that he/she is destined to enter the highest ranks of my organization

41. _____ Believes he/she is a special person

42. _____ Punishes the entire unit for mistakes made by one member

43. _____ Invades the privacy of subordinates

44. _____ Involves him/herself in organizational politics

45. _____ Does not permit subordinates to approach goals in new ways

46. _____ Creates a consistent climate within the workplace

47. _____ Makes negative comments about subordinates to others

48. _____ Denies responsibility for mistakes made in his/her unit

49. _____ Does not listen to ideas or advice that contradicts his/her viewpoints

50. _____ Holds subordinates responsible for things outside their job descriptions

51. _____ Tells subordinates that their thoughts or feelings are stupid

52. _____ Restricts subordinates' ability to make decisions for themselves

53. _____ Distances him/herself from people that might tarnish his/her reputation

54. _____ Behaves in ways that show he/she is self-centered

55. _____ Causes subordinates to try to "read" his/her mood

56. _____ Is rude to subordinates

57. _____ Allows subordinates lots of freedom in their work

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Slightly Disagree**	**Slightly Agree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

The **most destructive supervisor I have experienced…**

58. _____ Always has the last say in meetings
59. _____ Avoids decisions that may impair his/her reputation
60. _____ Will ignore ideas that are contrary to his/her own
61. _____ Gives preferential treatment to some subordinates but not others
62. _____ Is inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special circumstances
63. _____ Has frequent, erratic mood swings
64. _____ Gives subordinates the "silent treatment"
65. _____ Is not considerate about subordinates' commitments outside of work
66. _____ Is unpredictable in how he/she reacts to new information
67. _____ Takes credit for work his/her subordinates completed
68. _____ Implements company practices and policies in a consistent manner
69. _____ Punishes subordinates severely
70. _____ Will only offer assistance to people who can help him/her get ahead
71. _____ Maintains confidentiality when subordinates express concerns about higher level supervisors
72. _____ Incites conflict among his/her subordinates
73. _____ Thinks that he/she is more capable than others
74. _____ Is apt to show off when he/she gets the chance
75. _____ Makes subordinates come in to work even when they are sick
76. _____ Believes that he/she is more competent than anybody else
77. _____ Accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her
78. _____ Is open to constructive criticism about him/herself
79. _____ Believes he/she can make others believe anything he/she wants them to
80. _____ Does not give subordinates credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort
81. _____ Picks "favorites" from among his/her subordinate group
82. _____ Is principally concerned with the process of personal advancement
83. _____ Believes him/herself to be special
84. _____ Is good at controlling his/her temper
85. _____ Believes that he/she is an extraordinary person
86. _____ Keeps subordinates "on their toes"
87. _____ Speaks poorly about subordinates to other people in the workplace
88. _____ Thrives on compliments and personal accolades
89. _____ Believes that he/she can easily manipulate people

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Slightly Disagree**	**Slightly Agree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

The **most destructive supervisor I have experienced…**

90. _____ Believes that he/she is above the rules
91. _____ Affects the emotions of subordinates when impassioned
92. _____ Determines all decisions in the unit whether they are important or not
93. _____ Publicly belittles subordinates
94. _____ Treats some subordinates differently than others
95. _____ Reminds subordinates of their past mistakes and failures
96. _____ Stands up to his/her superior for his/her subordinates
97. _____ Focuses only on unit productivity, to the exclusion of subordinate welfare
98. _____ Creates factions among subordinates
99. _____ Puts pressure on subordinates
100. _____ Likes to be the center of attention
101. _____ Acts only in the best interest of his/her next promotion
102. _____ Gossips about other people in the organization
103. _____ Breaks promises he/she makes
104. _____ Tells subordinates they are incompetent
105. _____ Expresses anger at subordinates when he/she is mad for another reason

Section 2

To begin, think of the **most destructive supervisor you have experienced** and answer each question with regard to this individual. If you are no longer working with this person, answer as you would have when you were working with him/her. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

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

1. _____ I usually know how satisfied this supervisor is with what I do.
2. _____ I feel that this supervisor understands my problems and needs.
3. _____ I feel that this supervisor recognizes my potential.
4. _____ If necessary, this supervisor would use his or her power and influence to help me.
5. _____ I would support this supervisor's decisions even if he or she was not present.
6. _____ I have an effective working relationship with this supervisor.
7. _____ I can count on this supervisor to support me even when I'm in a tough situation at work

Section 3

To begin, think of the **most destructive supervisor you have experienced** and answer each question with regard to this individual. If you are no longer working with this person, answer as you would have when you were working with him/her. Using the scale below, please indicate the <u>frequency</u> with which this person exhibits each of these behaviors.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at All	**Once in a While**	**Sometimes**	**Fairly Often**	**Frequently, if not Always**

The **most destructive supervisor I have experienced…**

1. _____ Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts.
2. _____ Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.
3. _____ Fails to interfere until problems become serious.
4. _____ Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations form standards.
5. _____ Avoids getting involved when important issues arise.
6. _____ Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs.
7. _____ Is absent when needed.
8. _____ Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.
9. _____ Talks optimistically about the future.
10. _____ Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.
11. _____ Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.
12. _____ Waits for things to go wrong before taking action.
13. _____ Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.
14. _____ Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at All	**Once in a While**	**Sometimes**	**Fairly Often**	**Frequently, if not Always**

The **most destructive supervisor I have experienced…**

15. _____ Spends time teaching and coaching.
16. _____ Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are
       _____ achieved.
17. _____ Shows that he/she is a firm believer in, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."
18. _____ Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.
19. _____ Treats me as an individual rather than just a member of the group.
20. _____ Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action.
21. _____ Acts in ways that builds my respect.
22. _____ Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints,
       _____ and failures.
23. _____ Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.
24. _____ Keeps track of all mistakes.
25. _____ Displays a sense of power and confidence.
26. _____ Articulates a compelling vision for the future.
27. _____ Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards.
28. _____ Avoids making decisions.
29. _____ Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from
       _____ others.
30. _____ Gets me to look at problems from many different angles.
31. _____ Helps me to develop my strengths.
32. _____ Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assigned tasks.
33. _____ Delays responding to urgent questions.
34. _____ Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.
35. _____ Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations.
36. _____ Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.
37. _____ Is effective in meeting my job-related needs.
38. _____ Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying.
39. _____ Gets me to do more than I expected to do.
40. _____ Is effective in representing me to higher authority.
41. _____ Works with me in a satisfactory way.
42. _____ Heightens my desire to succeed.
43. _____ Is effective in meeting organizational requirements.
44. _____ Increases my willingness to try harder.
45. _____ Leads a group that is effective.

Section 4

The following questions ask about different elements of your work experience <u>while</u> <u>you were working with this destructive leader</u>. If you are no longer working with this person, answer as you would have when you were working with him/her.

Please circle the face below that best represents your <u>overall satisfaction</u> with…

1.   **Your <u>job</u>.**

2.   **Your <u>coworkers</u>.**

3.   **Your <u>supervisor</u>.**

4.   **Your <u>pay</u>.**

Debriefing: Developing a Measure of "Toxic Leadership"

Thank you for completing the survey! In the current study I am interested in developing a valid measure of toxic leadership. Recent articles in the popular press suggest that there is a unique, insidious type of dysfunctional leadership. These articles describe a unique blend of negative attributes and call it "toxic leadership" because they hypothesize that this leadership style will have particularly negative consequences for subordinates and organizations. Unfortunately, despite increased attention in the popular press, toxic leadership has not been systematically studied.

You just completed a questionnaire asking about various types of leadership behaviors that span both effective and destructive leadership styles. Your responses will help create and validate the first scientific measure of toxic leadership behavior.

The final purpose of this study is to develop an empirical survey that can be used to detect toxic leadership in organizations. This will allow researchers to help organizations identify and correct toxic leadership behaviors. The hope is that this measure will improve the work lives of subordinates who are currently suffering by working under toxic bosses. Therefore, your participation has contributed to an improvement of the work lives of other people.

I appreciate your willingness to share your thoughts and experiences with me. Your candor has been important in developing this survey. Once again, no information that will identify you will be used in the research and all results will be reported in the aggregate. Therefore, your participation in this study and the responses you provided are confidential.

If you have any further questions about this study please do not hesitate to contact the investigators. We really appreciate your participation in this study!

Andrew Schmidt: andrew.schmidt.umd@gmail.com, (301) 405-5934

Paul Hanges: phanges@umd.edu, (301) 405-5930

Appendix E – Final Scales

Abusive Supervision: alpha = 0.93
1. Ridicules subordinates
2. Holds subordinates responsible for things outside their job descriptions
3. Is not considerate about subordinates' commitments outside of work
4. Speaks poorly about subordinates to other people in the workplace
5. Publicly belittles subordinates
6. Reminds subordinates of their past mistakes and failures
7. Tells subordinates they are incompetent

Authoritarian Leadership: alpha = 0.89
1. Controls how subordinates complete their tasks
2. Invades the privacy of subordinates
3. Does not permit subordinates to approach goals in new ways
4. Will ignore ideas that are contrary to his/her own
5. Is inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special circumstances
6. Determines all decisions in the unit whether they are important or not

Narcissism: alpha = 0.88
1. Has a sense of personal entitlement
2. Assumes that he/she is destined to enter the highest ranks of my organization
3. Thinks that he/she is more capable than others
4. Believes that he/she is an extraordinary person
5. Thrives on compliments and personal accolades

Self-Promotion: alpha = 0.91
1. Drastically changes his/her demeanor when his/her supervisor is present
2. Denies responsibility for mistakes made in his/her unit
3. Will only offer assistance to people who can help him/her get ahead
4. Accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her
5. Acts only in the best interest of his/her next promotion

Unpredictability: alpha = 0.92
1. Has explosive outbursts
2. Allows his/her current mood to define the climate of the workplace
3. Expresses anger at subordinates for unknown reasons
4. Allows his/her mood to affect his/her vocal tone and volume
5. Varies in his/her degree of approachability
6. Causes subordinates to try to "read" his/her mood
7. Affects the emotions of subordinates when impassioned

References

Andersson, B. & Nilsson, S. (1964). Studies in the reliability and validity of the critical incident technique. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 48,* 398-403.

Ambrose, S. E. (1992). Band of Brothers: E Company 506th Regiment, 101st Airborne from Normandy to Hitler's Eagle Nest. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Aryee, S., Sun, L., Chen, Z. X., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 191-201.

Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations, 47,* 755-779.

Ashforth, B. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14,* 126-140.

Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1995). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mindgarten.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bavelas, A. (1948). A mathematical model for group structure. *Human Organizations, 7,* 16-30.

Bono, J. E. & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17,* 317-334.

Brandel, M. (2006). Bad boss: How to survive the monster manager. *Computerworld, January 23,* 31-33.

Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 234-246.

Cheng, B. Chou, L., Wu, T., Huang, M., & Farh, J. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 7,* 89-117.

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

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations – a longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 31,* 46-78.

Dearlove, D. (2003). Interview: Manfred Kets de Vries: The dark side of leadership. *Business Strategy Review, 14,* 25-28.

Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8,* 49-65.

Di Genio, J. (2002). The toxic boss. *Armed Forces Comptroller, Winter,* 14-18.

Dorfman, P. W. (1998). Implications of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism for leadership effectiveness. In L.C. Change & R. B. Peterson (Eds.), *Advances in international comparative management* (vol. 12, pp. 53-65). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Dreijmanis, J. (2005). A portrait of the artist as politician: The case of Adolf Hitler. *Social Science Journal, 42,* 115-127.

Dyck, D. (2001). The toxic workplace. *Benefits Canada, 25,* 52-57.

Erez, M. & Earley, P. C. (1993). *Culture, self-identity and work.* New York, NY:
    Oxford University Press.

Fielding, K.S. & Hogg, M.A. (1997). Social identity, self-categorization, and
    leadership: A field study of small interactive groups. *Group Dynamics: Theory,
    Research, and Practice, 1 (1)*, 39-51.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition.* New York, NY: Mcgraw-Hill
    Book Company.

Flynn, G. (1999). Stop toxic leaders before they stop you! *Workforce, August,* 44-46.
    See online at <www.workforce.com/archive/feature/22/22/12/223888/php>
    accessed 25 July 2006.

Frost, P. J. (2004). Handling toxic emotions: New challenges for leaders and their
    organization. *Organizational Dynamics, 33,* 111-127.

Furnham, A. (1996). The big five versus the big four: The relationship between the
    Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and NEO-PI five factor model of
    personality. *Personality & Individual Differences, 21(2)*, 303-307.

Gatewood, R. d., Field, H. S., & Barrick, M. (2008). Human Resource Selection.
    Mason, OH: Thomson South-western.

Goldman, A. (2006). High toxicity leadership: Borderline personality disorder and
    the dysfunctional organization. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21,* 733-746.

Goodman, L. A. (1961). Snowball sampling. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 32,*
    148-170.

Graham, J. W. (1991). Servant-leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *The Leadership Quarterly, 2,* 105-119.

Graves, J. R., & Robinson, J. D. (1976). Proxemic behavior as a function of inconsistent verbal and nonverbal messages. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23,* 333-338.

Henley, K. (2003). Detoxifying a toxic leader. *Innovative Leader, 12 (6),* article 578.

Hickman, S.E., Watson, P.J. & Morris, R.J. (1996). Optimism, pessimism, and the complexity of narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *20,* 521-525.

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

House, R. J., Wright, N. S., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). [Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory.](#) *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology.* San Francisco, CA: The New Lexington Press/Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: relationship of the narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 762-776.

Kets de Vries, M. F. (1999a). What's playing in the organizational theater? Collusive relationships in management. *Human Relations, 52,* 745-773

Kets de Vries, M. F. (1999b). High-performance teams: Lessons from the pygmies. *Organizational Dynamics, 27,* 66-77.

Kets de Vries, M. F. & Miller, D. (1985). Narcissism and leadership: An object relations perspective. *Human Relations, 38,* 583-601.

Klass, D. & Hutch, R. A. (1986). *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 16,* 89-109.

Kline, T. J. B. (2005). Psychological testing: A practical approach to design and evaluation. US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Korn, M. (2004). Toxic cleanup: How to deal with a dangerous leader. *Fast Company, 88,* 117.

Kulas, J. T., Stachowski, A. A., & Haynes, B. A. (in press). Middle response functioning in Likert-response to personality items. *Journal of Business Psychology.*

Kunin, T. (1955). The construction of a new type of attitude measure. *Personnel Psychology, 8,* 65-77.

Lester, M. C. (2007). Ten warning signs of a toxic boss. *Monster.* See online at < http://career-advice.monster.com/interview-preparation/Ten-Warning-Signs-of-a-Toxic-Boss/home.aspx> accessed 18 February, 2008.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005a). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians – and how we can survive them.* Oxford, England, Oxford University Press.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005b). The allure of toxic leaders: Why followers rarely escape their clutches. *Ivey business Journal, January/February,* 1-8.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005c). Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. *Leader to Leader, Spring 2005,* 29-36.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K.G., Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of

transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ

literature. *The Leadership Quarterly, 7 (3)*, 385-425.

Macklem, K. (2005). The toxic workplace. *Maclean's, 118,* 34-35.

May, D. R., Chan, A. Y. L., Hodges, T. D., & Avoilio, B. J. (2003). Developing the

moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 32,* 247-260.

Piper, W. E., Doan, B., Edwards, E. M., Jones, B. D. (1979). Cotherapy behavior,

group therapy process, and treatment outcome. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical

Psychology, 47,* 1081-1089.

Post, J. M. (1994). Saddam Hussein of Iraq: A political psychology profile. In

Blumberg, H. H. & French, C. C. (Eds.) The Persian Gulf War: Views from the

social and behavioral sciences. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Post, J. M. (1997). Narcissism and the quest for political power. In Ellman, C. S. &

Reppen, J. (Eds.) Omnipotent fantasies and the vulnerable self. Lanham MD:

Jason Aronson.

Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological

Reports, 45,* 590.

Reed, G.E. (2004). Toxic leadership. *Military Review, JUL-AUG,* 67-71.

Rosenthal, S. A. & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership

Quarterly, 17,* 617-633.

Sankowsky, D. (1995). The charismatic leader as narcissist: Understanding the abuse

of power. *Organizational Dynamics, 23,* 57-71.

Schneider, B.S., Paul, M.C., White, S.S., & Holcombe, K.M. (1999). Understanding

high school leaders I: Predicting teacher ratings of leadership behavior. *The*

Leadership Quarterly, 10 (4), 609-636.

Schneider, B.S., Ehrhart, K.H., Ehrhart, M.G. (2002). Understanding high school

leaders II. Peer nominations of leaders and their correlates. *The Leadership*

Quarterly, 13, 275-299.

Seal, D. W., Bogart, L. K., & Ehrhardt, A. A. (1998). Small group dynamics: The

utility of focus group discussions as a research method. *Group Dynamics: Theory,*

Research, and Practice, 2, 253-266.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2001). Experimental and quasi-

experimental designs for generalized causal inference. Boston, MA: Houghton

Mifflin Company.

Shaw, J. B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural

management. *Academy of Management Review, 15,* 626-645.

Sheng, M. M. (2001). Mao Zedong's narcissistic personality disorder and China's

road to disaster. In Feldman, O. & Valenty, L. O. (Eds.) Profiling political

leaders: Cross-cultural studies of personality and behavior. Westport, CT: Praeger

Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.

Simmons, K. (2001). Sticks and Stones. *Executive Update*. See online at

<http://www.asaecenter.org/PublicationsResources/articledetail.cfm?ItemNumber

=12992> accessed 7 February 2007.

Taylor, R. (2007). Tackling toxic leaders. *Director, May*, 27.

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., Hoobler, J., Duffy, M. K., Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 455-465.

Townsend, J. S., & Wichern, F. B. (1984). The development of the Spiritual Leadership Qualities Inventory. *Journal of Psychology & Theology, 12,* 305-313.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2007). 2006 Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries.

Vega, G. & Comer, D. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break your bones, but words can break your spirit: Bullying in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics, 58,* 101-109.

Walker, J. M. T. (2008). Looking at teacher practices through the lens of parenting style. *Journal of Experimental Education, 76,* 218-240.

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 247-252.

Wasylyshyn, K. M. (2005). The reluctant president. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 57,* 57-70.

West, B. (2007). Neutralize your toxic boss: Tips from four survivors. *Monster*. See online at < http://career-advice.monster.com/conflict-management/Neutralize-Your-Toxic-Boss/home.aspx> accessed 18 February, 2008.

Whicker, M. L. (1996). *Toxic leaders: When organizations go bad.* Westport, CT. Quorum Books.

Whicker, M. L. (1997). Minimizing the damage of a 'toxic leader.' *PA Times, 20,* 1-2.

Williams, D. F. (2005). Toxic Leadership in the U.S. Army. See online at < http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/ksil3.pdf > accessed 4 March, 2008.

Wilson-Starks, K. Y. (2003). Toxic leadership. *Transleadership, Inc.* See online at <www.transleadership.com> accessed 25 July 2006.

www.toxicboss.com

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