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ABSTRACT

Leadership Ineffectiveness: The Interactive Effects of Leader Personality, Job Demands, and Job Resources on Ethical Climate and Employee Turnover Intentions

by

Michelle D. Corman

Advisor: Dr. Joel Lefkowitz

Goals of the present research were to demonstrate that: (a) leadership personality is related to employee perceptions of the organization’s ethical climate; (b) leader job stress moderates this relationship for certain personality attributes; and (c) such leader-associated ethical climate, in turn, is related to employee turnover intentions and ultimate turnover (see Figure 1). Specifically, I investigated how individual differences in certain leadership “dark side” traits interact with leader job stress to influence the perceived ethical climate of their employees, to ultimately impact employee turnover intentions and turnover. Another goal of this research was to make unique predictions for the leadership dark side categories. Both new scales and a previously validated instrument were used. Specifically, the present research utilized the Hogan Development Scale (HDS), a well-known, validated, and highly utilized instrument to measure leaders’ dark side traits. Three new scales were identified in an archival dataset to assess (a) leader stress; (b) employee ethical climate perceptions; and (c) employee turnover intentions. Data were initially collected from a large organization headquartered in the United States, and represent responses from 498 managers mapped to team data comprising a total of 5,275 direct report responses. The present research employed both correlation and moderated mediation statistical techniques to investigate direct, indirect, and interactive relationships among variables.
Keywords: leadership dark side traits, leadership personality, ethical climate, ethical culture, job stress, job demands, job resources, job-demands-resources, employee turnover intentions, employee attitudes, structural equation modeling.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

It is believed that many leaders climb the organizational ladder based on luck and political skill, often without demonstrating true leadership ability (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Leadership ineffectiveness, as reflected in the manager’s inability to build, guide, and maintain a team that can outperform the competition (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994), is an important area to understand, as research shows that its prevalence is quite high. Specifically, according to Hogan, Hogan, and Kaiser (2010), the “base rate for managerial incompetence is about fifty percent” (p. 24). In addition, leadership ineffectiveness is important to understand because of the costs associated with failed leaders. Specifically, it is estimated that each failed senior leader costs the organization $1.5 to $2.7 million dollars (Harms & Spain, 2015). Further, costs associated with leadership development and coaching exceed $2 billion annually worldwide. These estimated costs do not include additional costs for severance packages, golden parachutes, lost social and intellectual capital, and costs associated with a disengaged workforce (Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2010).

It is important to understand the “dark side” of leadership, as it contributes to leadership ineffectiveness. Babiak and Hare (2006) published their book, “Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work” highlighting a disproportionate prevalence of “darkness” in management positions. For example, these researchers posit that while only about one percent of the general population is diagnosed as psychopaths, the prevalence in senior leadership positions is notably higher, at three percent. In subsequent research on this topic, Babiak, Neumann, and Hare (2010) attribute this high base-rate to power. That is, psychopaths are thought to be drawn to influential positions of power and are thus perhaps somewhat overrepresented in leadership
positions. Recent research has called for a heightened focus on leadership ineffectiveness in the workplace (Guenole, 2014).

Therefore, the present research sought to better understand leadership ineffectiveness and the impact of the dark side of leadership on ethical climate, particularly when the leader is faced with job stressors (i.e., high levels of job demands and low levels of job resources). Further, the present study sought to highlight the outcomes associated with such leader-associated ethical climate. Specifically, the goals of the present research were to investigate the extent to which: (a) leader personality is related to employee perceptions of the organization’s ethical climate; (b) leader job demands and job resources moderates this relationship for certain leader dark side personality attributes; and (c) how such leader-associated ethical climate, in turn, is related to both employee turnover intentions and ultimately, actual turnover. Unique predictions were tested for specific dark side personality attributes, and various paths among study variables were explored.

The present study utilized archival employee data collected from a large American owned multinational technology organization headquartered in the United States. Measures assessed in the present research encompass: (a) annual employee survey item responses with supervisor/subordinate reporting relationships mapped; (b) Hogan Personality Assessments from managers – linked to annual census data, with supervisor/subordinate reporting relationships mapped; and (c) data from the company’s human resource information systems (HRIS) three years post survey data collection, indicating employees who exited the organization three years after the employee survey administration.

There were a number of variables of interest in the present study. These include leader dark side traits, leader stress, employee ethical climate perceptions, employee turnover
intentions, and team turnover. All study variables are discussed in greater detail in chapter 3, however it is important to note that leader dark side personality data were derived from Hogan Personality Assessments, leader stress was collected via the annual company survey, direct report / subordinate attitudes about the ethical climate and turnover intentions were also collected via the annual company survey, and team turnover data were derived from a company HRIS file three years following the annual employee survey.

Findings indicated a number of relationships among study variables, and some hypotheses generated for the present research received support. Further, one of the three leader dark side categories demonstrated interesting relationships with other study variables, as assessed via path analysis. The most compelling finding of the present research indicates team perceptions of ethical climate mediate the relationship between one of the three leader dark side personality traits assessed (i.e., category I, moving away from people) and employee turnover intentions.

The theoretical rationales, hypotheses tested, methods, and results are described in greater detail throughout this paper. However, it is important to first understand the growing body of literature on leadership as a construct. Therefore, in the following chapter, I review the literature on leadership, tracing its development and application.
Chapter 2: Leadership Models

Leadership is defined as persuading other people to pursue a common goal that is important for the welfare and responsibilities of a group, while setting aside for a period of time their individual concerns (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). That is, leaders take on the task of directing and influencing behavior that likely would not have ordinarily occurred, through directing the action of others. Many leadership theories have emerged in the literature, including behavioral, contingency, relational, and trait theories, as described below.

Behavioral theories of leadership encompass assessing leadership ability through leader behavior. For example, early research in this area posited two disparate components of successful leadership: initiating structure and consideration (Fleishman, 1953). Initiating structure entails establishing clear guidelines and procedures to facilitate achievement of goals; consideration involves leading through demonstrating trust, respect, and concern for others. Judge and Piccolo (2004) found that initiating structure and consideration were positively related to employee job satisfaction and motivation, leader job performance, group performance, and leader effectiveness ratings. Further, this research demonstrated that consideration in particular showed stronger relationships with attitudinal outcomes such as employee job satisfaction, whereas initiating structure was more closely related to performance outcomes.

Contingency theory denotes that rewards are contingent upon followers meeting specified performance targets (Bass, 1985; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The first true contingency theory of leadership categorized leaders as either task-oriented or relationship-oriented (Fiedler, 1967). Further, importance is placed on leader-follower relationships, performance goal clarity, and formal authority, whereby optimal leadership outcomes are the result of correspondence between behaviors and situations. Specifically, Fiedler concluded that leaders characterized as task-
oriented are more effective in extreme situations (i.e., very favorable or unfavorable); whereas leaders characterized as relationship-oriented are more effective in moderately favorable situations. Specifically, during times of crisis, a task-oriented leader focuses on the task and acts decisively; whereas relationship-oriented leaders may become overwhelmed and distracted by the needs of others. On the other hand, in more moderate creative environments, relationship-oriented leaders may foster creativity in their followers while task-oriented leaders may inhibit their creativity. Another example of contingency theory is path-goal theory (Vroom, 1964), which encompasses the necessity for leaders to align goals of subordinates with the goals of the organization, and facilitate achievement of those goals.

Relational theories of leadership focus on the relationships between leaders and subordinates. For example, leader-member exchange theory (LMX; Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975) focuses on the leader-follower dyad. A central tenet of this theory is that the leader treats his or her followers differently, based on the mutual influence within each dyad. These dyadic relationships are categorized into two types: in-group and out-group. The in-group is a smaller number of trusted employees, often referred to as the inner circle. These followers are willing to work hard in exchange for the trust and positive interaction provided by the leader. They are typically characterized as dependable, committed, hard-working, and highly involved in administrative duties. The resulting relationship is one of trust, liking, provision of latitude, attention, and mutual respect and influence. Conversely, low quality relationships (defined as the out-group) are characterized by downward influence, role distinctions, social distance, contractual obligations, and distrust. Research has identified a number of positive employee outcomes associated with high LMX: higher job satisfaction, stronger organizational commitment, better role clarity, stronger levels of performance, greater well-being, and lower
levels of turnover (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Similarly, Ilies, Nahrgang and Morgeson (2007) found a relationship between high LMX and employee citizenship behaviors (i.e., going above and beyond one’s responsibilities to benefit the organization). Conversely, reduced performance among subordinates is associated with low-quality LMX relationships (Schreisheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999).

Trait theories of leadership focus on the impact of leader traits on the leader-subordinate dyad. Great man theory was among the earliest trait theories, which originally focused on traits such as height, gender, authoritarianism, intelligence, etc. (Redl, 1942). However, opponents dispelled the great man theory, concluding that no such traits consistently predicted leadership (Mann, 1959; Stodgill, 1948). As a result, leadership research began a shift toward more behavioral theories. Several decades passed before research began to focus once again on a trait approach.

Transformational/transactional leadership theories focus on leader influence over subordinates (Bass, 1985). Transformational and transactional appear at opposite ends of the same continuum. Specifically, a transformational leader is characterized as motivated by what is best for the organization, providing a compelling vision, and is driven by a collective sense of mission and long-term well-being (Barling, Christie, & Hopton, 2010; Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Further, transformational leaders resist short-term financial outcomes and focus rather on long-term well-being of employees. Such leaders act with integrity, and inspire motivation in others through encouraging employees to achieve more than previously thought possible, setting high but realistic standards, inspiring employees to overcome obstacles, and instilling a belief that they can confront and overcome current and future hurdles. In addition, transformational leaders provide intellectual stimulation through
encouraging employees to think for themselves, and to approach matters in innovative ways. That is, transformational leaders focus on individualized consideration by providing compassion and special attention to employees’ personal needs. Such leaders act as mentors to their employees, by affording them empowerment, which in turn leads to increased organizational commitment (Avolio, Sosik, Jong, & Berson, 2003). Conversely, transactional leaders are depicted as taking a Laissez-faire approach, avoiding and denying responsibility, and further neglecting to take necessary action even in dire situations. In the face of failure, transactional leaders tend to focus on their employees’ mistakes and failures (Bass, 1985).

Whereas trait theories of leadership were largely abandoned in the 1950’s, this approach to understanding leadership has come back into favor in more recent years, with a focus on individual differences. Further, recent research has also begun to shift focus to better understand leadership ineffectiveness, as reflected in the manager’s inability to build, guide, and maintain a team that can outperform the competition (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994).

The present research sought to better understand the “dark side” of leader personality, as a means to understanding leadership ineffectiveness. It is important to note that the study of dark personality is not new (Harms & Spain, 2015). Rather, its origin traces back to the early 1900’s with Kraepelin and Diefendorf’s (1907) attribution of disturbed personalities to dark personality. Dark personality characteristics included what they labeled (a) pseudoquerulants, described as a tendency toward defensiveness, suspiciousness, and litigiousness; (b) the morally insane characterized as possessing a tendency to behave in a cruel manner, a lack of sympathy, and a lack of foresight and comprehensive reflection and foresight; (c) the unstable, described as rapidly vacillating between interest and disinterest in activities, and having a propensity toward moodiness and irritability; and (d) the morbid liar and swindler, characterized by possessing high
levels of intelligence, experiencing joy from deceiving others, and a tendency to blame others for setbacks. Today, we recognize these typologies and apply the following modern labels: paranoia, psychopathy, borderline personality, and Machiavellianism, respectively (Harms & Spain, 2015).

Though the study of dark personality is not new, the study of its impact in the workplace is only recently a focus of mainstream organizational research (Harms & Spain, 2015; Spain, Harms, & LeBreton, 2014; Guenole, 2014). This heightened focus may be attributable to the prominence of dark personality research in books and literature targeted at mass audiences. For example, the popularity of literature detailing the impact of psychopathy in both the workplace and society in general (e.g. Babiak & Hare, 2006; Dutton, 2012) illustrates that there is an appetite among society at large for understanding potentially destructive dark personality characteristics. The present study sought to further understand dark personality, its influencers, and associated outcomes. The specific study variables of interest are defined, described, and reviewed in the following chapter.
Chapter 3: Study Variables

Leadership Dark Side Traits

Dark personality is conceptualized as individual difference characteristics that reflect a tendency or motivation to promote or elevate one’s self to the potential detriment of others (Harms & Spain, 2015; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). There are several approaches to understanding this phenomenon. One prevailing approach is the dark triad, which conceptualizes dark tendencies via heightened levels of any of the following three personality traits: narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy (Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006; Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

Under this model, use of the term "dark" simply implies that those possessing heightened levels of any of these traits have malevolent qualities. For example, narcissism is reflected in a propensity toward pride, egoism, grandiosity, and a lack of empathy (Corry, Merritt, Mrug & Pamp, 2008). Those scoring high on narcissism are apt to display entitlement, dominance, grandiosity, and superiority. Machiavellianism is characterized as a tendency to manipulate and exploit others, disregard morality, and engage in deception (Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006). Those who score high on this trait are unprincipled, cynical, and believe that interpersonal manipulation is the key to success – and behave accordingly (Furnham, Richards & Laulhus, 2013).

Psychopathy is characterized as a tendency toward impulsivity, selfishness, antisocial behavior, callousness, and remorselessness (Skeem, Polaschek, Patrick & Lilienfeld, 2011). It is further considered the most malevolent of the three dark triad traits, as individuals scoring high in psychopathy are likely to exhibit high levels of impulsivity and thrill-seeking, combined with low levels of empathy (Rauthman, 2012). It is important to note that heightened levels of any of these traits can result in workplace misconduct. For example, recent research shows that each of the dark triad traits is associated with manipulation at work (Jonason, Slomski, & Partyka, 2012).
Further, Jonason and colleagues’ research demonstrated that although each trait was shown to be related to manipulation in the workplace, each occurred though unique mechanisms. That is, those high in narcissism utilized their physical appearance to manipulate; those high in psychopathy used physical threats; those high Machiavellianism utilized interpersonal charm. However, it is important to note that this research – as well as the majority of dark triad research – was conducted in university settings, with employed college students comprising the sample.

Importantly, researchers posit that dark personality characteristics are not necessarily reflective of clinical pathologies, as these traits are not associated with an inability to function in everyday life (Furnham, Trickey, & Hyde, 2012; Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011; Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Wu & LeBreton, 2011). Rather, dark personality characteristics are considered a part of normal personality that can interfere with judgment and interpersonal relationships (Hogan et al., 2010; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Further, some researchers argue that dark personality characteristics may instead reflect present-day evolution of man, as dark personality can be functional in certain situations or at lower levels of the characteristic(s) (Benson & Campbell, 2007; Harms & Spain, 2015; Harms, et. al, 2011; Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Jones, 2014). For example, research has shown that moderate levels of dark personality characteristics can be associated with optimal performance outcomes such as accuracy in accounting firms (i.e., stemming from engaging in obsessive-compulsive behaviors, Harms et al., 2011). However, when dark personality characteristics are displayed with frequency, they are likely to become offensive to others – especially for those in managerial positions (Kaiser, LeBreton, & Hogan, 2015). Judge, Piccolo, and Kosalka (2009) posit that because leadership conditions often change quickly, leaders face challenges as the positive effects associated with the exhibition of a particular dark personality characteristic in one situation can pose a disadvantage in another.
Further, research has shown that dark personality has been associated with sub-par levels of leadership performance and other forms of dysfunction under the following conditions: (a) at particularly high levels of the associated characteristic(s) (Benson & Campbell, 2007; Harms & Spain, 2015; Hogan & Hogan, 2001); and (b) when stressful conditions are present and such traits become exaggerated or distorted (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2011).

As stated previously, there are several approaches to understanding dark personality. Another is through assessing leader dark side traits. Dark side traits – which follow a DSM-IV Axis 2-based model – were created to assess categories of dark personality, without imposing stigmas associated with the assessment of mental disorders on those assessed (Hogan & Hogan, 1997; Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Behavioral manifestations of dark side traits are thought to emerge or become exaggerated when people let their guard down or are resource-challenged. (Elliot & Thrash, 2002; Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan, et al., 2010; Kaiser & Kaplan, 2006; Kaiser, LeBreton, & Hogan, 2015). That is, those with high levels of dark side traits are apt to display associated behaviors when tired, stressed, or simply less vigilant about the way in which they are perceived. As such, it can take repeated exposure to leaders possessing high levels of dark side traits for others to recognize these tendencies or dispositions. Further, research has shown that while high scores on certain dark side traits can lead to potential short-term benefits or advantages – as evidenced in the following section – they are apt to be associated with a number of problems in the long term (Hogan, 2007; Hogan, et al., 2010).

Hogan and Hogan’s (1997) dark side traits are based on Karen Horney’s (1950) taxonomy of flawed interpersonal tendencies, which categorizes dark side traits (or flawed interpersonal tendencies) into three factors or categories: moving away, moving against, and moving toward people (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan, et. al., 2010). Initial research on the dark
side traits considered both the actor's view of his or her own personality (e.g., a leader's self-view) and observers’ perceptions of their personality (e.g., others' view of the leader) (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). These three dark side categories are described further below. The traits comprising each dark side category are described below as per the scale developers’ descriptions, with supporting research supplementing each description.

**Category I Dark Side Personality Traits.** Under stressful conditions, leaders with high levels of category I personality traits tend to move away from others. As a result, these leaders can be expected to cope with their challenges and manage their insecurities by intimidating and/or withdrawing from direct reports, colleagues, and teammates (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2005). This is evident in each of the excitable, skeptical, cautious, reserved, and leisurely personality characteristics comprising this category.

**Excitable.** Leaders with high levels of the excitable dark side trait are characterized as consistently having an expectation for disappointing relationships (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, when faced with a situation in which they believe they have been mistreated by others; they are likely to engage in intimidation, where their reactions are typically described as eruptive emotional displays or outbursts (Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2005). Specifically, such outbursts can involve arguing with coworkers, slamming doors, yelling, and even throwing objects. This is evidenced in Kaiser, LeBreton, and Hogan (2015) research demonstrating that leaders high in the excitable dark side trait are likely to engage in forceful leadership practices. Specifically, forceful leadership is associated with assuming authority and utilizing power (both personal and position) to drive performance from others (Kaiser, Overfield, & Kaplan, 2010; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2006). As a result, leaders high in the excitable dark side trait
are likely to experience difficulty in building and maintaining teams of people – a fundamental leadership task – because they are viewed as so volatile and unpredictable (Hogan et. al., 2010).

At their best (i.e., when situations are favorable, and stress levels are low), leaders high in the excitable dark side trait can exhibit a great capacity for empathy; because they understand that life can be unfair, and they can empathize with others experiencing hardships (Hogan et al., 2010). Similarly, recent meta-analytic findings revealed that scores on the excitable dark side trait positively predict trustworthiness – as demonstrated by supervisory ratings – suggesting that highly excitable managers are likely to elicit others’ trust at work through the transparent nature of their agendas and motives (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). In addition, at their best, highly excitable leaders are apt to experience intense – albeit short-lived – enthusiasm for other people, things, and projects (Hogan & Hogan, 2001).

However, at their worst (i.e., when situations are unfavorable / adverse, and stress levels are high), leaders high in the excitable dark side trait require a great deal of reassurance and personal attention from others; they can be quite hard to please. As a result, such leaders are likely to frequently change jobs, and experience many failed relationships. Hogan and Hogan (2001) further posit that this is because these leaders succumb easily to disappointment, and in the face of such disappointment, tend to withdraw and leave the frustrating situation. In addition, research has revealed a negative relationship between excitable dark side characteristics and leader performance ratings (Benson & Campbell, 2007; Gaddis & Foster, 2015). More specifically, meta-analytic results indicate that managers and leaders with a tendency toward emotional volatility tend to be viewed by their superiors as: (a) having poor attitudes towards work; (b) being poor leaders; (c) lacking the ability to use sound reasoning in making decisions and generate effective solutions to problems in the workplace; (d) having difficulty in quickly
adapting to change, altering approaches as needed, and trying new methods in the workplace; and (e) expressing difficulty in getting along with others or behaving appropriately in social situations (Gaddis & Foster, 2015).

**Skeptical.** Leaders high in the skeptical dark side trait are characterized as expecting to be cheated, betrayed, or otherwise deceived (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). In addition, highly skeptical leaders are prone to suspiciousness, argumentativeness, and an overall lack of trust in others. Further, they often participate in creating or spreading conspiracy theories. As such, they remain alert for signs of poor treatment, and retaliate when they believe they are victims of it. Such retaliation can take the form of accusations, physical violence, or litigation. Taken together, these actions are justified by the highly skeptical leader as preparedness for perceived self-defense.

At their best, leaders high in the skeptical dark side trait are typically intelligent, perceptive, and thoughtful (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Further, leaders high in this trait can be quite insightful about their organization’s politics and the potential motives of their competitors, as they are at times successful in the verification of their conspiracy theories (Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, such leaders are at times adept to the real meaning of events and the true agendas of others. However, though these leaders tend to be very insightful, they are often not skilled at playing politics, because they are deeply committed to their views, and as such, unlikely to compromise, even regarding small issues (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Nonetheless, their passionate commitment to their views and theories can lend to a perception by others as visionary and charismatic, causing people to be drawn to them. At their worst, those high in the skeptical dark side trait are likely to handle stress by withdrawing into their views and ideology, subsequently attacking perceived threats. Such highly skeptical leaders are likely to staunchly adhere to their
views and “won't give up without a fight” (Hogan & Hogan, 2001, p. 48). This is evidenced in recent research demonstrating that highly skeptical leaders are apt to engage in abusive or destructive supervision (Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013). As a result, they tend to accumulate enemies over time, lending to a self-fulfilling prophecy regarding their expectations of others (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). In addition, recent meta-analytic findings revealed that scores on the skeptical dark side trait negatively predict trustworthiness – as demonstrated by supervisory ratings – indicating that cynical managers are unlikely to elicit others’ trust at work (Gaddis & Foster, 2015).

Skeptical leaders’ stubbornness and apparent inability to trust others or compromise undermines their ability to effectively build a team (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010), a critical component of leadership. As such, research has identified a negative relationship between skeptical dark side characteristics and leader performance ratings (Benson & Campbell, 2007; Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011; Gassis & Foster, 2015). For example, high skepticism is associated with low performance ratings on judgment and fairness (Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011). Further, recent meta-analytic results indicate that leaders high in skepticism are likely to be rated by their superiors as having negative work attitudes, lacking ability to lead others, lacking focus on achievement, and lacking leadership dependability (Gassis & Foster, 2015). Stated differently, mistrustful managers and leaders tend to be viewed by their superiors as having poor attitudes towards work, being poor people leaders, expressing difficulty in achieving goals for themselves and others, and lacking dependability with regard to performing work tasks in a timely and consistent manner.

**Cautious.** Leaders high in the cautious dark side trait are likely to regularly fear receiving criticism, blame, or disgrace (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). As such, these leaders
are likely to maintain a heightened awareness against making mistakes, which as they perceive, could result in public embarrassment. Because highly cautious leaders are so alert to potential criticism, they are likely to misperceive innocuous situations as threatening and/or hazardous (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). In turn, those high in the cautious dark side trait are likely respond to the possibility of perceived threats, embarrassment, and criticism by defaulting to a cautious approach, which often manifests in inaction. Specifically, in order to avoid criticism, they follow established precedents and rules, resist change and innovation, and adhere to approaches that proved successful in the past (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, such leaders’ cautiousness can extend to their staff. That is, through fear that their subordinates will embarrass them, these leaders are likely to discourage and even forbid their employees from taking initiative. Not surprisingly, these leaders are typically unpopular as managers due to their indecisive, cautious, and controlling nature (Hogan & Hogan, 2001).

At their best, leaders high in the cautious dark side trait are apt to be careful and prudent in their approach to evaluating risk. That is, they rarely make hasty or ill-advised decisions, and in turn, can provide sound advice about courses of action (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, they serve as good counterparts to others who are impulsive and make rash decisions, because cautious leaders provide necessary balance to the dyad (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Conversely, at their worst, these leaders are likely to resist change, avoid innovation, stall, and act indecisively – even when a situation calls for immediate action. Further, such leaders are likely to be threatened by different and new situations, and as a result, prefer inaction over taking initiative. During times of heavy workloads and stress, these leaders often staunchly adhere to established procedures over new technology or alternative procedures. In addition, highly cautious leaders carefully control their subordinates, out of fear that an employee will err and
embarrass them, especially in front of their superiors. Further, research has revealed a negative relationship between cautious dark side characteristics and leader performance ratings (Benson & Campbell, 2007; Gaddis & Foster, 2015). More specifically, research has indicated that scores on the cautious dark side trait negatively predict the following performance criteria: work attitudes, ability to lead others, problem solving and decision-making (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). Stated differently, highly indecisive managers and leaders tend to be viewed by their superiors as poor leaders who have poor attitudes towards work, and further, lack the ability to use sound reasoning in making decisions and generating effective solutions to problems in the workplace.

**Reserved.** Leaders high in the reserved dark side trait are characterized as indifferent to others’ opinions, feelings, or expectations (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). This becomes especially evident in their behaviors and attitudes toward their staff. Specifically, these leaders are characterized as aloof, formal, introverted, and deficient in social insight. These individuals typically prefer working alone, and have a greater interest in things and data over people.

Highly reserved leaders often do not communicate well, if at all. In addition, they are often seen as unrewarding managers and leaders, who experience difficulty in building or maintaining a team. At their best, such leaders are characterized as resilient in times of adversity, as they are untroubled by criticism and rejection. In addition, they are likely to maintain their focus during tumultuous times, as they are not distracted by emotional disruptions or stressful situations. However, at their worst, those high in the reserved dark side trait can lack sensitivity to others’ feelings, moods, and needs. As a result, they can be perceived by others as imperceptive, rude, and tactless. When faced with very high pressure, these leaders tend to withdraw into their offices, handle matters by themselves, and stop communicating with their
colleagues and subordinates; which often leaves others confused as to what they need or want (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Further, recent meta-analysis revealed that scores on the reserved dark side trait negatively predict overall managerial performance, indicating that leaders who are highly reserved are apt to perform poorly in leadership roles (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). More specifically, reserved dark side trait scores negatively predict ability to lead others, leader problem solving and decision making, and leadership dependability. In other words, highly reserved managers tend to be viewed by their supervisors as poor leaders who lack: (a) the ability to use sound reasoning in making decisions and generate effective solutions to problems in the workplace; and (b) dependability to perform work tasks in a timely and consistent manner.

**Leisurely.** People high in the leisurely dark side trait outwardly can seem highly cooperative and pleasant, while privately expecting to be unappreciated and mistreated by others (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). While leisurely leaders often have great confidence in their own skills and abilities, they can be independent and stubborn. In addition, the highly leisurely can be quite cynical regarding the intentions and talents of others – especially their superiors. They are often also resolute about working at their own pace. That is, when the highly leisurely are pressed for output, they are prone to experience anger and their intentional response is often to slow down even more; as they have a tendency to express resentment indirectly, via excuse-making and procrastination. Those high in the leisurely dark side trait are apt to feel unappreciated, mistreated, and are therefore highly sensitive to any signs of disrespect – whether real or imagined (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). During instances in which the leisurely feel they have been disrespected or cheated, they are described as likely to retaliate through foot-dragging. However, such retaliation typically occurs under conditions of high deniability, as the highly leisurely often have the strong social skills to enable such intentional misbehaviors to be
perceived by others – especially superiors – as necessary delays. Further, those high in the
leisurely dark side trait are adept at hiding their internal feelings of frustration and annoyance,
while ostensibly being cooperative. As a result, such retaliatory peevishness and foot dragging
are typically quite hard to detect by superiors.

At their best, people high in the leisurely dark side trait often have strong interpersonal
skills and political prowess (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). However, at their
worst, they can be quite stubborn. Specifically, they are likely to focus solely on their own
agenda, while not supporting their subordinates and colleagues. Further, highly leisurely leaders
are likely to review low performance ratings from their superiors (Benson & Campbell, 2007),
and perform poorly in leadership roles (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). More specifically, leisurely dark
side traits negatively predict managers’ work attitudes, ability to lead others, achievement
orientation, leadership dependability (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). Stated differently, managers and
leaders with a tendency toward resentment tend to be viewed by their superiors as having poor
attitudes towards work, as poor leaders by their supervisors, apt to have difficulty in achieving
goals for themselves and others, and lacking dependability with regard to performing work tasks
in a timely and consistent manner.

In summary, leaders with high levels of any of the category I dark side characteristics are
apt to cope with their challenges by withdrawing from direct reports, colleagues, and teammates
(Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Further, meta-analytic results indicate that all five of the category I
dark side traits are inversely related to overall managerial performance and ability to effectively
lead others (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). In addition, a majority of these traits are negatively
associated with leaders’ attitudes toward work, ability to make effective decisions, and
dependability. Further, recent research demonstrates that category I dark side traits are inversely
related to leadership promotions, such that it takes leaders with high levels of category I dark side traits longer to climb the professional ladder (Furnham, Crump, & Ritchie, 2013).

**Category II Dark Side Personality Traits.** Under stressful conditions, leaders with high levels of category II dark side traits are likely to move against others (Hogan, et. al., 2010). That is, they are apt to manage self-doubt via charming and manipulating others. Stated differently, these leaders can be expected to charm, maneuver, and manipulate others in an effort to compensate for personal insecurities (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). This is evident in each of the bold, mischievous, colorful, and imaginative personality characteristics, as described in the following section. Each category II dark side trait is described below as per the scale developers’ descriptions, with supporting research supplementing each description.

**Bold.** People characterized as high in the bold dark side trait can have extremely high levels of self-esteem, and as such, have an expectation that others will like, respect, admire, praise, compliment, indulge, and obey them (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, they typically expect success in all aspects of their lives, and believe strongly in their legacy. From the observer’s viewpoint, their sense of entitlement and self-assurance is perceived as the most distinctive characteristics about these people. Behaviorally, the highly bold are characterized as being the first to speak in a group; they do so with great confidence, even during times in which they are wrong.

At their best, those high in the bold dark side trait are perceived as charismatic, energetic, and often take the initiative on projects. They take on tasks without fear, which often extends to success in sales, management, and entrepreneurial roles (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). In addition, they are likely to attract followers because of their aspirations, confidence, and subsequent ability to engage others. Recent research demonstrates a positive relationship between the bold
dark side trait and leadership promotions; such that it takes highly bold leaders less time to climb the professional ladder (Furnham, et al., 2013).

At their worst, the highly bold are likely to come across as demanding, arrogant, self-absorbed, and pompous (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). As a result, they are likely to assume more credit for their successes than warranted. In addition, they often refuse to acknowledge errors, mistakes, or failure. In other words, they are likely to attribute success to their own efforts; whereas they often attribute failures to others’ wrongdoings. As such, those high in the bold dark side trait are often untruthful because of their tendency to compulsively spin tales, and to reinterpret their own mistakes and failures – typically through blaming others. When leaders high in the bold dark side trait become frustrated, they are likely to “explode with narcissistic rage” (Hogan & Hogan, 2001, p. 48), because they did not receive the recognition they perceived they were due. In addition, the highly bold are extremely unlikely to learn from experience, and often ultimately wind up alienating their subordinates and colleagues through their abusive outbursts. Further, recent meta-analytic findings revealed that scores on the bold dark side trait negatively predict trustworthiness – as demonstrated by supervisory ratings – indicating that overconfident managers are unlikely to elicit others’ trust at work (Gaddis & Foster, 2015).

**Mischievous.** Those high in the mischievous dark side trait are characterized as expecting others to find them clever, charming, and even irresistible (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). As a result, those high in this trait are likely to feel that they can request favors, exceptions, and allowances, without feeling the need to reciprocate. Further, they are apt to see themselves as invulnerable. Therefore, they often engage in risk-taking for its own sake, and live dangerously. Others perceive those high in mischievousness as witty, bright, and engaging. This
enables mischievous people to extract promises, favors, and resources from others with relative ease. Not surprisingly, the highly mischievous are likely to perceive others as resources to be exploited. Therefore, they have little concern about violating others’ expectations, and exhibit difficulty in maintaining commitments. Further, recent meta-analytic findings revealed that scores on the mischievous dark side trait negatively predict managers’ ability to elicit others’ trust at work (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). In addition, this meta-analytic research demonstrated that scores on the mischievous dark side trait are negatively associated with leadership dependability, suggesting that impulsive managers tend to be viewed as lacking dependability with regard to performing work tasks in a timely and consistent manner.

At their best, those high in the mischievous dark side trait are perceived as fun, charming, courageous, engaging, daring and self-confident – to the point of seeming invulnerable (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, they can be quite seductive, as others often find them attractive, intriguing, and even irresistible (Hogan et. al., 2010). As a result, the highly mischievous can be quite fun to be around and even rewarding to engage or deal with. People high in this trait often handle heavy workloads and stress with great self-assurance. This is because – while they are easily bored – they find risk, danger, and stress invigorating; at times, they actively seek it. As a result, some of those high in mischievous dark side trait can become true heroes (e.g., through intervening in robberies, rushing into burning buildings, taking apart bombs, volunteering for dangerous assignments) as they seem to flourish in times of chaos and war (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010).

Conversely, at their worst, the highly mischievous are unpredictable, reckless, impulsive, remorseless, manipulative, and exploitative. Their recklessness and extreme self-confidence often result in committing many mistakes, especially at work. As a consequence, they tend to
utilize their manipulative ability and attempt to talk their way out of problems. As such, they also exhibit difficulty with telling the truth. Their self-confidence, self-deception, and recklessness often result in many conflicts; however mischievous individuals seem to be incapable of learning from experience. Consequently, relative to their capabilities and talent, the highly mischievous are likely to be underachievers in their academic and professional pursuits, because of their recklessness, impulsiveness, and inability to learn from mistakes. Further, research has revealed a negative relationship between mischievous dark side characteristics and overall leader performance ratings (Benson & Campbell, 2007).

**Colorful.** Those high in the colorful dark side trait are characterized as expecting others to find them entertaining and attractive, and subsequently expect to be the focus of attention (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). As such, they are adept at drawing attention to themselves, as they make dramatic entrances and exits, wear attention-grabbing clothing, and enjoy being on stage. It is important to note that some elevation on this trait lends to success in sales, politics and theatrical careers, as the highly colorful are often perceived by others as having an excellent stage presence. As a result, they often perform well in interviews and assessment centers. However, they also have a tendency toward being unpredictable and impulsive. Specifically, they often come across as noisy, distractible, unfocused, over-committed, and constantly seeking to be at the center of attention.

At their best, those high in the colorful dark side trait are quite entertaining, bright, fun, and flirtatious – often seen as the life of the party (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). High scores are associated with positive outcomes in the workplace as well. For example, research revealed that scores on the colorful dark side trait positively predict overall leadership performance (Gaddis & Foster, 2015), as well as leadership ratings and promotion rates
(Furnham, et al., 2013), suggesting managers who draw others to them and command attention are viewed as natural leaders who are fast to rise in the organization.

Those high in the colorful dark side personality trait cope with heavy workloads and stress by becoming extremely busy; as they enjoy the high stress, pressure, and drama in chaotic situations because they can emerge as the star (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). However, the highly colorful can be poor listeners and planners, and frequently over-commit themselves (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, recent meta-analytic findings revealed that they tend to ignore negative feedback, express negative attitudes at work, and are viewed by their supervisors as untrustworthy (Gaddis & Foster, 2015).

**Imaginative.** Those high in the imaginative dark side trait are characterized as perceiving the world in unique and often interesting ways, and enjoy entertaining others with their unusual insights and perceptions (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). They are likely to seek new ways to present and express themselves, and enjoy observing the reactions they evoke from others through their unexpected and surprising forms of self-expression. Those high in the imaginative dark side trait are seen by others as insightful, bright, innovative, and playful. On the other hand, they are also described as odd, eccentric, and flighty.

At their best, the highly imaginative are interesting, creative, visionary, insightful, exciting, and fun to be around (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, highly imaginative leaders are likely to engage in strategic leadership practices (Kaiser, et. al., 2015), through positioning their team for success by making bold moves, setting direction, and supporting innovation. Conversely, at their worst, the highly imaginative are described as self-absorbed, insensitive to the feedback and reactions of others, and indifferent to the political and social consequences of their self-interested focus and behaviors (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan
et. al., 2010). In addition, they tend to communicate poorly, and experience difficulty in expressing themselves in socially appropriate ways. Because these managers can be so unpredictable and distractible, colleagues and subordinates of highly imaginative managers are often unsure about the directions they give, intentions, and of their true desired outcomes; as these managers often confuse their colleagues and subordinates by changing directions quickly, and communicating in confusing ways. Further, these leaders are apt to receive low performance ratings from their superiors (Benson & Campbell, 2007; Gaddis & Foster, 2015; Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011), such as for communication, judgment, leadership, and conscientiousness (Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011). In addition, leaders high in the imaginative dark side trait are perceived by their superiors as untrustworthy and expressing difficulty in achieving goals for themselves and others (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). Further, this research also indicated negative relationships between the imaginative dark side trait and leadership dependability, leader flexibility and adaptability, and leader interpersonal skills, indicating that highly imaginative leaders are likely to lack dependability with regard to performing work tasks in a timely and consistent manner, express difficulty in quickly adapting to change (e.g., by altering approaches as needed, and trying new methods in the workplace), and express difficulty in getting along with others or behaving appropriately in social situations.

In sum, high levels of category II dark side traits are associated with a number of performance criteria, both positive and negative. Specifically, on one hand, high levels of any of the four category II dark side traits are associated with low levels of managerial trustworthiness (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). On the other hand, those high in bold or colorful dark side traits are fast to rise in the organization (Furnham, et al., 2013). However, such leadership success tends to be short lived from job to job, as leaders high in any of the category II dark side traits are apt to
turnover quickly – voluntarily or through termination (Carson, Shanock, Heggestad, Andrew, Pugh, & Walter, 2012).

**Category III Dark Side Personality Traits.** Managers and leaders with high levels of category III dark side traits are likely to move toward people (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Stated differently, they are apt to manage their insecurities via ingratiation and building alliances. However, these individuals tend to be anxious, and attempt to manage their anxiety by conforming to expectations and rules. The exaggerated forms of these traits can cause a leader to manage insecurities during times of distress by ingratiating others and building alliances (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Each category III dark side trait is described below as per the scale developers’ descriptions, with supporting research following each description.

**Diligent.** People high in the diligent dark side trait are characterized as constantly believing that their performance is being rigorously evaluated by others (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Accordingly, they hold themselves and others to high standards of performance, as they are quite concerned with doing a good job, being considered a good employee or citizen, and pleasing those in positions of authority. However, when the highly diligent believe they have failed or otherwise not lived up to their own high standards, they try even harder to succeed at the task at hand. As such, diligent individuals are considered careful, meticulous, planful, and hardworking (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). In addition, they adhere strictly to rules and expect that others should do so as well. Consequently, they can become quite frustrated and irritable when others do not follow established rules. Others perceive those high in the diligent dark side trait as conservative, highly detail oriented, risk averse, dependable, steady, and predictable (Hogan et. al., 2010).
As described, leadership dark side traits are associated with sub-par levels of leadership performance when stressful conditions are present, and/or such traits are exaggerated or distorted (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Regarding diligence specifically, under typical conditions, diligent managers at their best, are good role-models, who uphold very high standards of performance and professionalism. In addition, the highly diligent are often popular with their superiors due to their reliability. Further, their superiors often view them as model organizational citizens because they can be depended upon to complete their work with professionalism and competence, maintain high standards, and treat their coworkers and subordinates with respect. The highly diligent are also likely to exhibit strong operational leadership practices (Kaiser, et. al., 2015), characterized as positioning one’s team for near-term goal success by focusing resources, providing clear implementation details, and monitoring performance (Kaiser, et. al., 2010; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2006). Conversely, at their worst, highly diligent leaders can be particular, fussy, micro-managers who do not afford their subordinates control or choice over their work (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). As a result, such micro-management often alienates their staff members who, in turn, subsequently refuse to take initiative, but rather wait to receive specific instructions on what needs to be done.

Managers high in the diligent dark side trait often inadvertently create a great deal of stress for themselves, because their obsessive focus on high performance and quality makes it hard for them to delegate even simple tasks to others because they do not trust their employees to perform tasks as well as they would (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). As a result, managers and leaders with high levels of the diligent dark side trait often waste a great deal of effort and time ensuring menial tasks are completed in a certain manner. They also exhibit great difficulty in carrying out vision and achieving the big picture, as they tend to get lost in the details (Hogan & Hogan,
2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). As a result, their managerial approach can be described as ambivalent. That is, whereas their bosses are quite fond of them because of their reliability, and members of their staff appreciate their predictability; on the other hand, their lack of focus or interest in a vision coupled with their seemingly inability to delegate precludes their ability to maintain or build a team. In addition, because of their likelihood to become stressed by heavy workloads, improbability to delegate, and lack of ability to prioritize tasks, they often respond to stress and heightened workloads by working harder and longer – not smarter (Hogan et. al., 2010). As a result, quality can begin to suffer, particularly during long periods of increased workload; which often leads to diligent managers woefully falling further and further behind; which they find intolerable. However, to their great dismay, they can become an organizational bottle-neck to productivity, as an increasing volume of tasks must be reviewed, checked, revised, and ultimately approved by them (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Meta-analytic results indicate that scores on the diligent dark side trait negatively predict leadership dependability and interpersonal skills, suggesting that these managers who are unlikely to delegate tend to be viewed as lacking dependability with regard to performing work tasks in a timely manner and as expressing difficulty in getting along with others during times of distress or behaving appropriately in social situations (Gaddis & Foster, 2015).

**Dutiful.** Those high in the dutiful dark side trait are characterized as having great concern with getting along with and being accepted by others, especially authority figures (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Further, the dutiful believe that they are held to high standards of behavior by others (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). As such, they are sensitive to and alert for signs of disapproval. In addition, they seek opportunities to serve others, ingratiate themselves, and demonstrate their loyalty to their superiors and organization. Further, when they fear they
have offended others, they try even harder to please. People high in the dutiful dark side trait are perceived by others as polite, good natured, cordial, indecisive, and predictable. As managers, the highly dutiful will perform any task their superiors require. Consequently, they are reluctant to challenge authority – even to the detriment of their subordinates – which incontrovertibly diminishes their legitimacy as leaders.

At their best, those high in the dutiful dark side trait are characterized as conforming, polite, and eager to please others – especially those in positions of authority (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, because of their agreeable nature and because they seldom complain, criticize, or threaten; they are likely to rise in organizations, as they rarely make enemies. As such, recent meta-analytic findings revealed a positive relationship between dutiful and trustworthiness – as demonstrated by supervisory ratings – indicating that these eager to please managers are likely to elicit others’ trust at work (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). In addition, recent research conducted by Kaiser and colleagues (2015) demonstrated a positive relationship between dutiful and the exhibition of enabling leadership tendencies, characterized as creating the necessary conditions to enable others to contribute via participation, empowerment, and support (Kaiser, et. al., 2010; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2006).

Conversely, at their worst, the highly dutiful have difficulty maintaining and building a team (Hogan et. al., 2010). Specifically, they express difficulty in taking initiative, making decisions, or taking stands. As a result, their staff is often left feeling unsupported. Accordingly, recent meta-analytic results indicate that scores on the dutiful dark side trait negatively predict one’s ability to lead others (Gaddis & Foster, 2015).

At the broader category level, high levels of category III dark side traits are associated with a number of positive, mixed, and negative leadership performance results. Regarding
positive results, both category III traits are associated with achieving near-term performance outcomes (e.g., the highly diligent providing clear implementation details to their direct reports, and the highly dutiful providing support; Kaiser, et. al., 2015). Regarding mixed results, neither category III dark side trait is associated with overall managerial performance ratings (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). Regarding negative leadership performance results, category III traits are negatively associated with promotion rates, such that it takes these leaders longer to climb the professional ladder (Furnham, et al., 2013).

A number of measurement techniques associated with the dark side traits exist in the literature. Examples include projective measures (e.g. Harms & Luthans, 2012), conditional reasoning tests (e.g. James & LeBreton, 2010), written statements obtained from interviews (e.g. Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007), and even personal appearance (e.g. Nathanson, Paulhus, & Williams, 2006). However, these have been utilized with varying degrees of success, as most of these approaches are in their infancy and time will tell whether they will be demonstrated as effective for research and practice (Kaiser, LeBreton, & Hogan, 2015). However, a widely accepted method of measuring dark side traits and their levels is self-report. Specifically, the Hogan Development Scale (HDS) was devised nearly 20 years ago to assess the dark side personality traits (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). The creation of these scales and their validation are described further in the following section.

The 11 dark side personality characteristics assessed via the HDS were originally derived from the American Psychiatric Association’s DSM-IV, Axis 2 personality disorders taxonomy, as shown in Table 1 (Hogan & Hogan, 1997; Hogan & Hogan, 2001). However, Hogan and Hogan (2001) highlight a very important distinction between the two measures; with the DSM-IV many of the same attributes are assigned to multiple personality disorders, therefore
precluding practitioners’ ability to assess the associated traits using a measurement instrument. As a result, using the DSM-IV, it is difficult to discriminate among the attributes. The development of the HDS, on the other hand, involved carefully examining the item content across the 11 scales to eradicate such item overlap and to heighten the discriminatory power of the inventory. That is, each HDS scale’s content is independent of other scales’ content. Another important distinction is the application of the scales. Specifically, the HDS was created for career development, job placement, and promotion; whereas the DSM-IV was designed for evaluating mental health status. In addition, the HDS reflects workplace themes (e.g., attitudes toward success and competition, ways in which people relate to their colleagues, subordinates, and supervisors, etc.); whereas the DSM-IV does not. In an effort to ensure the acceptability of use in everyday applications, the names of the HDS scales were designed so as not to unnecessarily stigmatize those with high scores on any of the 11 factors. Finally, the HDS includes only items that do not contain obvious psychiatric or medical content, as per the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA, 1990), which deemed it no longer acceptable to evaluate mental disabilities in the workplace.

The HDS was originally modeled after Warren Jones’ PROFILE (Jones, 1988). Jones’ intent for the PROFILE was that of a psychometrically defensible replacement for the DSM-III personality disorders inventories – intended for use by clinical psychologists. Hogan and Hogan (1997) purportedly used the PROFILE with their business clients – prior to the ADA of 1990 – and found relationships between the assessment’s scores and managerial incompetence (e.g., inability to achieve career potential). Hogan and Hogan (1997) therefore concluded that: (a) work-related failures are associated with some degree of personality dysfunction; and (b) it is important to assess “dysfunctional dispositions” at work (p. 7). After passage of the ADA, it was
no longer acceptable to evaluate mental disabilities in the workplace, and therefore, the mental and medical nature of the PROFILE’s scales precluded its continued use in organizations. Hogan and Hogan thus identified a need for an inventory that assesses interpersonal behaviors at work, while not adversely affecting the reputation of people in the workplace.

As mentioned, Hogan and Hogan’s (1997) goal was to create scales with non-overlapping themes – to avoid spurious intercorrelations between the scales – that were nonclinical in nature. For legal reasons they also avoided items that referred to religious beliefs or sexual preferences. Specifically, the items were designed to capture what a person of a particular disposition is likely to do or say at work. As Hogan and Hogan developed each scale, they tested it on samples of workers, and initiated work to demonstrate validity evidence for each scale (e.g., through assessing internal consistency, correlating the scales with previously established measures, etc.), and then revised the items where necessary. At the completion of HDS development, the instrument had undergone six iterations of item construction, revision, testing, and additional revision. The scales were then defined as follows.

Excitable: those characterized as excitable are inconsistent, moody, and enthusiastic about new people and projects – only to become disappointed with them.

Skeptical: those characterized as skeptical are distrustful, have a heightened sensitivity to criticism, and question others’ true intentions.

Cautious: these individuals are reluctant to take changes, and resistant to change for fear of being negatively evaluated.

Reserved: reserved individuals lack awareness of or interest in others’ feelings, and are socially withdrawn.
Leisurely: those characterized as leisurely are indifferent to others’ requests – and become irritable with persistence – as they are quite autonomous.

Bold: bold Individuals are highly self-confident, unwilling to listen to advice or admit mistakes, and do not learn from experience.

Mischievous: those characterized as mischievous enjoy testing limits and taking risks.

Colorful: colorful individuals are dramatic, expressive, and seek attention from others.

Imaginative: those characterized as imaginative think and act in unusual and creative ways.

Diligent: diligent people are precise, careful, and critical of others’ performance.

Dutiful: those characterized as dutiful rely on others for support, are eager to please, and are reluctant to take self-directed action.

The HDS is a self-report measure, utilizing a dichotomous scale, to which respondents indicate a “disagree” or “agree” response to 168 statements measuring the dark side traits (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). See Table 2 for sample HDS items. Each corresponding category scale is comprised of 14 items (i.e., statements), with no overlap between the scales. As described, there is no content referencing religious beliefs, sexual preferences, or medical conditions. Further, the HDS items were also examined to ensure they do not contain content that can be construed as offensive, such as attitudes toward racial/ethnic groups or individuals with disabilities – so as not to stigmatize the respondent. The HDS also contains a social desirability scale – comprised of 14 items – to test for faking. Readability statistics were computed on the items, and a fifth grade reading level was established for the instrument.

As mentioned, each item has a dichotomous response format, and each scale is comprised of 14 items. Scores for each scale range from 0 to 14, with high scores representing elevated
presence of the trait. A number internal consistency tests were conducted from samples of over 2,000 individuals (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). Specifically, the HDS was administered to job applicants, employed adults, and graduate students. The ages spanned from 21 to 64 years old, with a mean age of 39 years. 322 women and 1,532 men were assessed. Approximately 15% held college degrees. The results revealed strong internal consistency of the scales (Hogan & Hogan, 1997), as demonstrated by their alpha reliabilities (Cronbach, 1951), which demonstrate the interrelatedness of a set of items (Schmidt, 1996). Specifically, these alpha reliability values ranged between .50 and .78, with an average of .67 (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). According to Hogan and Hogan, subsequent test-retest reliabilities ranged between .58 and .87, with an average of .75. Descriptive statistics were also assessed. Mean scores vary, ranging from 3.2 (excitable) to 9.8 (diligent). In addition, Hogan and Hogan found that the most variable scale was colorful (SD = 2.94); whereas dutiful represented the least variable scale (SD = 2.13).

To provide a theoretical framework for their research, Hogan and Hogan (1997) aligned the dark side traits to Horney’s (1950) taxonomy of flawed interpersonal tendencies. That is, Horney’s work outlined three tendencies: (a) moving away: attempting to succeed via intimidating and avoiding others; (b) moving against: attempting to succeed via manipulation and charm; and (c) moving toward: attempting to succeed via ingratiation and building alliances. Therefore, Hogan and Hogan mapped their dark side traits accordingly: (a) category I: moving away from people (intimidation), which includes excitable, skeptical, cautious, reserved, and leisurely traits; (b) category II: moving against people (manipulation), which encompasses bold, mischievous, colorful, and imaginative traits; and (c) category III: moving toward people (ingratiation), which includes diligent and dutiful traits. The factor loadings of the dark side traits
and the total percent of variance accounted for (61.6%) suggest such anticipated factor structure exists.

Initial validation research focused on identifying correlations with other measures of similar constructs, as convergent validation is one way of demonstrating the validity of a measure (Cattell, 1946; Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996; Messick, 1995). Specifically, each dark side trait was compared to similar personality traits on several well-established measures, including: (a) the Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI; Hogan & Hogan, 1995) – a measure of normal personality, derived from the Five-Factor Model (Wiggins, 1996); (b) the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Morey, Waugh, & Blashfield, 1985) – a well-known and highly respected measure of psychopathology; and (c) 360-degree performance ratings from the target’s supervisors, direct reports, and peers, which tested theories of response behavior (Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & van Heerden, 2004). Take the excitable dark side trait for example; its scale was created to model borderline personality, as exhibited in the workplace. As described previously, heightened levels of the excitable dark side trait are associated with elevated feelings of rejection and disappointment. As such, Hogan and Hogan predicted that this trait is highly negatively correlated with the adjustment scale of the HPI. Further, their validation research on excitable also showed a negative relationship with the affiliation scale of the MMPI, suggesting that those high in excitable refute a need for friendships and interpersonal relationships. When comparing managers’ excitable scores to others’ ratings of managers, Hogan and Hogan found moderate correlations with the following behaviors: not expressing emotions appropriately, yelling at others over mistakes, becoming easily upset, self-doubting, not calm, and moody.

In addition, research has identified negative relationships between the HDS and the Five Factor Model of personality (Douglas, Bore, & Munro, 2012; Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011).
For example, agreeableness – defined as an individual difference characteristic associated with being kind, warm, cooperative, sympathetic, and considerate (Costa & McCrae, 1991) – is negatively correlated with both HDS categories I and II (Douglas, Bore, & Munro, 2012). Similarly, this research also identified a negative relationship between all three HDS categories and empathy, defined as the capacity to feel or understand what another person or animal is experiencing, taken from others’ frame of reference (Davis, 1983).

Discriminant validity assesses whether measures that are not supposed to be related are, in fact, not related (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). As shown in tables 5 and 6, certain HDS traits are not related to certain other personality attributes. For example, the adjustment scale of the HPI (associated with feelings of rejection and disappointment) is not related to the mischievous dark side trait (associated with enjoying testing limits and taking risks).

Incremental validation efforts were also taken, which focused on determining whether the HDS would increase the prediction of leadership job performance beyond what was established by another existing assessment method, as incremental validation is one way of demonstrating the validity and utility of a measure (Cattell, 1946; Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996; Messick, 1995). Specifically, research found that the HDS dark side personality categories explain incremental variance in leadership job performance beyond the variance explained by five factor model personality measures (e.g., Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011). According to Hogan, et al. (2010), “most of these studies have linked HDS scores with ratings of managerial/professional incompetence, and demonstrated the ability of the inventory to account for unique variance beyond that obtained by traditional Five-Factor inventories” (p. 59).

The focus of the present research was on leaders’ dark side traits and the relationship between those traits and various workplace outcomes. Specifically, goals of the present research
were to demonstrate that: (a) leadership personality is related to employee perceptions of the organization’s ethical climate; (b) the composite effects of leader job demands and job resources moderate this relationship for category I and II leader dark side traits; and (c) such leader-associated ethical climate, in turn, is related to employee turnover intentions, and ultimately, actual employee turnover (see Figure 1). That is, I investigated how individual differences in leadership dark side traits interact with leader job demands and job resources to influence the perceived ethical climate of their employees, to ultimately impact employee turnover intentions and actual turnover. Another goal of this research was to make unique interactive predictions for the leadership dark side trait categories. Whereas the preceding section provided an overview of leadership dark side traits, the following sections describe ethical culture and climate, job demands and job resources, employee turnover, the predicted interactions among these variables, as well as establish support for the models of these constructs studied in the present research.

**Culture and Climate**

**Culture.** According to Schein (1984), “Organizational culture is the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems…[that are]…taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p. 3). Stated differently, culture encompasses the basic assumptions and shared values that explain what companies focus on and why they do what they do (Schneider, González-Romá, Ostroff, & West, 2017).

Many aspects of the organization’s culture affect employees’ perceptions and behaviors. Organizational culture reinforces the mission, vision, and goals of an organization, and provides a framework for expected employee conduct (Schein, 1992). That is, the organizational culture –
characterized by shared beliefs, assumptions, and values – helps to shape and guide both individual and group behavior (Erakovich, Bruce, & Wyman, 2002).

Organizational culture is created by the organization’s leaders and diffused to the employees through management. Thus, through role modeling, managers not only demonstrate and transmit desirable behaviors, but misbehaviors as well (Kulik, Fallon, & Salimath, 2008; Pinto, Leana, & Pil, 2008; Schneider, et. al., 2017; Simms & Brinkman, 2003; Vardi & Weitz, 2004). In addition, organizational culture serves as “a unique sense-making role” for employees (Vardi & Weitz, 2004, p. 185). Further, embedded within each organization’s culture is its climate (Martin & Cullen, 2006; Vardi, 2001; Vardi & Weitz, 2004; Victor & Cullen, 1988).

**Climate.** Whereas organizational culture encompasses shared norms, values, and assumptions, the organization’s climate refers to the policies, procedures, and practices of the organization, as well as perceptions of what is expected, supported, and rewarded (Denison, 1996; James & Jones, 1974; Jones & James, 1979; Schneider, et. al., 2017). It is important to note that a majority of climate research conducted to date has utilized self-report surveys as a method to assess experiences that employees have in their work settings (Schneider, et. al., 2017). Therefore, it follows that a majority of early research on climate focused on methodology and aggregation. For example, Schneider (1975) cautioned that survey items used in climate surveys should be written to correspond to the data aggregation level used in the analysis. For example, data for items containing “my organization” should be aggregated to the company level; items containing “my team” or “where I work” should be aggregated to the team level. Similarly, James and Jones (1974) coined different construct terminology, based on the level of analysis. For example, they argued that studies that assess climate data at the individual should
be labeled “psychological climate”; whereas studies that aggregate data to the company level were accurately reporting findings on “organizational climate”.

It was also during this era that Schneider (1975) contended that climate research should study a climate for something. This led to an abundance of research on focused climates – which are still studied today – such as safety climate (Hofmann, Morgeson, & Gerras, 2003; Neal & Griffin, 2006; Wallace, Popp & Mondore, 2006; Zohar, 1980; Zohar & Luria, 2005) and service climate (Liao & Chuang, 2007; Salvaggio, Schneider, Nishii, Mayer, Ramesh & Lyon, 2007; Schneider, White & Paul, 1998; Susskind, Kacmar, & Borchgrevink, 2003). Subsequent research on focused climates conducted by Ehrhart, Witt, Schneider, and Perry (2011) expanded to differentiate outcome climates (e.g., safety and service) from process climates (e.g., justice). Early research on justice climate, for example, focused on individual level perceptions of justice climate types: distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Masterson, 2001). This research led to the development and validation of a measure of justice climate (Colquitt, 2001), which laid the groundwork for studying justice climate at the department and organization levels of analysis (Simons and Roberson, 2003). Further, justice climate was investigated as a mediator between leadership attributes and team outcomes (Cole, Carter, & Zhang, 2013; Stoverink, Umphress, Gardner, & Miner, 2014).

Ethical climate – a variable of interest in the present study – is another example of a process climate. Specifically, an organization’s ethical climate refers to specific systems and subsystems regarding acceptable behavior (Deshpande, 1996; Martin & Cullen, 2006; Victor & Cullen, 1988). Ethical climate involves a shared perception of: (a) what is considered ethically correct behavior; and (b) how ethical issues are addressed. The present research sought to
investigate ethical climate as a mediator between leader dark side personality traits and employee turnover intentions. Therefore, as a first step toward justifying this approach, the following section provides an overview of the literature on ethical climate, creating parallels to the dark side personality to demonstrate that leader personality can relate to how employees perceive the ethical climate of the organization.

An organization’s ethical climate encompasses (a) the actions and behaviors that are considered to be ethically correct; and (b) the ways in which deviations from such expected actions and behaviors are handled (Victor & Cullen, 1988). Therefore, it can be concluded that whereas the ethical culture establishes the ethical values, the ethical climate establishes the ethical behaviors. Reichers and Schneider (1990) described organizational climate as “the shared perception of the way things are around here” (p. 22), possessing both formal and informal reinforcements of acceptable behavior. Therefore, ethical climate differs from ethical culture such that the behaviors of the founders, leaders, managers, and employees in the organization produce the climate. When embedded within the organization’s values, social norms make increasingly evident which behaviors are considered acceptable and unacceptable. Therefore, ethical culture and organizational norms establish the climate and eventually determine specific acceptable and unacceptable behaviors which are well known throughout the organization (Erakovitch et al., 2002).

Victor and Cullen (1987, 1988) devised an ethical climate construct, depicted by a two-dimensional matrix, which encompasses both the locus of analysis and ethical criteria that are associated with decision making. The locus of analysis specifies the focal point for consideration when making ethical decisions (i.e., individual, local, and cosmopolitan levels of analysis). The ethical criteria include egoism, benevolence, and principle.
The ethical criteria component of Victor and Cullen’s (1988) ethical climate matrix outlines the following ethical climate types: (a) egoistic climates, which focus on self-interest and self-interest maximizing behavior; (b) benevolent climates, which center on what is best for the people under consideration; and (c) principled climates, which focus on adhering to rules, laws, and professional codes of conduct. Each of these ethical criteria is described in greater detail below.

Egoism involves behavior that is guided by self-interest (Kohlberg, 1981; Lefkowitz, 2003; Martin & Cullen, 2006; Victor & Cullen, 1988). If one’s own welfare is the primary concern, it only follows that “…the welfare of society must always be subordinate to individual self-interest” (Lefkowitz, 2003, p. 21). Therefore, ethical climate can be created through leader behaviors that are guided by their own self-interest (Kohlberg, 1981; Lefkowitz, 2003; Martin & Cullen, 2006; Victor & Cullen, 1988).

Benevolence, on the other hand, entails the pursuit of the best outcomes for the greater good of society as a whole, or the largest amount of people (Kohlberg, 1981; Martin & Cullen, 2006; Peterson, 2002; Victor & Cullen, 1988). Therefore, on the positive end, ethical climate can also be created through leader behaviors that are guided by a focus on the greater good of the organization as a whole, or the largest amount of people (Kohlberg, 1981; Martin & Cullen, 2006; Peterson, 2002; Victor & Cullen, 1988). In the benevolence type of ethical climate, organizational decision-making is motivated by an overall concern for the well-being of the majority, where the practices, policies, and strategies of the organization also reflect an overarching concern for the well-being of others (Martin & Cullen, 2006).

A principled climate delineates ethical decision making based upon whether or not decisions are considered the intrinsically right thing to do in a given situation (Lefkowitz, 2003).
Laws, rules, procedures, and codes stipulate actions and decisions that are considered morally right and proper (Martin & Cullen, 2006). Ethical climate can be created through the organization’s policies, procedures and standards – focused on an overall sense of right versus wrong (Victor & Cullen, 1988). In this case, organizational decision-making is guided by a ubiquitous set of standards or rules to which all employees are held accountable (Martin & Cullen, 2006; Peterson, 2002; Victor & Cullen, 1988).

The locus of analysis component of Victor and Cullen’s (1988) ethical climate matrix dictates to whom the focus of the ethical climate applies. These include individual, local, and cosmopolitan. The individual locus of analysis is focused on oneself. As such, an individual/egoistic ethical climate emphasizes the pursuit of one’s own self-interest, an individual/benevolent ethical climate centers on personal relationships, and an individual/principled ethical climate focus on one’s own morals or beliefs. The local locus entails a focus on the organization or its subunits. As such, a local/egoistic ethical climate centers on what is best for the company (e.g., profitability), a local/benevolent ethical climate might focus on what is best for a company’s subunit (e.g., caring for the interest of all colleagues), a local/principled ethical climate centers on following company rules and regulations. The cosmopolitan focus centers on concern of the society. As such, a cosmopolitan/benevolent ethical climate emphasizes social responsibility or acting in the interest of the public to maximize the wellbeing of society, a cosmopolitan/principled ethical climate centers on following rules and regulations of collectives (e.g., society as a whole via laws or professional associations via codes of conduct).

Victor and Cullen (1987, 1988) did not expect all nine ethical climate dimensions to be present in all organizations. Rather, they created this conceptual framework to identify a range of
possible ethical climate dimensions, with the expectation that different dimensions will exist in
different organizations.

*Ethical climate – antecedents.* The organization’s leaders are responsible for establishing
the values, vision, mission, and goals of the organization; therefore, it is important to note
leadership’s role within the organization’s climate. In recent times, ethical scandals have plagued
business practices, drawing attention to the role of leadership and the impact leaders have on
demonstrating organizational values and providing ethical guidance to others. Brown, Trevino,
and Harrison (2005) defined ethical leadership as demonstrating appropriate conduct through
interpersonal relationships and personal actions. According to these researchers, ethical
leadership is grounded in social learning, which purports that leaders can influence others’
ethical behavior through modeling. Therefore, leaders are responsible for modeling desired
ethical behavior for their followers. This responsibility applies to lower-level managers and
supervisors as well. Specifically, Wimbush and Shepard (1994) demonstrated that subordinates
often mimic their supervisors’ behavior when supervisors hold the subordinates accountable for
their actions. It is important to note that social learning theory and modeling stem from Mead’s
(1934) symbolic interactionism theory. Specifically, the theory of symbolic interactionism
explains how people “create shared perceptions through an ongoing, social interactive process of
interpreting, defining, and evaluating events through symbols” (Wimbush & Shepard, 1994, p.
642). In the workplace, such symbols can take on many different forms. However, the majority
of symbols are expressed through both verbal and nonverbal communication between managers
and their subordinates. Further, supervisors are instrumental in disseminating and reinforcing
leadership’s policies, as well as the organization’s vision, mission, and goals. Taken together,
management – from senior leadership to the grassroots level line manager – represent a critical
determinant of the ways in which organizational policies are perceived, applied, and reinforced throughout the organization. In addition, leader and supervisor behaviors and misbehaviors shape the ethical climate. Specifically, leader and supervisor misconduct often conveys the message that the organization supports such conduct, and tolerates unethical behavior (Webber, 2007).

**Ethical climate – outcomes.** Several outcomes have been associated with ethical climate perceptions. For example, Cullen, Parmoteeah, and Victor (2003) investigated the relationship between Victor and Cullen’s (1987, 1988) three ethical climate criteria and organizational commitment. They found benevolent organizations have strong levels of organizational commitment, egoistic organizations have weak levels of organizational commitment, and principled organizations have strong levels of organizational commitment but only amongst professional workers. In addition to assessing ethical climate types, research has also investigated ethical climate strength. Ethical climate strength denotes how much influence an ethical climate has on an organization’s employees (Bartels, Harrick, Martell, & Strickland, 1998). In a strong ethical climate, behavioral expectations are clear, because the organization reinforces wanted behaviors and punishes unwanted behaviors. Since both wanted and unwanted ethical behaviors are made clear, employees in strong ethical climates are more apt to choose ethical behaviors when faced with a dilemma (Appelbaum, Dequiere, & Lay, 2005). In addition, companies with strong ethical climates are likely to be successful in addressing ethical issues. Whereas a strong ethical climate is associated with positive outcomes like organizational commitment, a weak ethical climate associated with negative outcomes such as workplace misconduct (Appelbaum et al., 2005; Appelbaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007; Bartels et al., 1998).
Workplace misconduct represents a range of negative workplace behaviors including tardiness, absenteeism, and reduced performance (Peterson, 2002). It is important to note that employees are likely to engage in misconduct when they experience deviant leader and manager behavior, because through the misconduct of their role models they infer that the organization supports such conduct (Webber, 2007). In addition, negative outcomes such as misconduct are common within organizations that are perceived by employees as tolerant of unethical practices. For example, a body of research demonstrates that employees are likely to act against their organization when they perceive their organization as unjust (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Goldstein & Ford, 2002; James, McIntyre, Glisson, Bowler, & Mitchell, 2004; LeBlanc & Barling, 2004; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

On the other hand, research has shown that one way of countering deviant behavior is through the establishment of a strong organizational culture, one that is focused on the organization’s core ethical values (Appelbaum et al., 2007). In addition, it is critically important that leaders and managers focus on the organization’s ethical climate via efforts to (a) communicate and disseminate these values to all employees in the organization, and (b) reinforce these values through their own actions in the establishment of the organization’s policies and norms.

**Ethical climate – measurement approach.** The current research employed a global self-report measure of ethical climate derived from an organization’s archival annual census survey data. That is, the survey data contain six questions that are believed to assess global employee ethical climate perceptions, ranging from positive to negative. As mentioned, ethical climate involves a shared perception of (a) what is considered ethically correct behavior and (b) how
ethical issues are addressed. Therefore, the ethical climate index used in the present study assessed both of these perceptions. In addition, this global measure of employee ethical climate perceptions was designed to encompass the three ethical criteria: egoism, benevolence, and principle identified in the literature. The present research sought to demonstrate that an interaction between leader job demands and job resources moderates the relationship between leader dark side traits and direct report ethical climate perceptions. Therefore, the following section will outline an interactionist perspective as it relates to leader dark side traits, leader job demands and job resources, and employee ethical climate perceptions.

As described below, category I and II leader dark side traits were expected to have a negative relationship with employee ethical climate perceptions, and category III leader dark side traits were expected to have a positive relationship with employee ethical climate perceptions. The rationale follows the conceptual connections between ethical climate types and leader dark side traits. It is important to note that the focus of the present research was not on the various ethical climate types, but rather, the extent to which the overall ethical climate of the organization is perceived as positive. Therefore, the purpose of reviewing ethical climate types section was to establish conceptual connections between leader dark side traits and ethical climate, as follows.

As described previously, egoism involves behavior that is guided by self-interest (Kohlberg, 1981; Lefkowitz, 2003; Martin & Cullen, 2006; Victor & Cullen, 1988). Further, ethical climate can be created through leader behaviors that are guided by their own self-interest (Kohlberg, 1981; Lefkowitz, 2003; Martin & Cullen, 2006; Victor & Cullen, 1988). In this case, employees perceive that organizational decision-making is motivated by (a) leader self-interest and/or (b) the organization’s best interest (Martin & Cullen, 2006; Wimbush & Shepard, 1994).
Also described previously, leaders and managers with elevated Category II (moving against people) leader dark side personality characteristics (i.e., arrogant, mischievous, colorful, and imaginative) are motivated by their own self-interest. Therefore, the following hypothesis was presented:

*Hypothesis 1: There is a negative relationship between Category II (moving against people) leader dark side personality characteristics (i.e., bold, mischievous, colorful, and imaginative) and direct report perceptions of ethical climate.*

Benevolence entails the pursuit of the best outcomes for the greater good of society as a whole, or the largest amount of people (Kohlberg, 1981; Martin & Cullen, 2006; Peterson, 2002; Victor & Cullen, 1988). In benevolent ethical climates, organizational decision-making is motivated by concern for the well-being of the majority (Martin & Cullen, 2006). As described previously, leaders and managers with elevated Category I (moving away from people) dark side personality characteristics (i.e., excitable, skeptical, cautious, reserved, and leisurely) cope with their challenges by withdrawing from or even intimidating direct reports, colleagues, and teammates (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Such withdrawal and/or intimidation can be construed as the antithesis of a focus on benefitting the organization’s majority. Therefore, the following hypothesis was presented:

*Hypothesis 2: There is a negative relationship between Category I (moving away from people) leader dark side personality characteristics (i.e., excitable, skeptical, cautious, reserved, and leisurely) and direct report perceptions of ethical climate.*

A principled climate is based on deontological ethical theory (Fritzsche, 2000; Fritzsche & Becker, 1984), which delineates ethical decision making based upon whether or not such decisions are considered the intrinsically right thing to do in a given situation (Lefkowitz, 2003).
Laws, rules, procedures, and codes stipulate actions and decisions that are considered morally right and proper in deontological theory (Martin & Cullen, 2006). Ethical climate can be created through the organization’s policies, procedures and standards – focused on an overall sense of right versus wrong (Victor & Cullen, 1988). In this case, organizational decision-making is guided by a ubiquitous set of standards or rules to which all employees are held accountable (Martin & Cullen, 2006; Peterson, 2002; Victor & Cullen, 1988). As described previously, leaders and managers with elevated Category III (moving toward people) leader dark side personality characteristics can be characterized as conforming to expectations and rules. Further, the exaggerated forms of these traits lead a leader to manage insecurities during times of distress by ingratiating others and building alliances (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Therefore, the following hypothesis was presented:

Hypothesis 3: There is a significantly positive relationship between Category III (moving toward people) leader dark side personality characteristics (i.e., diligent and dutiful) and direct report perceptions of ethical climate.

Given the differences in manifestation of dark side characteristics, it is reasonable to expect that these traits can impact employee perceptions differently. For example, as mentioned, those with elevated mischievous, colorful, bold, or imaginative personalities are likely to move against others through manipulation, and intimidation. Modeling such misbehaviors can send a strong message that such behavior is acceptable within the organization. Therefore:

Hypothesis 4: The absolute magnitude of the relationships between leader dark side traits and ethical climate perceptions is strongest for Category II (moving against people) dark side traits, in comparison with Categories I (moving away) and III (moving toward).

The Interactive Effects of Dark Side Traits, Job Demands, and Job Resources
When considering the antecedents of behavior, it is important to note that situational factors and person characteristics often affect behavior jointly (Bandura, 1986; Hershcovis & Barling, 2007; Judge, Martocchio, & Thoresen, 1997; Kammrath, Mendoza-Denton, & Mischel, 2005; Lefkowitz, 2009; Lewin, 1935; Marshall & Brown, 2006). This approach to understanding behavior is consistent with the interactionist perspective originally proposed by Lewin (1935) nearly a century ago which states that behavior is the result of an interaction between person and environmental factors or B=f(P,E). Recent research has expanded upon this interactionist perspective illustrating that traits – or person factors – can predispose people to react in certain ways to situation/environment factors (Hershcovis et al., 2007; Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999). For example, situational and organizational factors have been demonstrated to interact with the personality characteristics associated with managerial ineffectiveness (Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2010). That is, according to Hogan, Hogan, and Warrenfeltz (2007), dark side personality characteristics are only demonstrated during periods associated with “high stress or change, multitasking, task saturation or accomplishment, [and] poor person-job fit” (p. 52). During times characterized as stable and content, when the leader is able to maintain composure with ease, his or her dark side personality flaws do not lead to undesirable leadership behaviors that undermine leader performance. Poor leadership performance is a complex phenomenon, influenced by personality, impacted by both attitudes and environmental conditions, resulting in maladaptive behaviors that lead to poor performance (Hogan et al., 2010).

Leaders and managers are most apt to exhibit negative behaviors associated with leadership dark side traits when stressful conditions are present (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). As described in the following section, the literature on job stress draws upon a job-demands-resources model. Therefore, I propose that leader job demands and (a lack of) job resources
impose the stress necessary for dark side traits to emerge and influence their behavior, which in turn, influences their direct reports’ perceptions of ethical climate. More specifically, the present study investigated a composite leader job demands and job resources (i.e., leader stress) variable as a moderator of the relationship between leader dark side categories and employee ethical climate perceptions. In the following sections, I provide an overview of the job-demands-resources literature, creating parallels to both leadership dark side characteristics and ethical climate.

**Job-Demands-Resources.** The job-demands-resources model represents a well-accepted theoretical model of job stress, which is defined as an uncomfortable emotional experience accompanied by predictable biochemical, physiological, and behavioral changes (Hobfoll, 1989; Lazarus, 1993; Segerstrom & Miller, 2004). It is important to distinguish the stress as an outcome from the stressors that create it. That is, stressors represent a chemical or biological agent, environmental condition, external stimulus, or an event that causes stress to an organism. At work, stressors have been described in the literature as a situation in which a person must perform tasks that (a) threaten to exceed his or her ability and/or resources; and (b) occur under conditions where he or she fears the penalties associated with not meeting the demand (McGrath, 1976). Examples of job stressors include excessive organizational demands, long work hours, disruptive organizational change, and conflicting demands and pressures. Research has indicated a number of interpersonal job stressors as well, namely conflicts with supervisors, colleagues, subordinates and management policies (Spector, 2002). Job stress can be so aversive that employees avoid it through withdrawing psychologically (e.g., through reduced involvement), physically (e.g., frequent tardiness, absenteeism, etc.) or by exiting the organization altogether (Beehr & Newman, 1978).
Job stress is a prevalent problem in the workplace: approximately one-third of employees report high stress levels at work (NIOSH, 1999). In addition, three-quarters of workers believe that the average employee experiences more job stress than a generation ago (Princeton Survey Research Associates, 1997). Job stress can also be quite costly to organizations. For example, research shows that job stress is a major cause of absenteeism and turnover (NIOSH, 1999). Further, continuous heightened levels of job stress are associated with decreased motivation and diminished employee performance (Colligan, Colligan, & Higgins, 2006). It follows that job stress is considered one of the most prevalent workplace health risks for employees in developed countries (Spector, 2002; Wilson, Dejoy, Vandenberg, Richardson, & McGrath, 2004).

The job-demands-resources model denotes that job stress is a result of an imbalance between the demands of one’s job and the resources s/he has to address those demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003; Bakker, Demerouti, Taris, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2003; Balducci, Schaufeli, & Fracaroli, 2011; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Using this rationale, job stress risk factors can be grouped in two general categories: job demands and job resources.

Job demands represent the social, psychological, physical, or organizational components of one’s job that require continuous psychological and/or physical effort or skills (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003a); Bakker, Demerouti, Taris, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2003c). Job demands are associated with physiological and/or psychological consequences (e.g., burnout or exhaustion) (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2003b; Bakker, Demerouti, & Vergeke, 2004; Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005; Demerouti et al., 2001; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). Further, research has shown that the greater the demands and associated effort, the greater the associated psychological and physiological costs
Examples of job demands include workload (e.g., numerous shifting priorities), physical environment (e.g., safety and physical work conditions), and recipient contact (e.g., perceived support from others). Research has shown that job demands are not necessarily negative, though they can become job stressors when high effort is required to meet those demands, and the employee cannot recover from one set of demands before facing the next (Meijman and Mulder, 1998).

Job resources represent the social, psychological, physical, or organizational aspects of the job associated with any of the following: achieving work goals; reducing job demands and associated psychological and physiological costs; and/or stimulating personal growth, learning, and development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker et al., 2003a; Bakker, et al., 2003b). Richter and Hacker (1998) distinguish two categories of job resources: external resources (e.g., social and organizational) and internal resources (e.g., individual cognitive and action patterns). The focus of the present study is on external resources, as research highlights a lack of general agreement regarding which internal resources can be considered situation dependent or stable (Demerouti et al., 2001). Examples of external job resources include feedback (e.g., performance review), rewards (e.g., bonus), participation (e.g., connection to organizational goals), and supervisor support (e.g., giving direction). Research has demonstrated that (low) job resources are related to (de)motivation and (diminished) commitment (Bakker et al., 2003b; Bakker et al., 2004c; Bakker et al. 2005; Demerouti et al., 2001; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004).

In addition to established main effects of job demands and resources, research has also investigated their combined effects. For example, job resources can moderate the relationship between job demands on job strain and burnout, particularly when job demands are high (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker, et al., 2003b; Bakker et al., 2003c). This assumption is grounded in
conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 2001). According to COR theory, one is motivated to acquire, retain and protect resources, as they are considered valuable to the individual. Hobfoll (2002) further posits that resources gain saliency in the context of resource loss. Therefore, it is believed that job resources achieve their motivational potential when employees are confronted with heightened job demands (Bakker et al., 2003c; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). For example, when employees are faced with high social demands, the social support of peers is likely to become more salient and instrumental. Taken together, the job-demands-resources literature has established the following combined effects: (a) when both job demands and resources are high, employees are particularly likely to experience heightened strain and motivation; (b) when both are low, an absence of strain and motivation are expected; (c) when job demands are high and job resources are low, high strain and low motivation are expected; and (d) when job demands are low and job resources are high, low strain and high motivation are expected (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

**Job Demands, Job Resources, and Leader Dark Side Traits.** As described previously, leaders and managers are most apt to exhibit negative behaviors associated with leadership dark side traits when stressful conditions are present. Therefore, the present study investigated the moderating role of leader job demands and job resources. Specifically, I proposed that leader job stress moderates the relationship between leadership dark side traits and direct report ethical climate perceptions.

In addition, I proposed a different set of predictions for the various dark side trait categories. As described previously, heightened levels of category I and II leader dark side traits are expected to be associated with particularly negative workplace outcomes. For example, category I leader dark side traits are associated with withdrawal, (Hogan & Hogan, 2001), poor
managerial performance, and an inability to effectively lead others (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). In addition, category II leader dark side traits are expected to be associated with low levels of trustworthiness (Gaddis & Foster, 2015). Therefore, it was expected that employees reporting to managers with heightened levels of either category I or II dark side traits are apt to perceive the climate as unethical. Further, this relationship was expected to be exacerbated when leaders are faced with job stress (i.e., heightened job demands and limited job resources):

_Hypothesis 5: For category I and II leader dark side traits, the combined effects of leader job demands and job resources moderates the relationship between those characteristics and direct report perceptions of ethical climate such that at higher levels of leader job demands and lower levels of leader job resources, the negative relationship between leader dark side characteristics and employee ethical climate perceptions is stronger (see Figure 2)._  

These predicted relationships assume that personality (i.e., leader dark side traits) precedes the situation (i.e., leader job demands and job resources), as previous research has investigated situational factors as moderators between personality and various outcomes. For example, research has investigated moderators in the relationship between the big five personality traits and job performance. Specifically, Barrick and Mount (1991) investigated autonomy as a moderator, and Barrick, Parks, and Mount (2005) investigated monitoring as a moderator. In addition, De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2005) researched work environment as a moderator in the relationship between personality and transactional leadership. However, it is important to note that conversely, research has also investigated personality as a moderator between situational factors and various outcomes. For example, Skarlicki, Folger, and Tesluk (1999) investigated personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and
retaliation. In addition, Fox and Spector (2001) researched personality as a moderator between job stressors and organizational justice. In sum, the research on the directionality of the person-situation interaction is mixed. Therefore, it was possible that the present research would find that leader dark side personality traits moderate the relationship between (a) leader job stress and (b) direct report ethical climate perceptions, rather than supporting the prediction that leader job stress moderates the relationship between leader dark side personality traits and direct report ethical climate perceptions.

In the present study, leader dark side traits and a composite leader job demands and job resources variable were expected to interact to influence employee ethical climate perceptions. Further, these relationships were expected to vary, depending upon the specific heightened dark side category. As described previously, leaders with high levels of category II dark side traits (i.e., mischievous, colorful, bold, or imaginative) are characterized as likely to move against others through manipulation, and intimidation when stressed (Hogan et al., 2007), therefore, it is reasonable to expect the composite effect of leader job demands and resources to be particularly strong for this group.

*Hypothesis 6: The composite effect of leader job demands and job resources on leadership dark side traits is the strongest for leaders possessing heightened category II dark side traits (i.e., mischievous, colorful, bold or imaginative), such that at higher levels of job demands and lower levels of job resources, the negative relationship between leader dark side characteristics and direct report ethical climate perceptions is greater, relative to leaders with elevated category I dark side traits.*

In the present research, a different set of predictions was made for category III (moving toward others) leader dark side traits. That is, diligent and dutiful leaders are characterized as
conforming to expectations and rules under normal conditions, and should be excellent role models of acceptable behavior (Hogan et. al., 2007). Further, exaggerated forms of diligence and duty can cause a leader to manage insecurities during times of distress by ingratiating others and building alliances. Given that leaders high in category III dark side traits are predisposed or driven to do the right thing; situational factors should not diminish that likelihood. Therefore, I did not expect job demands and job resources to influence the hypothesized relationship between category III dark side traits and direct report perceptions of ethical climate. Specifically:

_Hypothesis 7: Leader job demands and job resources have no moderating effect between category III dark side traits and employee ethical climate perceptions._

Summarizing to this point, I have reviewed the literature supporting the following predictions in the present study: (a) leadership personality is related to how employees perceive the ethical climate of the organization; (b) the composite effects of leader job demands and job resources moderate this relationship; and (c) the specific interactive effects vary across the three dark side trait categories.

I now turn to the ultimate outcome variables of interest in the present study: employee turnover intentions and actual turnover. Specifically, I expected that ethical climate – created through an interaction between leadership dark side characteristics and leader job stress – is related to employee turnover intentions and ultimately, employee turnover.

**Employee Turnover**

A large volume of research has been devoted to understanding voluntary employee turnover and factors that influence it (Hancock, Allen, Bosco, McDaniel, & Pierce, 2013; Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012; Shaw, Duffy, Johnson, & Lockhart, 2005). Such interest likely stems from the high costs associated with turnover (Mueller & Price, 1989). Specifically, this
includes costs associated with recruiting, selecting, training and developing new hires, as well as providing employee benefits (Allen, Bryant, & Vardann, 2010; Kazi, & Zadeh, 2011; Mossholder, Settoon, & Henagan, 2005; Shaw et al., 2005). Not only is turnover costly, it is also associated with hindered organizational performance, such as through decreased customer service quality (Hancock et al., 2013) and increased accident rates (Shaw, Gupta, & Delery, 2005). As a consequence, organizations are negatively impacted by turnover, as it is associated with lowered organizational financial performance, lowered work attitudes among remaining employees, and decreased overall productivity (Park & Shaw, 2013). Therefore, gaining a better understanding of the antecedents of employee turnover can enable organizations to improve operational effectiveness and employee morale (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Hancock et al., 2013). Employee turnover is purportedly one of the most challenging areas for human resources professionals to understand and influence, and they are charged with identifying its causes and with prevention (Kazi, & Zadeh, 2011).

Many decades of research have sought to better understand voluntary employee turnover. Substantial focus was placed on studying employee turnover in the late 1950s. March and Simon’s (1958) early research provided a framework for investigating this phenomenon, which still influences research today. Specifically, this framework proposed that employees’ decision to withdraw from their organization can be categorized into two influencing factors: push-to-go and pull-to-leave. A growing body of research has focused on better understanding both push factors (e.g., poor management practices such as abusive supervision within the current organization) and pull factors (e.g., attractive job alternative from another organization) to predict employee turnover decisions (Cheloha, & Farr, 1980; Griffeth et al., 2000; Shaw et al., 2005).
Senior leaders are often particularly interested in specific push-factors within their organization because these are factors within their control; whereas pull factors are much more difficult – if not impossible – to influence (Harman, Lee, Mitchell, Felps, & Owens, 2007; Segrest, Andrews, & Hurley-Hanson, 2015). Therefore, the role of effective leadership on voluntary employee turnover has become increasingly important (Herman, Huang, & Lam, 2013). The present research focused on ethical climate, as influenced by leadership, as a push factor associated with employee turnover intentions.

It is important to note that research has already established a negative relationship between ethical climate and employee turnover intentions, such that employees who perceive the organization as ethical are less likely to intend to leave (Valentine, Godkin, Fleischman, & Kidwell, 2011). Research has also demonstrated the impact that managers and leaders can have on employee turnover (e.g., Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). However, no research to date has explored these variables jointly. Therefore, in the present study, I proposed that through the creation of an unethical environment, managers influence their employees’ intentions to leave, and ultimate decisions to turnover. Specifically:

Hypothesis 8a: The ethical climate associated with the interactive effects of category I or II leader dark side characteristics, leader job demands, and leader job resources is related to both employee turnover intentions and actual turnover such that higher levels of leader category I or II dark side traits, higher levels of leader job demands, and lower levels of leader job resources are associated with lower direct report perceptions of ethical climate, and higher levels of direct report turnover intentions and actual turnover (see Figure 3).
As described previously, a number of factors influence employee turnover. Given the manager’s role in influencing employees and their environment, it was reasonable to expect that the link between their personality and their direct reports’ turnover intentions is stronger than that of the mediating effect of ethical climate described in hypothesis 8a. In other words, it was posited that managers influence their employees in a number of ways, not just through the ethical climate they create. Therefore, the following hypothesis was presented:

**Hypothesis 8b: The direct link between leader dark side traits and employee turnover intentions is stronger than the proposed composite relationship between leader dark side traits, ethical climate and turnover intentions.**

A different set of predictions were presented for category III dark side traits. As described previously, exaggerated forms of diligence and duty can cause a leader to manage insecurities during times of distress by ingratiating others and building alliances. In addition, it is not unreasonable to expect such leaders to positively influence the ethical climate of their workgroups through modeling relationship-building behaviors. However, this associated ethical climate was not expected to have a relationship with employee turnover intentions; as other negative attributes associated with elevated III dark side traits – e.g., extreme risk aversion, production delays, micro-management, a focus on short-term outcomes, and a lack of delegation – should still have an association. Therefore:

**Hypothesis 9: The relationships between category III leader dark side characteristics and both (a) employee ethical climate perceptions, and (b) employee turnover intentions is direct in nature (see Figure 4).**
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Participants

The present study utilized archival employee data collected from a large American owned multinational technology organization headquartered in the western United States. Geographic locations of facilities located abroad include Malaysia, China, United Kingdom, Philippines, India, Brazil, Slovakia, Panama, Ireland, and Morocco. Collected data encompass: (a) annual employee survey of 102 items assessing attitudes – about the company, leadership, and jobs – from approximately 85,000 managers and employees representing a wide array of jobs (e.g., information technology, legal, human resources, corporate, etc.) with supervisor/subordinate reporting relationships mapped; (b) Hogan Personality Assessments from 636 managers – of the original sample of 85,000 – linked to annual census data, with supervisor/subordinate reporting relationships mapped; (c) data from human resource information systems (HRIS) three years post survey data collection, indicating employees terminated three years after the survey administration.

A dataset was created for the present research that merged these datasets and mapped direct reports to the 636 managers who received Hogan Personality Assessments. To ensure there would be sufficient variation and teams would be of sufficient size, I chose manager cases representing teams of 5 or more direct reports. This resulted in a dataset that represents 498 individual-level manager cases. In addition, mapped to each manager record are aggregated responses from his/her direct reports for each item on the annual employee survey. Aggregated data represent responses from 5,275 direct reports. The $N$ for each direct report group is reported
for each manager in the data set, with an average of 10.6 direct reports per manager. No demographic data were shared or obtained for the present research. ¹

**Procedure**

In September 2012, all employees employed by the company for at least 30 days prior to the survey administration were invited to participate in the annual employee survey. Tenure data were not available for the present study, therefore the distribution of new versus high tenured employees is unknown. Participation was voluntary and confidential. To ensure confidentiality, a third party consulting agency was contracted to host the survey, collect the data, analyze the results, and provide aggregate results to the company’s leaders. The minimum N for sharing aggregate results was five. The survey was administered via web, and the survey data collection administration was open for two weeks.

In early 2012, approximately 700 managers and leaders had been selected to receive a Hogan Personality Assessment and a coaching session from a Hogan certified coach, as part of the company’s leadership development program. Participation was voluntary. Each assessment was administered via web, and sessions to review results and provide coaching via telephone were completed within one month of the assessment.

**Measures**

The present study utilized scales identified within the merged archival dataset described above to assess all study variables of interest – leader dark side traits, leader job demands and job

¹ The dataset utilized for the present research was used by previous researchers to investigate the relationships between leader dark side traits and employee engagement – defined as the degree to which employees think, feel, and act in ways that represent high levels of enthusiasm and commitment to the stakeholders of the company (Sirota & Klein, 2014). A sample engagement item used for that research is “I feel motivated to go beyond what is normally expected in order to help the company succeed.” The present research does not investigate employee engagement.
resources, direct report ethical climate perceptions, direct report turnover intentions, and actual team turnover. Leader dark side traits were measured using Hogan Personality Assessments (i.e., the full HDS), whereas the other four variables of interest were measured through the creation of new scales, represented in the annual employee census survey archival data. Each of these measures is described further in the following sections.

**Leader Dark Side Traits.** To assess leaders’ dark side personality characteristics, the present study utilized the HDS 11 dark side traits obtained in the archival dataset to derive the three HDS categories identified in the literature. Upon creation of the HDS categories, reliability estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) were assessed to denote internal consistency of the measures. All hypotheses investigating leader dark side traits were conducted at the HDS category I, II, or III levels.

**Leader Job Demands, Job Resources, and Job Stress.** Two indices were created for the present study to measure both job demands and job resources. These indices included items from the self-report data from the company’s annual attitudinal survey. In utilizing the archival dataset described above, the present research included as many facets that have been identified in the literature as possible.

The following job demands facets have been identified in the literature: physical workload, time pressure, recipient contact, physical environment, and shift work (Demerouti, Taris, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2003). The archival dataset utilized in the present research contains four items from the following job demands facets: workload, physical environment, and recipient contact. A sample item included in the job demands scale used for the present research is “Processes and procedures allow me to effectively meet my customers' needs” (physical environment).
The following job resources facets have been identified in the literature: feedback, rewards, job control, participation, job security, and supervisor support (Demerouti, Taris, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2003). The archival dataset utilized in the present research contains items from the following job resources facets: feedback, participation, rewards, and supervisor support. A sample item included in the job resources scale used for the present research is “I receive ongoing feedback that helps me improve my performance” (feedback) ($N = 5$ items; see Figure 5 illustrating the overlap between the job demands and job resources facets identified in the literature with those available for the present study; see Table 3 for the specific list of job demands and job resources items used in the present study; note that Figure 5 illustrates the broader job demands and job resources facets and Table 3 lists specific items used in the present research.)

Upon creation of the job demands and job resources indices, reliability estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) were assessed to denote internal consistency of the measures, and determine if any anticipated items should be eliminated. In addition, exploratory factor analytic procedures were conducted to assess the factor structure of the indices. The present research also created a composite measure of leader job stress by combining leader job demands and job resources indices, using an additive approach, which is described in greater detail below.

Each item of the employee survey utilizes a five-point scale with the following response options: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (4) agree, (5) strongly agree. In addition, each item contains a “don’t know / not applicable” response option, and employees were free to skip any of the 102 items as they completed the survey. For the present study, “don’t know / not applicable” response options were removed from analysis at the item-
level, or in other words, treated the same as a blank skipped item (coded as missing). No more than 8% of respondents skipped or selected “don’t know / not applicable” for any particular item.

All items from the employee annual census attitudinal survey are positively valenced, meaning that agreement with these statements represents positive attitudes. Therefore, high scores on the job demands items represent positive attitudes toward job demands (i.e., low demands), and high scores on the job resources items represent positive attitudes toward job resources. Therefore, data for both job demands and job resources were reverse scored so that high scores indicate high levels of leader job demands and low levels of job resources, respectively. In creating the composite leader job stress variable, the present research followed an additive approach, which involved summing job demands and job resources index mean scores. This approach resulted in composite scores ranging from two to ten. High scores indicate high levels of leader job demands and low levels of leader job resources. Low scores indicate low levels of leader job demands and high levels of leader job resources. Creation of the composite job stress was justified, as the magnitude of correlation between the leader job demands and job resources indices was substantive \( r = -.56; \ p = .000 \).

**Ethical Climate.** An ethical climate index was created for the present study that identified six ethical climate items from the self-report data from the company’s annual attitudinal survey to assess employee perceptions of ethical climate. As described previously, ethical climate involves a shared perception of (a) what is considered ethically correct behavior and (b) how ethical issues are addressed. The ethical climate scale created for the present study included items that assess both sets of perceptions. In addition, the present study sought to identify items/questions from the company’s annual attitudinal survey that encompass the three ethical climate types identified in the literature: (a) egoistic, (b) benevolent, and (c) principled, as
described previously. A sample egoistic item is “Team members are held accountable to act in [the company’s] best interest”; a sample benevolent item is “[My leader] creates an environment of trust and support for the team”; a sample principled item is “[The company] does not tolerate team members who act illegally or unethically in order to achieve business results”. These items employ the same 1-5 scale and use the same mean index scoring procedures as the job demands and job resources measures (see Table 4 for a list of the ethical climate index items). Upon creation of the ethical climate index, a reliability estimate (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha) was assessed to denote internal consistency of the measure, and determine if any items should be eliminated. In addition, exploratory factor analytic procedures were conducted to assess the factor structure of the index.

In order to justify the assumption that the ethical climate variable created for the present study truly represents a shared group-level perception of ethical climate, within group agreement among direct reports was assessed. The present research utilized \( r_{WG} \) (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984), which compares observed variance ratings to the variance of both: (a) a theoretical distribution that represents no variance (i.e., the null distribution); and (b) actual ratings. Reliability estimates range from +1.0 (perfect agreement, given the group mean) to -1.0 (maximum disagreement, given the group mean). A value of .80 and above is widely considered representative of strong within group agreement (Brown & Hauenstein, 2005). The present research randomly chose 15 direct report groups of varying sizes, and assessed within group agreement (i.e., \( r_{WG} \) values) for each team to provide evidence that group-level ethical climate exists for this company.

**Employee Turnover Intention.** A turnover intention index was created for the present study by identifying five items from the self-report data from the company’s annual attitudinal
survey to assess employee turnover intentions. Sample items include: “Even if I were offered a comparable position with similar pay and benefits at another company, I would stay at [the company]” (see Table 5 for a list of turnover intention items). These items employ the same 1-5 scale and use the same Mean index scoring procedures as the job demands, job resources, and ethical climate measures. As described previously, all items from the employee annual census attitudinal survey are positively valenced, meaning that agreement with these statements represents positive attitudes. Therefore, data for turnover intention items were reverse scored so that high scores indicate high turnover intentions. Upon creation of the turnover intention index, a reliability estimate (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha) was assessed to denote internal consistency of the measure, and determine if any items should be eliminated. In addition, exploratory factor analytic procedures were conducted to assess the factor structure of the index.

**Employee Turnover.** The third party consulting agency continued working with the organization for several years after data from this study were collected. Therefore, data from the company’s human resource information systems (HRIS) were collected for three years after data were collected for the present study, indicating employees actively employed by the organization three years later. These HRIS data were used to indicate actual employee turnover post survey administration, and coded into the master dataset. Specifically, for each manager record, the percentage of turnover for his/her respective team – as calculated three years after the survey – is indicated, with scores ranging from 0 to 1 (with 0 indicating 0% turnover, and 1 indicating 100% turnover).

**Hypothesis Testing**

The present research constructed the category I, II, and III dark side traits established in the literature by aggregating the associated traits for each category. Consistent with previous
research, all hypotheses involving leader dark side traits were tested at the HDS category level. Specifically, for hypotheses 1-4, bivariate correlations were used to assess the direct relationships between leader dark side traits and direct report ethical climate perceptions.

Hypotheses 5-9 were tested using Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) MODMED macro for SPSS, a path analysis routine which allows for testing moderating and mediating effects both jointly (i.e., moderated mediation in this study) and individually (i.e., moderation and mediation in this study). This analysis allowed for the testing of direct relationships between: (a) leader dark side traits; (b) leader job demands and job resources; (c) employee ethical climate perceptions; (d) employee turnover intentions; and (e) employee turnover, as well as the indirect and interactive relationships between these variables.
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Preliminary Analyses

Before testing hypotheses, it was important to first assess the reliability of each scale used in the present research, whether the scale replicated a pre-established measure (i.e., HDS leader dark side categories), or represented a new scale created specifically for the present research (i.e., leader job demands and job resources, employee ethical climate perceptions, and employee turnover intentions). Consistent with previous research, two approaches were used for scales created for the present research: (a) principal axis analysis; and (b) internal consistency analysis as recommended by Cronbach (1957). Internal consistency of the leader dark side category measures was also assessed, as described below.

I assessed the internal consistency of each of the three HDS categories, using trait scores. Cronbach’s alpha values indicated acceptable internal consistency levels for two of the three HDS categories: HDS category I (moving away from people; \( \alpha = .71 \)) and HDS category II (moving against people; \( \alpha = .70 \)). Looking to the item total statistics for each category, removal of certain traits would not improve the internal consistency of either category. Therefore, hypotheses involving HDS category I and II categories were assessed at the category level with confidence. HDS category III (moving toward others), on the other hand, demonstrated poor internal consistency (\( \alpha = .23 \)). Despite the low internal consistency of the HDS category III measure, all hypotheses were tested using the three categories as defined in the abundance of existing literature.

To assess the factor structure of the job demands and job resources data, a principal axis factor analysis was carried out. Factors with eigenvalues greater than one were examined. The scree-plot analysis also revealed that the slope of these eigenvalues was underpinned by two
discernible factors, with a small degree of overlap (see Figure 6). In addition, items loaded onto their respective expected factors (see Table 6). The total amount of variance explained by the two-factor structure was 58.26%. Each of the job demands and job resources factors reached acceptable levels of inter-item reliability as measured by the Cronbach’s alpha test: (a) job demands (4 items; $\alpha = .72$); and (b) job resources (5 items; $\alpha = .82$). As described previously, a leader job stress composite variable was created by summing mean scores of the leader job demands and leader job resources indices. This composite variable reached an acceptable level of inter-item reliability, as demonstrated by Cronbach’s alpha (9 items; $\alpha = .84$).

A principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed to determine the factor structure of the ethical climate measure. Given that there are no subscales in this measure, I first performed factor analytic procedures on the full employee attitude survey dataset. All items loaded onto one factor. However, due to the likelihood of multicollinearity of the measures, I refrained from relying on a one dimension factor structure solution. Therefore, I restricted the dataset to the two outcome indices of interest in the present study: employee ethical climate and employee turnover intentions. Factor analytic results on these combined indices revealed two factors with eigenvalues greater than one, and items loaded onto their respective expected factors (see Figure 7 and Table 7). I then assessed the internal consistency of each measure. The ethical climate factor reached a high level of inter-item reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .87$). Similarly, the employee turnover intentions factor also reached a high level of inter-item reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .83$).

In order to justify the assumption that the ethical climate variable created for the present study truly represents a shared group-level perception of ethical climate, within group agreement among direct reports was assessed, using $r_{WG}$ (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984). As stated
previously, reliability estimates of .80 and above are considered representative of strong within group agreement (Brown & Hauenstein, 2005). The present research randomly chose 15 direct report groups of varying sizes (ranging from five to ten employees), and assessed within group agreement (i.e., \( r_{WG} \) values). Results indicate a group-level ethical climate exists for this company, as \( r_{WG} \) values ranged from .84 to 1.0 for these randomly selected 15 groups representing 116 employees.

**Main Results**

**Descriptive Statistics.** Table 8 shows the ranges, means, standard deviations, and the internal consistencies (Cronbach’s alpha), as applicable, of all study variables used in the present study. Some variables represent a single score (e.g., employee turnover), and others represent indices (e.g., HDS categories). Therefore, internal consistency information appears for indices only. As shown in Table 8, most indices show reasonable to good reliabilities, with the exception of HDS category III (moving toward people; \( \alpha = .23 \)).

**Correlates.** Table 9 shows correlations among all study variables. Pearson Correlation testing revealed that each variable of interest in the present study is correlated with at least one other variable of interest in the present study. These relationships are described below, beginning with an overview of the HDS correlates.

**HDS Correlates.** The first step in assessing HDS correlates was to investigate intercorrelations among the three HDS categories. One such relationship emerged. As shown in Table 9, HDS categories I (moving away from people) and III (moving toward people) were moderately positively correlated \( (r = .25; p = .000) \). Moving beyond the intercorrelations among the HDS categories, the analysis also revealed that HDS category I was slightly correlated with all other study variables of interest in the present research: (a) the leader job demands and job
resources composite ($r = .11; p = .018$); (b) employee ethical climate perceptions ($r = -.10; p = .031$); (c) employee turnover intentions ($r = .13; p = .004$); (d) actual team turnover ($r = .10; p = .043$). In other words, leaders high in category I (moving away) dark side traits tended to perceive slightly greater levels of job stressors, (as indicated by the composite job demands and job resources composite variable). In addition, their subordinates perceived the ethical climate as slightly more negative and expressed somewhat higher turnover intentions. Further a higher percentage of their teams subsequently exited the organization three years following the employee survey.

Regarding HDS categories II and III, correlations with other study variables were few. Specifically, HDS category II (moving against people) was slightly positively correlated with leader job demands and job resources ($r = .09; p = .041$), suggesting that leaders high in category II dark side traits are slightly more likely to perceive greater levels of job stressors, (as indicted by the composite job demands and job resources variable). Beyond the intercorrelation described above, HDS category III did not demonstrate relationships with other study variables of interest.

**Ethical Climate Correlates.** The ethical climate variable used in the present study demonstrated relationships with three other study variables of interest: (a) HDS category I (moving away from people; $r = -.10; p = .031$); (b) the leader job demands and job resources composite ($r = -.14; p = .002$); and (c) employee turnover intentions ($r = -.80; p = .000$). That is, subordinates were slightly more likely to perceive the ethical climate as negative if they report to leaders high in either HDS category I dark side traits, or the job demands job resources composite. Further, subordinates who perceived the ethical climate as more negative expressed greater intention to quit.
**Employee Turnover Intentions Correlates.** Employee turnover intentions demonstrated relationships with three study variables of interest in the present research. Specifically, as expected, the employee turnover intentions variable was: (a) positively correlated with both HDS category I leader dark side traits ($r = .13$; $p = .004$) and the leader job demands job resources composite ($r = .14$; $p = .002$); and (b) as reported above, highly negatively correlated with employee ethical climate perceptions ($r = -.80$; $p = .000$). That is, the present research found that both leader HDS category I dark side traits and job demands job resources composite levels (where high scores indicate high demands and low resources) were positively associated with subordinates’ intention to quit. In addition, low employee ethical climate perceptions were strongly associated with higher employee turnover intentions, as expected. It is important to note that contrary to expectations, the study variable representing actual employee turnover demonstrated a relationship with only one other study variable in the present research: HDS category I dark side traits ($r = .09$; $p = .043$). Therefore, three years following the survey, leaders high in HDS category I (moving away from people) were slightly more likely to have experienced higher turnover levels on their respective teams.

**Hypothesis Testing using Pearson Correlation Analysis.** *Hypothesis 1.* I predicted a significant negative relationship between category II (moving against people) leader dark side personality characteristics and direct report perceptions of ethical climate. Pearson Correlation testing at the category level revealed no relationship between these study variables ($r = -.02$; $p = .589$). Therefore, hypothesis 1 was not supported.

*Post Hoc Analysis.* As a follow-up post hoc correlation analysis, relationships were tested between individual HDS category II traits and ethical climate items. Pearson correlation analysis revealed a slight negative relationship between the imaginative category II leader dark side trait
and the following ethical climate item: “[Company] does not tolerate team members who act illegally or unethically in order to achieve business results” (r = -.08; p = .031) (see Table 10). Therefore, subordinates of leaders high in the imaginative dark side trait were slightly more likely to perceive the organization as tolerant of using unethical tactics to achieve business results.

**Hypothesis 2.** I predicted a significantly negative relationship between category I (moving away from people) leader dark side traits and direct report perceptions of ethical climate. Pearson Correlation testing at the HDS category level revealed a slight, albeit significant relationship between these variables (r = -.10; p = .031). Therefore, hypothesis 2 received support.

**Hypothesis 3.** I predicted a significantly positive relationship between category III (moving toward people) leader dark side traits and direct report perceptions of ethical climate. Pearson Correlation testing at the category III level revealed no relationship between these variables (r = .05; p = .262). Therefore, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

**Post Hoc Analysis.** As a follow-up post hoc correlation analysis, relationships were tested at the individual HDS category III trait level and ethical climate item level. This analysis revealed a slight positive correlation between the dutiful category III dark side trait and the following ethical climate items: (a) “Within my team, people are rewarded (e.g., opportunities, promotions, pay etc.) according to their job performance” (r = .11; p = .004); (b) “I feel valued as a team member of [Company]” (r = .10; p = .008); and (c) “[My leader] creates an environment of trust and support for our team” (r = .10; p = .008). Whereas the dutiful dark side trait demonstrated modest relationships with half of the ethical climate items, the other trait
comprising the category III dark side category – diligent – exhibited no relationships with any of the ethical climate items (see Table 11).

**Hypothesis 4.** I predicted that the relationship between leader dark side traits and ethical climate is strongest for category II (moving against) dark side traits. However, whereas employee ethical climate perceptions were slightly negatively correlated with HDS category I (moving away; \( r = -.10; p = .031 \)), contrary to expectations, ethical climate was not associated with HDS category II (moving against; \( r = -.02; p = .589 \)). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

**Hypothesis Testing using Path Analysis.** Hypotheses 5-9 were tested using Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) MODMED macro for SPSS, which allows for testing moderating and mediating effects both jointly (i.e., moderated mediation in this study) and individually (i.e., moderation and mediation in this study). Given the relationships identified via Pearson correlation analysis, a moderated mediation test was performed among the following study variables: HDS category I dark side traits, leader job demands and job resources, employee ethical climate perceptions, and employee turnover intentions. Specifically, MODMED Model 2 enabled me to test the extent to which an indirect effect of HDS category I dark side traits on employee turnover intentions through employee ethical climate perceptions is moderated by leader job demands and job resources. Stated differently, this model specified the path from HDS category I to employee ethical climate perceptions as moderated by leader job demands and job resources. A similar test was not performed with HDS category II, as correlation analysis revealed no relationship between HDS category II and either employee ethical climate perceptions or employee turnover intentions. This was also the case for HDS category III, although it is important to note that no moderation, mediation, or moderated mediation was
originally predicted for HDS category III. To summarize findings tested, MODMED results revealed that ethical climate mediates the relationship between HDS category I and employee turnover intentions. That is, through ethical climate, HDS category I dark side traits exhibited an indirect effect for employee turnover intentions. Contrary to expectations, the path from HDS category I to employee ethical climate perceptions was not moderated by the leader job demands and job resources. These results are detailed below, as they pertain to the specific testing of Hypotheses 5-9.

**Hypothesis 5.** I predicted that for category I and II leader dark side traits, leader job stress moderates the relationship between leader dark side characteristics and direct report perceptions of ethical climate such that at higher levels of leader job stress, the negative relationship between leader dark side characteristics and employee ethical climate perceptions is stronger. Contrary to expectations, MODMED results indicated no significant moderating effect ($\beta = .003; \ p = .567$). Further, a similar test was not performed with HDS category II, as correlation analysis revealed no relationship between HDS category II and either employee ethical climate perceptions or employee turnover intentions. Taken together, hypothesis 5 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 6.** I predicted the interactive effect of leader job demands and job resources (as conceptualized by the composite leader job demands and job resources variable) on leadership dark side traits is the strongest for leaders possessing heightened category II dark side traits (i.e., mischievous, colorful, bold or imaginative), such that at higher levels of job demands and lower levels of job resources, the negative relationship between leader dark side characteristics and direct report ethical climate perceptions is greater, relative to leaders with elevated category I dark side traits. No relationships were identified between category II dark side traits and employee ethical climate perceptions. Therefore, hypothesis 6 was not supported.
Hypothesis 7. I predicted that leader job demands and job resources has no moderating effect between category III dark side traits (moving away) and employee ethical climate perceptions. The lack of relationship with other study variables eliminated the justification to conduct path analysis using the HDS category III variable, therefore providing a lack of support for hypothesis 7.

Hypothesis 8a. I predicted the ethical climate associated with the interactive effects of category I or II leader dark side characteristics and leader job demands, and job resources (as conceptualized as leader job stress) is related to both employee turnover intentions and actual turnover such that higher levels of leader category I or II dark side traits, higher levels of job demands, and lower levels of job resources are associated with lower direct report perceptions of ethical climate, higher levels of direct report turnover intentions, and actual turnover. See Figure 1 for the full model prediction. Given the lack of relationship identified between employee turnover intentions and actual team turnover, this portion of the path analysis was not tested. Rather, Pearson correlation analysis justified testing paths among the following study variables: HDS category I, leader job demands and job resources, employee ethical climate perceptions and employee turnover intentions. More specifically, I tested the extent to which an indirect effect of HDS category I dark side traits on employee turnover intentions through employee ethical climate perceptions is moderated by leader job demands and job resources. A similar test was not performed with HDS category II, as correlation analysis revealed no relationship between HDS category II and either employee ethical climate perceptions or employee turnover intentions. MODMED results revealed that ethical climate mediates the relationship between HDS category I and employee turnover intentions, as once I controlled for employee ethical climate perceptions, the relationship between HDS category I and employee turnover intentions was no
longer significant ($\beta = .03; p = .290$). Therefore, through ethical climate, HDS category I dark side traits exhibited an indirect effect for employee turnover intentions. Contrary to expectations, the path from HDS category I to employee ethical climate perceptions was not moderated by leader job stress ($\beta = -.003; p = .567$), as described above in Hypothesis 5 results. See Figure 8 for re-specified model results. Hypothesis 8a did not receive support with regard to category II dark side traits. However, given the support for mediation for category I dark side traits, but lack of support for moderation, hypothesis 8a received partial support.

**Hypothesis 8b.** I predicted that the direct link between leader dark side traits and employee turnover intentions is stronger than the proposed composite relationship between leader dark side traits, ethical climate and turnover intentions. Given Pearson correlation results indicating employee turnover intentions is related to HDS category I, but not categories II or III, I was able to test this hypothesis for HDS category I only. Given the strength of the relationship between ethical climate perceptions and employee turnover intentions ($r = -.80; p = .000$) results indicate the composite relationship between HDS category I, ethical climate, and employee turnover intentions is stronger than the direct link between HDS category I and employee turnover intentions ($r = -.13; p = .004$). Therefore, Hypothesis 8b was not supported.

**Hypothesis 9.** I predicted that the ethical climate associated category III leader dark side characteristics has no relationship with turnover intentions; rather, the relationship between category III leader dark side characteristics and employee turnover intentions is direct in nature. Given the lack of significant direct relationship between category III leader dark side traits and employee turnover intentions ($r = -.07; p = .107$), hypothesis 9 was not supported.
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion

The present research examined the interactive relationships between leader dark side traits and leader job demands and job resources, and their relationships with ethical climate, employee turnover intentions, and team turnover. While the number of hypotheses supported was few, interesting results emerged nonetheless. There are several important conclusions that can be drawn from the current findings as well as some limitations that will be useful in guiding future research in this area.

Leader Dark Side Traits. While the internal consistency data reached reasonable levels for the category I (moving away) and category II (moving against) dark side scales, the category III (moving toward) traits lacked the internal consistency requisite to constitute a factor. These could represent sample artifacts specific to the population assessed in the present study. That is, these data were collected on leaders from one organization, where desired competencies indicative of successful leadership may be unique due to the organization type, and therefore influence the specific types of leaders who are attracted to, selected by, and retained by the organization. Future research could benefit from comparing HDS data across various company sectors (e.g., technology, finance, non-profit, etc.) to determine if the HDS factor structure varies by industry type. Given the lack of internal consistency, it was not surprising that HDS category III demonstrated a relationship with only one other study variable – HDS category I. However, regardless of the lack findings associated with category III dark side traits, more compelling relationships with other study variables of interest were identified for both categories I and II – particularly for category I – as described below.
**Category I Dark Side Traits.** Of the HDS categories assessed in the present study, category I (moving away) dark side traits demonstrated the most robust findings. Beginning with a review of the correlation analysis (beyond the intercorrelation with category III), category I leader dark side traits were – albeit very slightly – correlated with all other study variables in the present research. Specifically, category I was positively associated with: (a) leader job stress; (b) employee turnover intentions; and (c) actual employee turnover. Further, category I was slightly negatively correlated with employee ethical climate perceptions, providing support for hypothesis 2. Taken together, leaders high in category I (moving away) dark side traits tended to perceive higher job stress levels, and their subordinates were slightly: less likely to perceive the ethical climate as positive, more likely to intend to quit, and more likely to have left the organization three years after survey and personality data were collected. It is important to note that while effect sizes are very modest, this makes intuitive sense, as many factors associated with employee attitudes at work, beyond simply those specific to one’s manager.

As expected, path analysis results revealed employee ethical climate mediates the relationship between category I leader dark side traits and employee turnover intentions. That is, as expected, through ethical climate, HDS category I dark side traits exhibited an indirect effect for employee turnover intentions. Contrary to expectations, the path from HDS category I to employee ethical climate perceptions was not moderated by leader job stress, therefore providing only partial support for Hypothesis 5 and 8a.

**Category II Dark Side Traits.** Many of the expected relationships predicted for category II dark side traits were not supported, as indicated by partial to complete absence of support for Hypotheses 1, 4, 5, 6, and 8a. Rather, the sole variable of interest that exhibited a relationship with category II dark side traits was leader job stress. Therefore: (a) counter to the expectations
of hypothesis 1, no relationship was identified between category II leader dark side traits and direct report perceptions of ethical climate; (b) hypothesis 4 – which predicted that the relationship between leader dark side traits and ethical climate is the strongest for the category II dark side traits – was not supported, as there was no relationship between category II dark side traits and employee ethical climate perceptions; and (c) the lack of relationship with other study variables eliminated the justification to conduct path analysis using the HDS category II variable, therefore providing a lack of support of moderated mediation as predicted in Hypotheses 5, 6, and 8a. However, follow-up post hoc correlation analysis revealed relationships between certain HDS category II traits and ethical climate. Specifically, heightened levels of the imaginative leader dark side trait were associated with employee perceptions that the company tolerates behaving unethically to achieve business results. This is likely attributable to the highly imaginatives’ propensity to behave in unusual ways (Kaiser, et. al., 2015) and their indifference to the political and social consequences of their behaviors (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, research has shown that subordinates of highly imaginative managers are often unsure about the directions they give or their intentions.

**Category III Dark Side Traits.** Analysis of category III (moving toward) dark side traits was challenging from the beginning, as the traits within demonstrated poor internal consistency. Therefore, it was not surprising that HDS category III demonstrated a relationship with only one other study variable – HDS category I. Therefore, counter expectations, HDS category III did not demonstrate a positive relationship with ethical climate (as predicted hypothesis 3), nor a negative relationship with employee turnover intentions (as predicted in hypothesis 9). Further, the lack of relationship with other study variables eliminated the justification to conduct path
analysis using the HDS category III variable, therefore providing a lack of support for Hypotheses 7.

Follow-up post hoc correlation analysis carried out between HDS category III traits and ethical climate indicate leaders high in the dutiful dark side trait are apt to foster an ethical climate in which: (a) employees are rewarded according to performance; (b) employees feel that they are valued as members of the company; and (c) the leader creates an environment of trust and support for the team. These results are consistent with the literature indicating that dutiful leaders are eager to please (Hogan & Hogan, 2010); (b) trustworthy (Gaddis & Foster, 2015); and are prone to exhibit enabling leadership tendencies, through creating the necessary conditions to enable others to contribute via participation, empowerment, and support (Kaiser, et. al., 2010; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2006). On the other hand, the other category III dark side trait – diligence – did not correlate with any of the ethical climate items assessed in the present study. In sum, higher levels of the dutiful dark side trait – and not diligence – are associated with stronger employee ethical climate perceptions.

Taken together, the findings for the HDS dark side categories were limited, such that very few study variables were associated with either category II or III dark side traits (when aggregated to the HDS category level). However, HDS trait level analyses were informative. Take HDS category III for example. The dutiful dark side trait – and not diligence – demonstrated a slight positive relationship with employee ethical climate perceptions. It may be that the fast-paced, cutting-edge nature of this technology company is well aligned with a leader high in the dutiful dark side trait. That is, highly dutiful leaders lead through enabling and engaging their teams (Kaiser, et. al., 2010; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2006). Further, it is not surprising that the category III factor structure was not supported in this organization, as it is reasonable to
expect: (a) leaders high in the dutiful dark side trait to succeed in a fast paced environment; and (b) leaders high in the diligent dark side trait to fail. This is because highly diligent leaders tend to exhibit great difficulty in carrying out a vision and achieving the big picture, as they tend to get lost in the details (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). Further, the highly diligent leader’s lack of focus coupled with their seemingly inability to delegate precludes their ability to maintain or build a team. In addition, because of their likelihood to become stressed by heavy workloads, hesitancy to delegate, and lack of ability to prioritize tasks, the highly diligent often respond to stress and heightened workloads by working harder and longer – not smarter (Hogan et. al., 2010). As a result, quality can begin to suffer and their team falls behind. Ultimately, the highly diligent can become organizational bottle-necks to productivity, as an increasing volume of tasks must be reviewed, checked, revised, and approved by them (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan et. al., 2010). These attributes are unlikely to fare well in a fast-paced environment that centers on speed of results. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that leaders high in the dutiful dark side trait are more likely to be attracted to, selected by, and succeed in a fast-paced organization than leaders high in diligence. Taken together, it is not surprising that in the present research: (a) these traits did not hold together to comprise the category III dark side factor; and (b) more robust findings emerged for the dutiful dark side trait. Future research should investigate this phenomenon to determine if this pattern of results is typical in other fast-paced organizations (e.g., companies within the technology sector), or if it is simply an artifact for the present study.

**Leader Job Demands, Job Resources, and Job Stress.** In the present study, leader job demands and leader job resources indices were used to create the composite leader job stress variable. The purpose was to create a measure of stressful work conditions to serve as a
moderator variable in the analysis, as previous research on the dark side traits purports that stressful work conditions exacerbate dark side traits’ effects on behavior, increasing the likelihood of negative workplace outcomes (Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2011). Therefore, the present research sought to replicate this approach in an effort to understand the leader dark side traits, the associated role of leader job demands and job resources, and their joint effects on workplace outcomes (i.e., ethical climate, employee turnover intentions, and actual employee turnover).

Creation of the job demands and job resources scales was relatively straightforward, as each scale was supported by exploratory factor analytic procedures and demonstrated strong internal consistency. Creation of the leader job stress variable was also straightforward, and employed an additive approach such that job demands and job resources scores mean index scores were summed to create the composite leader job stress variable. Results indicated that although leader stress was both positively and negatively correlated with a number of study variables, it did not serve as a moderator between leader dark side traits and employee ethical climate perceptions. Therefore, it appears that the job demands and job resources items used in the present study were insufficient in eliciting the levels of stress necessary to produce more robust findings. Given the abundance of literature associated with leader job demands/job resources and stress, future research should explore alternate measures of either job demands/job resources or other sources of stress in the workplace to compare and contrast differing effects on the dark side traits.

**Ethical Climate.** The employee ethical climate perceptions variable performed very well in the present research. Specifically, the items constructing the index were supported by exploratory factor analytic procedures and demonstrated strong internal consistency. In addition,
ethical climate demonstrated relationships with a number of other study variables of interest in the present study. Specifically, as expected, correlation analysis demonstrated that ethical climate is inversely related to HDS category I dark side traits, leader job stress, and employee turnover intentions. While ethical climate’s inverse relationship with HDS category I dark side traits and leader job stress was of modest strength, its negative inverse relationship with employee turnover intentions was quite strong. Further, analysis demonstrated a mediation effect for HDS category I dark side traits. That is, through ethical climate, HDS category I dark side traits exhibited an indirect effect for employee turnover intentions. Contrary to expectations, the path from HDS category I to employee ethical climate perceptions was not moderated by leader job stress.

Given these relationships, the importance of a strong ethical climate is clear. Further, the present research also highlights the importance of considering both the individual (i.e., leader dark side traits) and the situation (i.e., stressful work conditions) when making personnel decisions. That is, organizations can benefit from employing an interactionist approach. For example, considering both the individual and the environment can aid key personnel decisions such as selection (e.g., determining goodness of fit for leadership roles) and organization structuring (e.g., matching leaders and teams).

**Employee Turnover.** Two employee turnover variables were created for the present research: (a) a turnover intention scale consisting of attitudinal ratings from employees; and (b) actual three-year team turnover data percentages for each manager. While the employee turnover intention scale performed well in the present research, the team turnover variable did not. Specifically, both correlation and path analyses demonstrated relationships between employee turnover intentions and a number of study variables. That is, as expected, Pearson Correlational analysis revealed employee turnover intention was: (a) modestly positively associated with both
leader category I dark side traits and leader job stress; and (b) strongly negatively associated with employee ethical climate perceptions. See Figures 7, 8 and 9.

Conversely, the employee team turnover variable demonstrated a significant relationship with only one other variable of interest in the present research – HDS category I dark side traits. Counter expectations, employee turnover intentions and actual team turnover were not related in the present research.

This artifact could be attributable to the vast array of reasons that employees ultimately exit organizations, encompassing both push to go and pull to leave factors. Therefore, employees leaving the organization for personal reasons (e.g., to care for a sick relative, retirement, pursuing a professional degree), or to accept and enticing job offer elsewhere can dilute the effects of those who leave because they feel that they are pushed out. Future research should investigate actual employee turnover deeper as a dependent variable in a similar model. For example, the ability to isolate turnover data to cases in which employees left for organizational reasons (e.g., abusive supervision, unfavorable organizational changes, etc.) could lend deeper insight to the pathways to turnover.

Previous research has investigated the relationship between employee turnover intentions and actual turnover, which indicate turnover intentions are a fairly representative indicator of actual turnover. Specifically, for employees who select “less than one year” as a response option to the question “how long do you plan to continue working for this company”, approximately half actually do leave within the year (Sirota & Klein, 2013). Therefore, the employee turnover intentions variable was an important variable to measure and assess in the present research.

Conclusion
The results of the present research demonstrate that employee ethical climate perceptions can mediate the relationship between leader personality attributes and employee turnover intentions. This research was important in highlighting the importance of both person and situation factors in understanding both critical employee outcomes and paths among variables. For example, organizations can benefit from better understanding of the consequences of employing leaders with certain personality attributes (e.g., category I dark side traits), as some personality attributes can influence the team’s climate (e.g., ethical climate) and direct reports’ intention to quit.

Leadership ineffectiveness is a pervasive problem with consequences. Additional research in this domain can help us understand this phenomenon and assist us in recognizing antecedents, interactive effects, and paths among them (e.g., individual differences and organizational factors). From an applied perspective, research in this domain can assist us in designing training programs, conflict resolution strategies, and managerial interventions. Further, highlighting the importance and impact of ethical climate can have implications for future organizational strategy.
Table 1

*DSM-IV Personality Disorder HDS Themes (Hogan & Hogan, 1997, p 42)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSM-IV Personality Disorder</th>
<th>HDS Themes</th>
<th>HDS Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>Inappropriate anger; unstable and intense relationships alternating between idealization and devaluation.</td>
<td>Excitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid</td>
<td>Distrustful and suspicious of others; motives are interpreted as malevolent.</td>
<td>Skeptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>Social inhibition, feelings of inadequacy, and hyper-sensitivity to criticism or rejection.</td>
<td>Cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizoid</td>
<td>Emotional coldness and detachment from social relationships; indifferent to praise and criticism.</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Aggressive</td>
<td>Passive resistance to adequate social and occupational performance; irritated when asked to do something he/she does not want to do.</td>
<td>Leisurely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>Arrogant and haughty behaviors or attitudes; grandiose sense of self-importance and entitlement.</td>
<td>Bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>Disregard for the truth; impulsivity and failure to plan ahead; failure to conform with social norms.</td>
<td>Mischievous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histrionic</td>
<td>Excessive emotionality and attention seeking; self-dramatizing, theatrical, and exaggerated emotional expression.</td>
<td>Colorful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizotypal</td>
<td>Odd beliefs or magical thinking; behavior or speech that is odd, eccentric, or peculiar.</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive-Compulsive</td>
<td>Preoccupations with orderliness, rules, perfectionism, and control; overconscientious and inflexible.</td>
<td>Diligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Difficulty making everyday decisions without excessive advice and reassurance; difficulty expressing disagreement out of fear of loss of support or approval.</td>
<td>Dutiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Scale Name</td>
<td>Sample Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category I: Moving Away from People</td>
<td>Excitable</td>
<td>I get angry quickly. Few people have met my expectations. Sometimes I am not sure what I really believe. When someone does me a favor, I wonder what he/she wants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skeptical</td>
<td>People who are in charge will take advantage of you if you let them. There are some people I will never forgive. I feel awkward around strangers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>People sometimes think I'm timid. People tell me I'm not assertive enough. I consider myself a loner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>I prefer to keep people at a distance. Other people's problems don't concern me. I sometimes put off doing things for people I don't like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisurely</td>
<td>People at work expect me to do everything. It irritates me to be interrupted when I'm working on something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II: Moving Against People</td>
<td>Bold</td>
<td>I would never take a job that is beneath me. I do many things better than almost everyone I know. I was born to do great things. I try things that other people think are too risky. I often do things on the spur of the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mischievous</td>
<td>When I want to get my way, I know how to &quot;turn on the charm&quot;. In a group, I am often the center of attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorful</td>
<td>I like to have several things going on at the same time. I sometimes dress so as to stand out from the crowd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>People describe me as unconventional. I sometimes feel I have special talents and abilities. May of my ideas are ahead of their time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III: Moving Toward People</td>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>Dutiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have high standards for my performance at work.</td>
<td>On important issues, I dislike making decisions on my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tend to be a perfectionist about my work.</td>
<td>There is nothing wrong with flattering your boss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am fussy about schedules and timing.</td>
<td>I take pride in being a good follower.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
*Job Demands and Job Resources Indices Created for the Present Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Text</th>
<th>Job Demands</th>
<th>Job Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes and procedures allow me to effectively meet my customers’ needs.</td>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Company] has the right systems (infrastructure, tools, technology) in place to achieve our business goals.</td>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My team gets the cooperation it needs from other teams to achieve our business objectives.</td>
<td>Recipient Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Company] is committed to providing work life solutions (e.g., benefits and resources, flexibility to help manage work and personal responsibilities).</td>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive on-going feedback that helps me improve my performance.</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can see a clear link between my work and [Company]’s objectives.</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I feel my career goals can be met at [Company].</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[My leader] creates challenging assignments and growth opportunities.</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[My leader] does a good job setting and giving direction that helps me prioritize my work.</td>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Ethical Climate Index Created for the Present Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within my team, people are rewarded (e.g., opportunities, promotion, pay etc.) according to their job performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued as a team member of [the company].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[The company] does not tolerate team members who act illegally or unethically in order to achieve business results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members are held accountable to act in [the company’s] best interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My team has a climate in which diverse perspectives are valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[My leader] creates an environment of trust and support for our team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Employee Turnover Intention Index Created for the Present Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even if I were offered a comparable position with similar pay and benefits at another company, I would stay at [Company].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to work for [Company].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think [Company]'s best days are ahead of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see a long term career at [Company].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am seeking a long term career in the [my BU] organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
*Job Demands and Job Resources Factor Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes and procedures allow me to effectively meet my customers' needs.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Company] has the right systems (infrastructure, tools, technology) in place to achieve our business goals.</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My team gets the cooperation it needs from other teams to achieve our business objectives.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Company] is committed to providing work life solutions (e.g., benefits and resources, flexibility to help manage work and personal responsibilities).</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive on-going feedback that helps me improve my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can see a clear link between my work and [Company]'s objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I feel my career goals can be met at [Company].</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[My leader] creates challenging assignments and growth opportunities.</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[My leader] does a good job setting and giving direction that helps me prioritize my work.</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Table 7
*Ethical Climate and Turnover Intentions Factor Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within my team, people are rewarded (e.g., opportunities, promotions, pay etc.) according to their job performance.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued as a team member of [Company].</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Company] does not tolerate team members who act illegally or unethically in order to achieve business results.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members are held accountable to act in [Company]'s best interest.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My team has a climate in which diverse perspectives are valued.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[My leader] creates an environment of trust and support for our team.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I were offered a comparable position with similar pay and benefits at another company, I would stay at [Company].</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to work for [Company].</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think [Company]'s best days are ahead of it.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see a long term career at [Company]</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am seeking a long term career in the [my business unit] organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Range - Scales</th>
<th>Range - Responses</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDS Cat I: Moving Away</td>
<td>(1-14)</td>
<td>(1-12)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDS Cat 2: Moving Against</td>
<td>(1-14)</td>
<td>(1.5-12.25)</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDS Cat 3: Moving Toward</td>
<td>(1-14)</td>
<td>(2.5-12)</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Job Stress Composite</td>
<td>(2-10)</td>
<td>(2-10)</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Ethical Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>(1-5)</td>
<td>(2-5)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>(1-5)</td>
<td>(1.87-5)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Turnover</td>
<td>(0-1)</td>
<td>(0-1)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
*Correlations table for Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. HDS Cat I: Moving Away</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HDS Cat 2: Moving Against</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HDS Cat 3: Moving Toward</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leader Job Stress Composite</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EE Ethical Climate Perceptions</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EE Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EE Turnover</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlations are significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlations are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
### Table 10

*Correlations between HDS Category II Traits and Ethical Climate Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: Within my team, people are rewarded (e.g., opportunities, promotions, pay etc.) according to their job performance.</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: I feel valued as a team member of [Company].</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: [Company] does not tolerate team members who act illegally or unethically in order to achieve business results.</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: Team members are held accountable to act in [Company]'s best interest.</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: My team has a climate in which diverse perspectives are valued.</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: [My leader] creates an environment of trust and support for our team.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDS Category II Trait: Bold</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischievous</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorful</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td><strong>-.08</strong>*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlations are significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)*
Table 11
**Correlations between HDS Category III Traits and Ethical Climate Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: Within my team, people are rewarded (e.g., opportunities, promotions, pay etc.) according to their job performance.</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: I feel valued as a team member of [Company].</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: [Company] does not tolerate team members who act illegally or unethically in order to achieve business results.</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: Team members are held accountable to act in [Company]'s best interest.</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: My team has a climate in which diverse perspectives are valued.</th>
<th>Ethical Climate Item: [My leader] creates an environment of trust and support for our team.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDS Category III Trait: Diligent</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutiful</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)**
Figure 1. Predicted Model of Results for Category I and II Leader Dark Side Traits.
Figure 2. Predicted Moderation Effect of Leader Job Stress.
Figure 3. Predicted Interactive Effects for Category I and II Leader Dark Side Traits.
Figure 4. Predicted Main Effects for Category III Leader Dark Side Traits.
Figure 5. Job Demands and Job Resources Facets identified in the literature. (Note: darker black font indicates facets identified in the archival data and used for the present study. Also note: certain facets are represented by more than 1 item: i.e., physical environment and rewards are each comprised of two items.).
Figure 6. Job Demands and Job Resources Scree Plot.
Figure 7. Ethical Climate and Turnover Intentions Scree Plot.
Figure 8. Re-Specified Model of Results.
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